Goal Area 1: Preventing Initiation of Tobacco Use Among Young People
Goal Area 1

Preventing Initiation of Tobacco Use Among Young People

**Inputs**
- State health department and partners
- Community mobilization
- Counter-marketing
- School-based prevention
- Policy and regulatory action

**Activities**
- Completed activities to reduce and counteract pro-tobacco messages
- Completed activities to disseminate anti-tobacco and pro-health messages
- Completed activities to increase tobacco-free policies and use of anti-tobacco curricula in schools
- Completed activities to increase restrictions on tobacco sales to minors and to enforce those restrictions
- Completed activities to increase cigarette excise tax
- Targeted to populations with tobacco-related disparities

**Outputs**

**Outcomes**

**Short-term**
- Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation
- Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools
- Increased restrictions and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors
- Reduced tobacco industry influences

**Intermediate**
- Reduced susceptibility to experimentation with tobacco products
- Decreased access to tobacco products
- Decreased tobacco-related morbidity and mortality

**Long-term**
- Reduced initiation of tobacco use by young people
- Reduced tobacco-use prevalence among young people
- Reduced tobacco-related disparities
Goal Area 1

Preventing Initiation of Tobacco Use Among Young People

Short-term Outcomes

- **Outcome 6:** Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation
  - 1.6.1 Level of confirmed awareness of anti-tobacco media messages
  - 1.6.2 Level of receptivity to anti-tobacco media messages
  - 1.6.3 Proportion of students who would ever wear or use something with a tobacco company name or picture
  - 1.6.4 Level of support for policies, and enforcement of policies, to decrease young people’s access to tobacco
  - 1.6.5 Level of support for increasing excise tax on tobacco products
  - 1.6.6 Level of awareness among parents about the importance of discussing tobacco use with their children
  - 1.6.7 Level of support for creating policies in schools
  - 1.6.8 Proportion of young people who think that the cigarette companies try to get young people to smoke

- **Outcome 7:** Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools
  - 1.7.1 Proportion of schools or school districts reporting the implementation of 100% tobacco-free policies
  - 1.7.2 Proportion of schools or school districts that provide instruction on tobacco-use prevention that meets CDC guidelines
  - 1.7.3 Proportion of schools or school districts that provide tobacco-use prevention education in grades K–12
  - 1.7.4 Proportion of schools or school districts that provide program-specific training for teachers
  - 1.7.5 Proportion of schools or school districts that involve families in support of school-based programs
  - 1.7.6 Proportion of schools or school districts that support cessation interventions for students and staff who use tobacco
  - 1.7.7 Proportion of schools or school districts that assess their tobacco-use prevention program at regular intervals
  - 1.7.8 Proportion of students who participate in tobacco-use prevention activities
1.7.9 Level of reported exposure to school-based tobacco-use prevention curricula that meet CDC guidelines

1.7.10 Perceived compliance with tobacco-free policies in schools

1.7.11 Proportion of schools or school districts with policies that regulate display of tobacco industry promotional items

■ **Outcome 8: Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors**

- 1.8.1 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that ban tobacco vending machine sales in places accessible to young people
- 1.8.2 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that require retail licenses to sell tobacco products
- 1.8.3 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that control the location, number, and density of retail outlets
- 1.8.4 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that control self-service tobacco sales
- 1.8.5 Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies
- 1.8.6 Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for infractions of public policies against young people’s access to tobacco products
- 1.8.7 Changes in state tobacco control laws that preempt stronger local tobacco control laws

■ **Outcome 9: Reduced tobacco industry influences**

- 1.9.1 Extent and type of retail tobacco advertising and promotions
- 1.9.2 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate the extent and type of retail tobacco advertising and promotions
- 1.9.3 Extent of tobacco advertising outside of stores
- 1.9.4 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate the extent of tobacco advertising outside of stores
- 1.9.5 Extent of tobacco industry sponsorship of public and private events
- 1.9.6 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate tobacco industry sponsorship of public events
- 1.9.7 Extent of tobacco advertising on school property, at school events, and near schools
- 1.9.8 Extent of tobacco advertising in print media
1.9.9 □ Amount and quality of news media stories about tobacco industry practices and political lobbying

1.9.10 □ Number and type of Master Settlement Agreement violations by tobacco companies

1.9.11 □ Extent of tobacco industry contributions to institutions and groups

1.9.12 □ Amount of tobacco industry campaign contributions to local and state politicians

Intermediate Outcomes

■ Outcome 10: Reduced susceptibility to experimentation with tobacco products

1.10.1 □ Proportion of young people who think that smoking is cool and helps them fit in

1.10.2 □ Proportion of young people who think that young people who smoke have more friends

1.10.3 □ Proportion of young people who report that their parents have discussed not smoking with them

1.10.4 □ Proportion of parents who report that they have discussed not smoking with their children

1.10.5 □ Proportion of young people who are susceptible never-smokers

■ Outcome 11: Decreased access to tobacco products

1.11.1 □ Proportion of successful attempts to purchase tobacco products by young people

1.11.2 □ Proportion of young people reporting that they have been sold tobacco products by a retailer

1.11.3 □ Proportion of young people reporting that they have been unsuccessful in purchasing tobacco products from a retailer

1.11.4 □ Proportion of young people reporting that they have received tobacco products from a social source

1.11.5 □ Proportion of young people reporting that they purchased cigarettes from a vending machine

1.11.6 NR □ Proportion of young people who believe that it is easy to obtain tobacco products

■ Outcome 12: Increased price of tobacco products

1.12.1 □ Amount of tobacco product excise tax
Long-term Outcomes

■ **Outcome 13: Reduced initiation of tobacco use by young people**
  ▶ **1.13.1** Average age at which young people first smoked a whole cigarette
  ▶ **1.13.2** Proportion of young people who report never having tried a cigarette

■ **Outcome 14: Reduced tobacco-use prevalence among young people**
  ▶ **1.14.1** Prevalence of tobacco use among young people
  ▶ **1.14.2** Proportion of established young smokers
KEY OUTCOME INDICATORS for Evaluating Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs
Outcome 6

**Increased Knowledge of, Improved Anti-tobacco Attitudes Toward, and Increased Support for Policies to Reduce Youth Initiation**

The theory of change associated with preventing young people from starting to use tobacco begins with increasing their knowledge of the dangers of tobacco use, changing their attitudes toward tobacco use, and increasing public support for policies that reduce the likelihood that young people will use tobacco. The tobacco industry spends more than $12.5 billion per year on marketing. Adolescents are bombarded with pro-tobacco messages in and around retail stores, in magazines, in movies, and by smokers around them. Evidence shows that anti-tobacco media campaigns, when combined with other interventions, are effective in reducing tobacco use by adolescents. For example, the “truth” anti-tobacco media campaign in Florida achieved nearly 93% confirmed awareness of the message among young people and was associated with improved anti-tobacco attitudes. After one year, both susceptibility to smoking and cigarette use declined more among Florida’s young people than among young people in the rest of the nation.

In addition to changing young people’s attitudes toward tobacco use, it is necessary to increase adult support for implementing and enforcing policies that reduce the likelihood that young people will begin smoking. Such policies include increasing tobacco excise taxes, passing and enforcing strong laws that decrease young people’s access to tobacco, and implementing tobacco-free school policies. Policies such as these eventually create an environment that supports a smoke-free lifestyle among young people.

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

- **1.6.1** Level of confirmed awareness of anti-tobacco media messages
- **1.6.2** Level of receptivity to anti-tobacco media messages
- **1.6.3** Proportion of students who would ever wear or use something with a tobacco company name or picture
- **1.6.4** Level of support for policies, and enforcement of policies, to decrease young people’s access to tobacco
- **1.6.5** Level of support for increasing excise tax on tobacco products
- **1.6.6** Level of awareness among parents about the importance of discussing tobacco use with their children
- **1.6.7** Level of support for creating policies in schools
- **1.6.8** Proportion of young people who think that the cigarette companies try to get young people to smoke
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### Outcome 6

**Increased Knowledge of, Improved Anti-tobacco Attitudes Toward, and Increased Support for Policies to Reduce Youth Initiation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Overall Quality</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1</td>
<td>Level of confirmed awareness of anti-tobacco media messages</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2</td>
<td>Level of receptivity to anti-tobacco media messages</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3</td>
<td>Proportion of students who would ever wear or use something with a tobacco company name or picture</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" />†</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.4</td>
<td>Level of support for policies, and enforcement of policies, to decrease young people’s access to tobacco</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.5</td>
<td>Level of support for increasing excise tax on tobacco products</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" />$^\dagger$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6</td>
<td>Level of awareness among parents about the importance of discussing tobacco use with their children</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" />$^\dagger$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.7$^{NR}$</td>
<td>Level of support for creating policies in schools</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.8$^{NR}$</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who think that the cigarette companies try to get young people to smoke</td>
<td><img src="chart" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

$^\dagger$ Denotes no data.

$^{NR}$ Denotes an indicator that is not rated (see Appendix B for an explanation).
Indicator 1.6.1

Level of Confirmed Awareness of Anti-tobacco Media Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6</td>
<td>Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What to measure

Proportion of the target population that can accurately recall a media message.

Why this indicator is useful

Evaluators should measure exposure to anti-tobacco media messages to confirm awareness of these messages by asking respondents to provide specific information about the message.

Example data source(s)

Legacy Media Tracking Survey (LMTS), 2003
Information on LMTS available at: http://tobacco.rti.org/data/lmts.cfm

Population group(s)

Young people aged less than 18 years

Example survey question(s)

From LMTS
Have you recently seen an anti-smoking or anti-tobacco ad on TV that shows _________________________________?

☐ Yes ☐ Maybe, not sure ☐ No ☐ Refused to answer

What happens in this advertisement? (DO NOT READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

What do you think the main message of this ad was? (DO NOT READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES)

Comments

The example questions could be asked of adults.
Evaluators may want to categorize awareness of the medium (e.g., billboard, television, print) through which respondents learned of the anti-tobacco message.
Programs may want to evaluate confirmed awareness of an advertisement by respondents’ smoking status (current, former, or never) and addiction level (e.g., light, moderate, or heavy), because awareness levels may differ significantly among groups with different levels of addiction.
Evaluators should work closely with countermarketing campaign managers to (1) develop a separate series of questions for each main media message and (2) coordinate data collection with the timing of the media campaign.

Rating

Overall quality

Resources needed

Strength of evaluation evidence

Utility

Face validity

Accepted practice
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Indicator 1.6.2

Level of Receptivity to Anti-tobacco Media Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6</td>
<td>Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>The level of receptivity to media messages by the intended audience. Receptivity is generally defined as the extent to which people are willing to listen to a persuasive message. In tobacco control evaluation, however, the definition is narrower; receptivity is the extent to which people believe that the message was convincing, made them think about their behavior, and stimulated discussion with others.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Message awareness is necessary but not sufficient to change the knowledge, attitudes, and intentions of young people. Media campaigns are effective only if their messages reach and resonate with the intended audience. A well-received message helps ensure campaign effectiveness.² ³ One study found that receptivity to anti-tobacco messages was a significant predictor of lower rates of intention to smoke.⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example data source(s)</td>
<td>Legacy Media Tracking Survey (LMTS), 2003 Information on LMTS available at: <a href="http://tobacco.rti.org/data/lmts.cfm">http://tobacco.rti.org/data/lmts.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group(s)</td>
<td>Young people aged less than 18 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Example survey question(s) | From LMTS Tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statement: This ad is convincing. Would you say you:  
- Strongly agree  
- Agree  
- Disagree  
- Strongly disagree  
- Have no opinion  
- Don’t know  
Would you say the ad gave you good reasons not to smoke?  
- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know  
Did you talk to your friends about this ad?  
- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know |
| Comments | The example questions could be asked of adults. Evaluators may want to assess receptivity by the medium through which respondents learned of the media message (e.g., television, print, or radio). Evaluators should work closely with countermarketing campaign managers to (1) develop a separate series of questions for each main media message and (2) coordinate data collection with the timing of the media campaign. |
| Rating | Overall quality low high | Resources needed | Strength of evaluation evidence | Utility | Face validity | Accepted practice |
|        | | | | | | better |
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Indicator 1.6.3

**Proportion of Students Who Would Ever Wear or Use Something with a Tobacco Company Name or Picture**

**Goal area 1**  
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 6**  
Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation

**What to measure**  
Proportion of students who are willing to buy or receive a cigarette promotional item (e.g., sports gear, clothing, lighters, or sunglasses)

**Why this indicator is useful**  
Evidence suggests a causal relationship between adolescents’ willingness to wear or use tobacco promotional items and the likelihood that they will experiment with cigarettes.1–5 Young people who are highly receptive to tobacco marketing are more than twice as likely to become established smokers as those with a low level of receptivity to tobacco marketing.3

**Example data source(s)**  
Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004

**Population group(s)**  
Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**  
Would you ever use or wear something that has a tobacco company name or picture on it, such as a lighter, t-shirt, hat, or sunglasses?  
☐ Definitely yes  ☐ Probably yes  ☐ Probably not  ☐ Definitely not

**Comments**  
None

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low ↔ high</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**References**

Indicator 1.6.4

Level of Support for Policies, and Enforcement of Policies, to Decrease Young People’s Access to Tobacco

Goal area 1  Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 6  Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation

What to measure  Proportion of adults who support policies and enforcement of policies restricting young people’s access to tobacco products

Why this indicator is useful  Tobacco-free policies are unlikely to be adopted without support from business owners, policy makers, and the general public. In California, for example, public support for retail tobacco sales licensing policies has grown since 1990, and this has contributed to the passage of local tobacco licensing ordinances in several jurisdictions.

Example data source(s)  Adult Tobacco Survey (ATS): CDC Recommended Questions: Supplemental Section F: Policy Issues, 2003

Population group(s)  Adults aged 18 years or older

Example survey question(s)  From ATS
How important is it that communities keep stores from selling tobacco products to teenagers? Would you say it is

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- No opinion/Don’t know
- Refused

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Store owners should be required to have a license to sell tobacco products, similar to alcohol, so that teens can’t buy tobacco products. Would you say it is

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- No opinion/Don’t know
- Refused

Comments  The example questions could be asked of decision makers or retailers. Evaluators may want to analyze the level of support for creating policies to decrease access to tobacco by respondent’s tobacco use.

Rating  Overall quality: high  Resources needed: low  Strength of evaluation evidence:  Utility:  Face validity:  Accepted practice: better

Denotes no data.

References
**Indicator 1.6.5**

**Level of Support for Increasing Excise Tax on Tobacco Products**

**Goal area 1**

Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 6**

Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation

**What to measure**

Proportion of adults who support an increase in excise tax on cigarettes and the amount of tax increase they support

**Why this indicator**

Public opinion is a major determinant of the feasibility of enacting an excise tax increase on tobacco products. Tobacco policies are unlikely to be adopted without support from business owners, policy makers, and the general public. Measuring policy makers’ support for a tax increase will assess their willingness to support legislation for a tax increase.

**Example data source(s)**


**Population group(s)**

Adults aged 18 years or older

**Example survey question(s)**

From ATS

How much additional tax on a pack of cigarettes would you be willing to support if some or all the money raised was used to support tobacco control programs?

- [ ] More than two dollars a pack
- [ ] Less than fifty cents a pack
- [ ] Two dollars a pack
- [ ] No tax increase
- [ ] One dollar a pack
- [ ] Don’t know/Not sure
- [ ] Fifty to ninety-nine cents a pack
- [ ] Refused

**Comments**

The example questions could be asked of decision makers or opinion leaders. Evaluators may want to analyze the level of support for increasing an excise tax on tobacco products according to the smoking status of the respondent. To gather more complete data on tobacco use, evaluators can also ask questions about the use of other tobacco products such as spit tobacco (smokeless), bidis, small cigars, and loose tobacco (roll-your-own).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$^\dagger$$</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^\dagger$ Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

Denotes no data.

**References**

Indicator 1.6.6

Level of Awareness Among Parents About the Importance of Discussing Tobacco Use with Their Children

**Goal area 1**
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 6**
Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation

**What to measure**
Proportion of parents who believe that discussing tobacco use with their children is important

**Why this indicator is useful**
Although studies show that parental discussion about tobacco can reduce young people’s tobacco use, many parents do not discuss tobacco use with their children. Increasing awareness among parents of the importance of discussing tobacco use with their children is an important step in reducing tobacco initiation and use.

**Example data source(s)**
No commonly used data sources were found

**Population group(s)**
Parents of young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**
How important is it that you discuss tobacco use with your child(ren)? Would you say it is

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all
- No opinion/Don’t know
- Refused to answer

**Comments**
The authors created this example question. It does not come from any commonly used data source.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**References**

Indicator 1.6.7<sup>NR</sup>

### Level of Support for Creating Policies in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 6</strong></td>
<td>Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What to measure</strong></td>
<td>Proportion of adults who support creating and actively enforcing tobacco-free policies in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why this indicator is useful</strong></td>
<td>Young people’s attitudes about the acceptability of smoking are influenced by what they see their peers and educators doing at school. Strong school anti-tobacco policies require the support of parents, teachers, principals, policy makers, and the general public.¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Example data source(s)
- University of California at San Diego, California Tobacco Survey (CTS): Adult Attitudes and Practices, 1996
  - Information on CTS available at:
    - [http://ssdc.ucsd.edu/tobacco](http://ssdc.ucsd.edu/tobacco)
- Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), Tobacco Use Prevention Module, 2000

#### Population group(s)
- Adults aged 18 years or older

#### Example survey question(s)
- **From ATS**
  How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Tobacco use by adults should not be allowed on school grounds or at any school events.
  - [ ] Strongly agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Disagree
  - [ ] Strongly disagree  [ ] No opinion/Don’t know  [ ] Refused

- **From CTS**
  Do you think schools should prohibit students from wearing clothing or bringing gear with tobacco brand logos to school?
  - [ ] Yes  [ ] No

- **From BRFSS**
  Do you think that smoking should be allowed in all areas of schools, restaurants, day care, and indoor work areas, some areas, or not allowed at all?
  - [ ] All areas  [ ] Some areas
  - [ ] Not allowed  [ ] Refused to answer

#### Comments
The example questions could also be asked of decision makers. Evaluators may want to analyze the level of support for creating tobacco-free policies in schools based on the respondent’s tobacco use. This indicator was not rated by the panel of experts and, therefore, no rating information is provided. See Appendix B for an explanation.
**GOAL AREA 1**

▲ Outcome 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🤔</td>
<td></td>
<td>🤔</td>
<td>🤔</td>
<td>🤔</td>
<td>🤔</td>
<td>🤔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

🤔 Denotes no data.

NR: Denotes an indicator that is not rated (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**Reference**
Indicator 1.6.8<sub>NR</sub>

**Proportion of Young People Who Think That the Cigarette Companies Try to Get Young People to Smoke**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6</td>
<td>Increased knowledge of, improved anti-tobacco attitudes toward, and increased support for policies to reduce youth initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who believe that cigarette companies try to get young people to start smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>If young people are aware of the tobacco industry’s attempts to persuade them to start smoking, they may become less susceptible to the tobacco industry’s marketing tactics.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group(s)</td>
<td>Young people aged less than 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example survey question(s)</td>
<td>Do tobacco companies try to get young people to start smoking by using advertisements that are attractive to young people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>This indicator was not rated by the panel of experts and, therefore, no rating information is provided. See Appendix B for an explanation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denotes no data.

<sup>NR</sup> Denotes an indicator that is not rated (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**Reference**

Increased Anti-tobacco Policies and Programs in Schools

To prevent and reduce tobacco use by young people, schools should implement comprehensive anti-tobacco policies and programs that reinforce tobacco-free norms. Young people spend much of their time in school and are influenced by school policies and programs and by the actions of their peers and of adults.\(^1\) Evidence shows that education programs that include instruction on the short- and long-term physiologic and social consequences of tobacco use, social influences on tobacco use, peer norms, and life skills can prevent or reduce tobacco use among students.\(^2,3\) School-based interventions that are combined with mass media campaigns and additional community-wide educational anti-tobacco activities show evidence of effectiveness in reducing tobacco use among young people.\(^3\) The Community Guide to Preventive Services Task Force, however, states that insufficient evidence is available to indicate that either school-based education programs (e.g., classroom programs) or student-delivered community education (e.g., Students Working Against Tobacco [SWAT]) are effective when implemented alone, without other community activities to supplement or reinforce them.\(^3\)

The demand for effective tobacco-use cessation interventions for young people has been growing.\(^4\) As with all public health programs, such interventions must be based on evidence that proves that they work. Unfortunately, few rigorous scientific studies exist on which to base recommendations that would help young smokers quit.\(^4\)

CDC provides guidelines for school health programs to prevent tobacco use and addiction.\(^2\) The guidelines include recommendations on policies, curricula and instruction, teacher training, parental involvement, tobacco-use cessation, and evaluation. The guidelines are based on research, scientific theory, and practice.

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

- **1.7.1** Proportion of schools or school districts reporting the implementation of 100% tobacco-free policies
- **1.7.2** Proportion of schools or school districts that provide instruction on tobacco-use prevention that meets CDC guidelines
- **1.7.3** Proportion of schools or school districts that provide tobacco-use prevention education in grades K–12
- **1.7.4** Proportion of schools or school districts that provide program-specific training for teachers
- **1.7.5** Proportion of schools or school districts that involve families in support of school-based programs
- **1.7.6** Proportion of schools or school districts that support cessation interventions for students and staff who use tobacco
- **1.7.7** Proportion of schools or school districts that assess their tobacco-use prevention program at regular intervals
Proportion of students who participate in tobacco-use prevention activities

Level of reported exposure to school-based tobacco-use prevention curricula that meet CDC guidelines

Perceived compliance with tobacco-free policies in schools

Proportion of schools or school districts with policies that regulate display of tobacco industry promotional items

References
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**Outcome 7**

**Increased Anti-tobacco Policies and Programs in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7.1</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts reporting the implementation of 100% tobacco-free policies</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.2</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that provide instruction on tobacco-use prevention that meets CDC guidelines</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.3</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that provide tobacco-use prevention education in grades K–12</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.4</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that provide program-specific training for teachers</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.5</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that involve families in support of school-based programs</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.6</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that support cessation interventions for students and staff who use tobacco</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.7</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that assess their tobacco-use prevention program at regular intervals</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SSS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.8</td>
<td>Proportion of students who participate in tobacco-use prevention activities</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.9</td>
<td>Level of reported exposure to school-based tobacco-use prevention curricula that meet CDC guidelines</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.10</td>
<td>Perceived compliance with tobacco-free policies in schools</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.11</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts with policies that regulate display of tobacco industry promotional items</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Rating" /> $SS$ <img src="image2" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image3" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image4" alt="Rating" /> <img src="image5" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

$\n$ Denotes no data.
**Indicator 1.7.1**

**Proportion of Schools or School Districts Reporting the Implementation of 100% Tobacco-free Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 7</td>
<td>Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that report having a policy that prohibits anyone from using tobacco at all times on school grounds, at all school-sponsored functions, and in school vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Young people spend much of their formative years in school. Their attitudes toward the acceptability of smoking in general are influenced by the actions of their peers and educators at school.¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example data source(s)</td>
<td>CDC School Health Profiles: School Principal Questionnaire (Profiles), 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group(s)</td>
<td>School principals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example survey question(s)</th>
<th>From Profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has this school adopted a policy prohibiting tobacco use?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the tobacco prevention policy specifically prohibit use of each type of tobacco product for each of the following groups?</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of tobacco product</th>
<th>Students Yes No</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff Yes No</th>
<th>Visitors Yes No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokeless tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the tobacco prevention policy specifically prohibit use during each of the following times for each of the following groups? | □ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Students Yes No</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff Yes No</th>
<th>Visitors Yes No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During school hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During non-school hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the tobacco prevention policy specifically prohibit tobacco use in each of the following locations for each of the following groups? | □ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Students Yes No</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff Yes No</th>
<th>Visitors Yes No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In school buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On school grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school buses or other vehicles used to transport students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At off-campus, school-sponsored events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To measure this indicator fully, evaluators should use all four example questions, not just one or two.

Evaluators could also collect information on school districts in order to measure the proportion of students in the district who attend schools with anti-tobacco policies.

This indicator can be used to measure progress toward achieving Recommendation 1 of CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$\text{S}$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

References
Indicator 1.7.2

Proportion of Schools or School Districts That Provide Instruction on Tobacco-use Prevention That Meets CDC Guidelines

Goal area 1
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 7
Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools

What to measure
Proportion of schools or school districts that report providing instruction on (1) the physiologic and social consequences of tobacco use and (2) the social influences on tobacco use, peer norms, and life skills

Why this indicator is useful
Evidence suggests that programs that include instruction on the short- and long-term physiologic and social consequences of tobacco use, social influences on tobacco use, peer norms, and life skills can prevent or reduce tobacco use among students.\(^1\),\(^2\)

Example data source(s)
- CDC School Health Profiles: Lead Health Education Teacher Questionnaire (Profiles), 2002

Population group(s)
- Health education teachers
- Teachers and school administrators

Example survey question(s)
From Profiles
During this school year, did teachers in this school teach each of the following tobacco use prevention topics in a required health education course for students in any of grades 6 through 12? Mark yes or no for each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example survey question(s) (cont.)

During the last school year (2002–2003), which of the following topics did you cover in your tobacco use prevention lessons? (Mark all that apply).

- I did not teach tobacco prevention lessons
- Effects of tobacco on health
- How many young people smoke
- Reasons why young people smoke
- Social consequences of using tobacco
- Secondhand smoke
- Social influences that promote tobacco use
- Behavioral skills for resisting tobacco offers
- General personal and social skills (e.g., problem solving, assertiveness, communication, and goal setting)
- Tobacco cessation
- Tobacco advertising and marketing
- Cigar use
- Other (specify): __________________________________________

Comments

It would be useful for evaluators to obtain information on the specific curriculum taught. Further information on the anti-tobacco curriculum being taught could be collected using a student survey.

This indicator can be used to measure progress toward achieving Recommendation 2 of CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction.”

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

References

**Indicator 1.7.3**

**Proportion of Schools or School Districts That Provide Tobacco-use Prevention Education in Grades K–12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 7</td>
<td>Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that report providing tobacco-use prevention education in grades K–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Research, theory, and current practice demonstrate that the success of school-based prevention programs dissipates over time. CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction,” therefore, calls for tobacco use prevention to be taught in each grade, with increasing intensity in middle school and reinforcement in high school grades.¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example data source(s)**

CDC School Health Profiles: Lead Health Education Teacher Questionnaire (Profiles), 2002

**Population group(s)**

Health education teachers

**Example survey question(s)**

**From Profiles**

During the school year, in which of the following grades was information on tobacco-use prevention provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are required tobacco-use prevention units or lessons taught in each of the following courses in the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Home economics or family and consumer education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Physical education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Family life education or life skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Special education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

This indicator can be used to measure progress toward achieving Recommendation 3 of CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction.”¹
### Goal Area 1: Preventing Initiation of Tobacco Use Among Young People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⬅️.low</td>
<td>⬅️.low</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

### Reference
**Indicator 1.7.4**

### Proportion of Schools or School Districts That Provide Program-specific Training for Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 7</td>
<td>Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that report providing tobacco-use prevention education training for school educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction” state that curriculum implementation and overall program effectiveness are improved when teachers are trained to deliver the program as designed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Example data source(s)

- CDC School Health Profiles: Lead Health Education Teacher Questionnaire, (Profiles), 2002

#### Population group(s)

- Health education teachers
- Teachers
- District coordinators

#### Example survey question(s)

**From Profiles**

During the past two years, did you receive staff development (such as workshops, conferences, continuing education, or any other kind of in-service training) on each of the following topics? [22 health topics (letters a–v) are listed; tobacco-use prevention is one topic] Mark yes or no for each topic.

Would you like to receive staff development on each of these [22] health education topics? Mark yes or no for each topic.

**From California Tobacco Use Prevention Education Evaluation: Teacher Survey**

During the past five years, how much tobacco use prevention training have you received?

- None
- More than one full day of in-service training
- One full-day of in-service training
- Less than a full-day of in-service training
- I don’t remember

During the past five years, were you trained to deliver a specific published tobacco-use prevention curriculum?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t remember

---

*KEY OUTCOME INDICATORS for Evaluating Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs*
Overall, to what extent do you feel you are prepared to teach tobacco use prevention lessons?

☐ A great deal  ☐ Somewhat  ☐ Not too much  ☐ Not at all  ☐ Does not apply

**Example survey question(s) (cont.)**

**From California Tobacco Use Prevention Education Evaluation: District Coordinator Survey**

During the 2002–2003 school year, how many tobacco-specific in-service trainings, workshops, or staff development sessions has your school district sponsored or attended? ☐

______ Number of trainings, workshops, or staff development sessions. ☐

☐ I do not know/I’m not sure

If your district did sponsor or attend tobacco-specific in-service trainings, workshops, or staff development sessions during the last school year (2002–2003), how many schools were represented? ☐

Number of schools represented: _______

**Comments**

This indicator can be used to measure progress toward achieving Recommendation 4 of CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction.”

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference**

Indicator 1.7.5

Proportion of Schools or School Districts That Involve Families in Support of School-based Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 7</td>
<td>Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What to measure: Proportion of schools or school districts that attempt to get students’ parents or families involved in school-based tobacco-use prevention or cessation programs

Why this indicator is useful: CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction” recognizes the important role that parents and families play in providing social and environmental support that will help young people remain tobacco-free. Families are part of the greater community to which schools should be connecting their programs.1,2

Example data source(s):
- CDC School Health Profiles: Lead Health Education Teacher Questionnaire (Profiles), 2002

Population group(s): Health education teachers

Example survey question(s):
From Profiles
During this school year, has this school done each of the following activities? Mark yes or no for each activity.
- □ Provided families with information on the health education program
- □ Met with a parents’ organization such as the PTA or PTO to discuss the health education program
- □ Invited family members to attend a health education class

From California Tobacco Use Prevention Education Evaluation: Teacher Survey
To what extent have you tried to get students’ parents involved in tobacco use prevention education? □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Involvement</th>
<th>Extent That You Tried to Get Parents Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Included parents in homework assignments</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Held meeting with parents of student smokers</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distributed parent-student handbook that included description of tobacco-free school policy</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distributed newsletters or educational materials to parents</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provided information on smoking cessation to parents</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Had tobacco education displays or discussions at open houses, meetings, health fairs</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invited parents to be guest speakers on tobacco issues</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involved parents in school-related activities (e.g., as judges of poster essay contests)</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other (describe)</td>
<td>□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

The example survey questions are limited to the perspective of educators. They cannot be used to assess parents’ actual involvement or desire to be involved in school-based tobacco control activities.

This indicator can be used to measure progress toward achieving Recommendation 5 of CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction.”

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

References

Indicator 1.7.6

**Proportion of Schools or School Districts That Support Cessation Interventions for Students and Staff Who Use Tobacco**

| Goal area 1 | Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people
| Outcome 7 | Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools

**What to measure**
Proportion of schools or school districts that report providing tobacco cessation support (e.g., counseling for students and staff who use tobacco or referrals to tobacco-cessation programs)

**Why this indicator is useful**
CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction” recommends that schools support cessation for staff and students, either by providing referrals to cessation services or by sponsoring cessation programs.1,2

**Example data source(s)**
CDC School Health Profiles: School Principal Questionnaire (Profiles), 2002

**Population group(s)**
School principals

**Example survey question(s)**
From Profiles
Does your school provide referrals to tobacco cessation programs for each of the following groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
A survey question could be added regarding (1) the cessation services at the school or (2) the type of cessation programs to which students and faculty are referred.

This indicator can be used to measure progress toward achieving Recommendation 6 of CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction.”1

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Indicator 1.7.7

Proportion of Schools or School Districts That Assess Their Tobacco-use Prevention Program at Regular Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 7</td>
<td>Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of schools or school districts that report having an evaluation system in place and using it to assess their tobacco-use prevention program at regular intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction” recommend that schools assess their tobacco-use prevention programs at regular intervals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example data source(s) | No commonly used data sources were found |

Population group(s)  ▶ School principals
▶ Health education teachers

Example survey question(s) | Does your school (or school district) assess your tobacco-use prevention program at regular intervals?  
| □ Yes  □ No  □ Not sure |

Comments  ▶ The authors created this example question. It does not come from any commonly used data source.

This indicator can be used to measure progress toward achieving Recommendation 7 of CDC’s “Guidelines for School Health Programs to Prevent Tobacco Use and Addiction.”

Rating  ▶ Overall quality  ▶ Resources needed  ▶ Strength of evaluation evidence  ▶ Utility  ▶ Face validity  ▶ Accepted practice

$\text{Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75\% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).}$
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Indicator 1.7.8

Proportion of Students Who Participate in Tobacco-use Prevention Activities

Goal area 1
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 7
Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools

What to measure
Proportion of students who report participating in at least one tobacco-use prevention activity in the past 12 months

Why this indicator is useful
An intervention with growing popularity is involving young people in anti-tobacco activities. These activities help reduce young people’s susceptibility to experimenting with tobacco by changing the social norm regarding tobacco use.\(^1\),\(^2\)

Example data source(s)
Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004

Population group(s)
Young people aged less than 18 years

Example survey question(s)
During the past 12 months, have you participated in any community activities to discourage people your age from using cigarettes, chewing tobacco, snuff, dip, or cigars?

Yes  No, I did not know about any activities

Comments
Evaluators may choose to categorize data by grade level and type of school (elementary, middle, high school, private, parochial, public).
Evaluators may want to assess young people’s awareness of anti-smoking activities at school and outside school.

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{§}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\d\)
Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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### Indicator 1.7.9

**Level of Reported Exposure to School-based Tobacco-use Prevention Curricula That Meet CDC Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 7</strong></td>
<td>Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What to measure</strong></td>
<td>Proportion of students who report receiving tobacco prevention education in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why this indicator is useful</strong></td>
<td>Measuring students’ recall of tobacco education helps verify curriculum delivery and saliency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Example data source(s)
- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group(s)</th>
<th>Young people aged less than 18 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Example survey question(s)

**From YTS**

During this school year, did you practice ways to say NO to tobacco in any of your classes (for example, by role-playing)?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not sure

During this school year, were you taught in any of your classes about the dangers of tobacco use?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Not sure

**From California Independent Evaluation: Youth Survey**

During the last year (12 months), did you discuss the reasons why people your age smoke during any of your classes?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I don’t know/I’m not sure

During the last year (12 months), did you discuss how many people your age smoke during any of your classes?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I don’t know/I’m not sure

#### Comments

Evaluators may also choose to categorize data by grade level and type of school (elementary, middle, high school, private, parochial, public).

Student perceptions of tobacco prevention education should also be evaluated; students who perceive the education as helpful are less susceptible to smoking than those who do not perceive it as useful.

#### Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>single</td>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### References

**Indicator 1.7.10**

**Perceived Compliance with Tobacco-free Policies in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 7</td>
<td>Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of students who report that the school population is complying with the school’s tobacco-free policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Perceived compliance with tobacco-free policies is one measure of actual compliance with these policies. If tobacco-free policies are not observed, they are not likely to be effective in changing social norms or inhibiting tobacco use among young people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example data source(s)**

- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
- CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

| Population group(s) | Young people aged less than 18 years |

**Example survey question(s)**

From **YTS and YRBSS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes on school property?</td>
<td>0 days, 1 or 2 days, 3 to 5 days, 6 to 9 days, 10 to 19 days, 20 to 29 days, All 30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the past 30 days, on how many days did you use chewing tobacco, snuff, or dip on school property?</td>
<td>0 days, 1 or 2 days, 3 to 5 days, 6 to 9 days, 10 to 19 days, 20 to 29 days, All 30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From **California Independent Evaluation: Youth Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a rule at your school that no one is allowed to smoke cigarettes in the school building or on the school yard?</td>
<td>Yes, No, I don’t know/I’m not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you seen any students break that rule?</td>
<td>Yes, No, My school does not have a no-smoking rule, I don’t know/I’m not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many students who are smokers break that rule?</td>
<td>None, A few, Some, Most, All of them, My school does not have a no-smoking rule, I don’t know/I’m not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you seen adults break that rule?</td>
<td>Yes, No, My school does not have a no-smoking rule, I don’t know/I’m not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a rule at your school that no one is allowed to use chewing tobacco or snuff in the school building or on the school yard?</td>
<td>Yes, No, I don’t know/I’m not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

If students report on the YTS or YRBSS instruments (1) the existence of a tobacco-free school policy and (2) having personally used tobacco products more than 1 day on school property, they are considered noncompliant.

Evaluators may categorize data by grade level and type of school (elementary, middle, high school, private, parochial, public).

Evaluators should determine the scope of the tobacco-free policies before evaluating perceived compliance with them.

The example survey questions could be asked of teachers and principals.

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\$ Denotes no data.
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Indicator 1.7.11

Proportion of Schools or School Districts with Policies That Regulate Display of Tobacco Industry Promotional Items

Goal area 1  Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 7  Increased anti-tobacco policies and programs in schools

What to measure  Proportion of schools and school districts that have policies that regulate the display of tobacco advertising in the school, on school grounds, on school vehicles, or in school publications. This policy should cover apparel and other merchandise showing tobacco logos.

Why this indicator is useful  Studies have consistently associated possession of or willingness to use tobacco industry promotional items with increased smoking among youth. Restrictions on the display of these promotional items at school contribute to an anti-tobacco social norm.

Example data source(s)  CDC School Health Profiles: School Principal Questionnaire (Profiles), 2002

Population group(s)  School principals

Example survey question(s)  Is tobacco advertising prohibited in each of the following locations?

Location  
- In the school building  
- On the school grounds, including on the outside of the building, on playing fields, or other areas of the campus  
- On school buses or other vehicles used to transport students  
- In school publications

Is tobacco advertising through sponsorship of school events prohibited?  

Are students at your school prohibited from wearing tobacco brand-name apparel or carrying merchandise with tobacco company names, logos, or cartoon characters on it?  

Does your school post signs marking a tobacco-free school zone (that is, a specified distance from school grounds where tobacco use by students, faculty and staff, and visitors is not allowed?)  

Comments  Evaluators may also choose to categorize data by grade level and type of school (elementary, middle, high school, private, parochial, public).

Rating  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Outcome 8

Increased Restriction and Enforcement of Restrictions on Tobacco Sales to Minors

Activities to decrease young people’s access to tobacco products are recognized components of a comprehensive approach to reducing the number of young people who start smoking. Efforts to reduce young people’s access to tobacco products are based on the rationale that making it more difficult for young people to obtain tobacco products will discourage them from beginning or continuing to use tobacco and thus reduce the prevalence of tobacco use. One strategy is to attempt to reduce retail tobacco sales to minors through activities such as (1) passing laws that restrict young people’s access to tobacco (including laws barring the sale of tobacco products to minors, bans on self-service displays of tobacco products, and bans or restrictions on tobacco vending machines), (2) educating merchants about these laws, (3) enforcing compliance with these laws, (4) educating the community and the media about the value of these laws, and (5) mobilizing the community to support these laws.

Experience shows that adoption and sustained enforcement of strong laws are prerequisites for reducing young people’s access to tobacco. Although this approach is necessary for success, it is not sufficient. Compliance checks show that laws against selling tobacco products to young people, when accompanied by retailer education and enforcement, can reduce the proportion of retailers who are willing to sell these products to minors. But, these reductions do not automatically translate into reductions in young people’s self-reported or perceived access to tobacco products, or into reductions in their tobacco use—the ultimate goal of youth access interventions. Some studies suggest that even if only a few retail outlets in a community sell tobacco to minors, young people who use tobacco are likely to know of these outlets and to frequent them.

According to the *Guide to Community Preventive Services*, the most effective approach to preventing young people from gaining access to tobacco products (as measured by minors’ self-reported tobacco purchase or use behaviors) consists of a combination of strong local and state laws, vigorous and sustained enforcement of these laws, retailer education, and—most importantly—community mobilization to generate community support for efforts to reduce youth access to tobacco products. As with other aspects of tobacco control, community mobilization may play a particularly important role because of its ability to change social norms—in this case, norms regarding the social acceptability of selling or otherwise providing tobacco products to minors. The *Guide to Community Preventive Services* indicates that none of the interventions listed above have been shown to be effective when implemented in isolation, in particular when implemented without a strong link to community mobilization initiatives.

Moreover, even if illegal sales to minors were eliminated completely, young people could still acquire tobacco products through other, noncommercial or social sources, including shoplifting, stealing from parents and other relatives, borrowing from friends and relatives, and asking older friends or strangers to buy tobacco products for them. In fact, younger children (who have less success than older children in
purchasing tobacco products at retail outlets) often rely on these alternative sources to obtain tobacco products. Thus, even interventions that are successful in reducing young people’s self-reported or perceived access to tobacco products through commercial sources will not necessarily reduce their overall access to or use of these products. Accordingly, as rates of retail sales to minors decline, interventions to address these other sources of access will become increasingly important.

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

- **1.8.1** Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that ban tobacco vending machine sales in places accessible to young people
- **1.8.2** Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that require retail licenses to sell tobacco products
- **1.8.3** Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that control the location, number, and density of retail outlets
- **1.8.4** Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that control self-service tobacco sales
- **1.8.5** Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies
- **1.8.6** Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for infractions of public policies against young people’s access to tobacco products
- **1.8.7** Changes in state tobacco control laws that preempt stronger local tobacco control laws

**References**


**For Further Reading**


## Outcome 8

### Increased Restriction and Enforcement of Restrictions on Tobacco Sales to Minors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.8.1  | Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that ban tobacco vending machine sales in places accessible to young people                  | low             | $\,
| 1.8.2  | Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that require retail licenses to sell tobacco products                                           | low             | $\,
| 1.8.3  | Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that control the location, number, and density of retail outlets                                   | low             | $\,
| 1.8.4  | Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that control self-service tobacco sales                                                           | low             | $\,
| 1.8.5  | Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies                                                                             | low             | $\,
| 1.8.6  | Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for infractions of public policies against young people’s access to tobacco products   | low             | $\,
| 1.8.7  | Changes in state tobacco control laws that preempt stronger local tobacco control laws                                                      | low             | $\,

* Denotes low reviewer response: that is, greater than 75% of the experts either did not rate the indicator, or gave the criterion an invalid rating (see Appendix B for an explanation).
† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).
$\$ Denotes no data.
Indicator 1.8.1

Proportion of Jurisdictions with Policies That Ban Tobacco Vending Machine Sales in Places Accessible to Young People

Goal area 1: Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 8: Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors

What to measure: Proportion of local jurisdictions that have enforceable policies banning tobacco vending machine sales in locations accessible to minors

Why this indicator is useful: Accessible vending machines provide virtually unrestricted access to tobacco and can be used by even the youngest children. As of 2004, 46 states and the District of Columbia restricted minors’ access to tobacco through vending machines, and 30 states and the District of Columbia banned vending machines in locations that are accessible to young people.

Example data source(s):
- Policy tracking system
- Americans for Nonsmokers’ Rights (ANR)
  Information on ANR available at: http://www.no-smoke.org
- American Lung Association’s State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues (SLATI)
  Information on SLATI available at: http://slati.lungusa.org

Population group(s): Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring pertinent local tobacco laws, ordinances, or regulations.

Example survey question(s): Not applicable

Comments: Evaluators may want to assess the levels of restrictions on tobacco vending machines (e.g., restrictions on placement of vending machines). Evaluators may also choose to gather data on the size and demographics of the population affected by the relevant laws or ordinances.

Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>$ $ $</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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**Indicator 1.8.2**

**Proportion of Jurisdictions with Policies That Require Retail Licenses to Sell Tobacco Products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 8</td>
<td>Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of local jurisdictions that have public policies requiring retailers to have a license in order to sell tobacco products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Licensing laws that include graduated penalties for illegal sales and provisions for suspension or revocation for repeated violations may be an incentive for merchants to obey the law. Requiring licenses allows evaluators to develop a comprehensive list of tobacco merchants that can be used to conduct compliance checks. In addition, licensing fees can be used to support the cost of compliance checks. As of 2004, 39 states and the District of Columbia required tobacco retailers to obtain a license for over-the-counter tobacco sales and 27 states and the District of Columbia had laws in place identifying circumstances in which retail licenses can be suspended or revoked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example data source(s)**
- Policy tracking system
- Americans for Nonsmokers’ Rights (ANR)
- Information on ANR available at: [http://www.no-smoke.org](http://www.no-smoke.org)

**Population group(s)**
Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring pertinent local tobacco laws, ordinances, or regulations.

**Example survey question(s)**
Not applicable

**Comments**
Evaluators may also choose to gather data on the size and demographics of the population affected by the relevant laws or ordinances.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>🍁</td>
<td>🍁</td>
<td>🍁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**
Indicator 1.8.3

Proportion of Jurisdictions with Policies That Control the Location, Number, and Density of Retail Outlets

Goal area 1  Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 8  Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors

What to measure  Proportion of local jurisdictions that have public policies controlling the location, number, and density of tobacco retail outlets

Why this indicator is useful  Limiting the number of retail tobacco outlets decreases the availability of tobacco products and the number of pro-tobacco messages in a community. It also means that fewer stores need to be monitored for compliance with laws that prohibit young people’s access to tobacco.1,2

Example data source(s)  ▶ Policy tracking system
▶ Americans for Nonsmokers’ Rights (ANR)
Information on ANR available at: http://www.no-smoke.org

Population group(s)  Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring pertinent local tobacco laws, ordinances, or regulations.

Example survey question(s)  Not applicable

Comments  Evaluators may also choose to gather data on the size and demographics of the population affected by the relevant laws or ordinances.

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$*$  Denotes low reviewer response: that is, greater than 75% of the experts either did not rate the indicator, or gave the criterion an invalid rating (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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**Indicator 1.8.4**

**Proportion of Jurisdictions with Policies That Control Self-service Tobacco Sales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 8</td>
<td>Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>Proportion of local jurisdictions that have public policies controlling self-service tobacco sales (i.e., sales that allow customers to handle tobacco products before purchasing them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Self-service displays contribute to the visibility of tobacco and pro-tobacco messages in stores; they also make shoplifting tobacco products easier for minors. Illegal sales are more common when young people can access tobacco products directly through self-service displays rather than having to ask clerks for assistance.1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example data source(s)**
- Policy tracking system
- Americans for Nonsmokers’ Rights (ANR)
  Information on ANR available at: [http://www.no-smoke.org](http://www.no-smoke.org)

**Population group(s)**
Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring pertinent local tobacco laws, ordinances, or regulations.

**Example survey question(s)**
Not applicable

**Comments**
Evaluators may also choose to gather data on the size and demographics of the population affected by the relevant laws or ordinances.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**
**Indicators 1.8.5**

**Number of Compliance Checks Conducted by Enforcement Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 8</td>
<td>Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What to measure**

The number of checks conducted by enforcement agencies (e.g., police, health department inspectors, or building inspectors) to assess the level of retailer compliance with laws, regulations, or ordinances related to the sale of tobacco to minors.

**Why this indicator is useful**

An effective means of enforcing tobacco-free public policies is to conduct regular compliance checks, which reduce illegal sales. Compliance checks are also a method of assessing rates of compliance with laws regulating tobacco sales to minors. Such checks convey the message that policy makers and the public care about tobacco-free policies and are serious about enforcing them.\(^1\),\(^2\),\(^3\)

**Example data source(s)**

- **Enforcement Agency Survey**

**Population group(s)**

Agency representatives responsible for enforcement.

**Example survey question(s)**

From California Independent Evaluation: Policy Enforcement Survey: Youth Access to Tobacco

During the past 12 months, how many sting operations did your agency conduct to enforce PC §308(a) (illegal tobacco sales by merchants)?

**Comments**

Survey respondents may not have access to all requested information.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^†\) Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**References**

**Indicator 1.8.6**

**Number of Warnings, Citations, and Fines Issued for Infractions of Public Policies Against Young People’s Access to Tobacco Products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 8</td>
<td>Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>The number of warnings, citations, and fines issued to retailers for infractions of public policies against young people’s access to tobacco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why this indicator is useful**

Studies show that aggressive enforcement of laws regulating tobacco sales to young people results in significantly reduced sales to minors and may also result in reduced smoking prevalence among teenagers.1-3

**Example data source(s)**

- Enforcement Agency Survey

**Population group(s)**

Agency representatives responsible for enforcement

**Example survey question(s)**

From California Independent Evaluation: Policy Enforcement Survey: Youth Access to Tobacco

In the past year, how often has your agency conducted any of the following types of enforcement activities related to Penal Code §308?

- Responded to complaints about merchants selling tobacco products to minors
- Issued warnings to merchants selling tobacco products to minors
- Issued citations to merchants for illegal sales of tobacco products to minors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Evaluators may want to assess the effects that different penalties (e.g., graduated fines, loss of license to sell tobacco) have on illegal tobacco sale to minors.

Data must be interpreted in context. For example, a low number of citations may indicate either high levels of compliance or low levels of enforcement.

**Rating**

- **Overall quality**
  - Resources needed: $$$
  - Strength of evaluation evidence: ●
  - Utility: ○
  - Face validity: ○
  - Accepted practice: ○

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**References**

Indicator 1.8.7

Changes in State Tobacco Control Laws That □ Preempt Stronger Local Tobacco Control Laws □

Goal area 1 Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 8 Increased restriction and enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors □

What to measure □ Any change in legislation that prevents local jurisdictions from enacting restrictions that are more stringent than the state’s restrictions on minors’ access to tobacco or tobacco-related marketing

Why this indicator is useful Preemptive legislation is the tobacco industry’s chief strategy for eradicating local tobacco control ordinances. Because of the striking increase in the number of local tobacco control ordinances from the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s, the tobacco industry aggressively pushed for states to pass legislation that preempted local regulation of tobacco in various areas, including minors’ access, smoke-free indoor air, and marketing. As of September 1998, 21 states preempted at least one provision of local minors’ access restrictions. As of December 31, 2004, only two states, Maine and Delaware, have successfully repealed preemption laws in their entirety in any area of tobacco control policy. Preemptive laws prevent communities from engaging in the process of public education, mobilization, and debate that occurs when a local ordinance is under consideration, a process that can increase awareness and change social norms. They also pose a barrier to local enforcement, because communities and local enforcement agencies may be less likely to enforce state laws that they were not directly involved in adopting than to enforce local ordinances.

Example data source(s) CDC State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) system Data available at http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/STATEsystem

Population group(s) Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring state tobacco control laws.

Example survey question(s) Not applicable

Comments None

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low to high</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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Outcome 9

Reduced Tobacco Industry Influences

According to the most recent Federal Trade Commission tobacco report, the U.S. tobacco industry spent almost $12.5 billion in 2002 to advertise and promote its products.\(^1\) It is not surprising, therefore, that studies show that a high percentage of young people are exposed to, aware of, and able to recall tobacco advertising.\(^2\) Moreover, researchers have found that receptivity to tobacco industry marketing is associated with susceptibility towards tobacco use, that teenagers are three times more sensitive to cigarette advertising than adults, and that young people who approve of tobacco advertising and identify with the images portrayed in the advertisements are more likely than non-approving young people to start smoking.\(^2-8\)

In addition, tobacco advertising can distort young people’s perceptions of tobacco use.\(^2,6-8\) An indirect result of heavy tobacco industry advertising is the dampening effect it has on the number and quality of media stories about the health risks of smoking.\(^2\) By promoting smoking, the tobacco industry undermines the ability of parents to prevent adolescents from starting to smoke.\(^9\)

Many of the tobacco industry’s advertising expenditures are in retail stores.\(^1\) Retail stores are saturated with pro-tobacco signage, branded objects, and tobacco displays. Many of these objects are clustered around the cash registers, making it virtually impossible for anyone, including children, not to be exposed to pro-tobacco messages. Signage visible outside the stores exposes entire communities to tobacco marketing. The result is that many U.S. children grow up surrounded by pro-tobacco messages.\(^10\)

The tobacco industry also spends considerable resources to sponsor or support public events, the arts, and other worthy causes.\(^1\) It is clear that the tobacco industry influences policy makers through contributions and lobbying, which results in a more favorable, pro-tobacco policy environment.\(^11\)

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

- 1.9.1 Extent and type of retail tobacco advertising and promotions
- 1.9.2 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate the extent and type of retail tobacco advertising and promotions
- 1.9.3 Extent of tobacco advertising outside of stores
- 1.9.4 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate the extent of tobacco advertising outside of stores
- 1.9.5 Extent of tobacco industry sponsorship of public and private events
- 1.9.6 Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate tobacco industry sponsorship of public events
- 1.9.7 Extent of tobacco advertising on school property, at school events, and near schools
Goal Area 1: Preventing Initiation of Tobacco Use Among Young People

1.9.8 □ Extent of tobacco advertising in print media

1.9.9 □ Amount and quality of news media stories about tobacco industry practices and political lobbying

1.9.10 □ Number and type of Master Settlement Agreement violations by tobacco companies

1.9.11 □ Extent of tobacco industry contributions to institutions and groups

1.9.12 □ Amount of tobacco industry campaign contributions to local and state politicians
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## Outcome 9

### Reduced Tobacco Industry Influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9.1</td>
<td>Extent and type of retail tobacco advertising and promotions</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>◊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.2</td>
<td>Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate the extent and type of retail tobacco advertising and promotions</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>◊†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.3</td>
<td>Extent of tobacco advertising outside of stores</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.4</td>
<td>Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate the extent of tobacco advertising outside of stores</td>
<td>$$$‡</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.5</td>
<td>Extent of tobacco industry sponsorship of public and private events</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.6</td>
<td>Proportion of jurisdictions with policies that regulate tobacco industry sponsorship of public events</td>
<td>$$$‡</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.7</td>
<td>Extent of tobacco advertising on school property, at school events, and near schools</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.8</td>
<td>Extent of tobacco advertising in print media</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.9</td>
<td>Amount and quality of news media stories about tobacco industry practices and political lobbying</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.10</td>
<td>Number and type of Master Settlement Agreement violations by tobacco companies</td>
<td>$$$$‡</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.11</td>
<td>Extent of tobacco industry contributions to institutions and groups</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9.12</td>
<td>Amount of tobacco industry campaign contributions to local and state politicians</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).
‡ Denotes that the experts’ rating was modified (see Appendix B for an explanation).
† Denotes no data.
**Indicator 1.9.1**

### Extent and Type of Retail Tobacco Advertising and Promotions

**Goal area 1**  
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 9**  
Reduced tobacco industry influences

**What to measure**  
The level and type of tobacco advertising and promotion in and around retail stores and the extent of indoor and outdoor advertisements including promotions, price reductions, and strategic product placement

**Why this indicator is useful**  
Retail stores have become the industry’s primary communication channel to smokers and potential smokers. As a result, all shoppers, regardless of age or smoking status, are exposed to pro-tobacco messages. Some studies show that young people who approve of tobacco advertising and identify with the image portrayed in the advertisements are more likely to start smoking. Moreover, frequent (at least weekly) exposure to retail tobacco marketing among middle-school students is associated with a 50% increase in the odds of their ever smoking a cigarette, even after controlling for other known risk factors (e.g., parent smokes or friend smokes).

**Example data source(s)**  
- Environmental scan of tobacco advertising and promotional practices in retail outlets
- Operation Storefront: Youth Against Tobacco Advertising and Promotion Initiative  

**Population group(s)**  
Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by observation.

**Example survey question(s)**  
Not applicable

**Comments**  
Note that in *Lorillard v. Reilly* (533 U.S. 525 [2001]), the U.S. Supreme Court held that most regulations regarding cigarette advertising are preempted by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, which makes it difficult for states and localities to regulate the extent and amount of retail tobacco advertising and promotion.

Evaluators may choose to gather and report their findings by type of retailer (e.g., grocery store, convenience store, or gas station).

States can track the price of tobacco products independently by collecting scanner data (obtained from scanning product bar codes), which provide information on brand and promotions. However, the cost of this type of data collection can be prohibitive.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$$5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

◊ Denotes that the experts’ rating was modified (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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**Indicator 1.9.2**

**Proportion of Jurisdictions with Policies That Regulate the Extent and Type of Retail Tobacco Advertising and Promotions**

**Goal area 1**

Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 9**

Reduced tobacco industry influences

**What to measure**

The proportion of local jurisdictions that have public policies that in some way regulate retail advertising and promotion of tobacco

**Why this indicator is useful**

The tobacco industry is increasingly shifting its advertising focus to retailer incentives including offering financial and trade benefits to retailers that sell and display tobacco products. Regulating retail advertising and promotions may significantly reduce young people’s exposure to tobacco advertising.

**Example data source(s)**

Policy tracking system

**Population group(s)**

Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring pertinent local tobacco laws, ordinances, or regulations.

**Example survey question(s)**

Not applicable

**Comments**

Note that in *Lorillard v. Reilly* (533 U.S. 525 [2001]), the U.S. Supreme Court held that most regulations regarding cigarette advertising are preempted by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, which makes it difficult for states and localities to regulate the extent and amount of retail tobacco advertising and promotion.

Evaluators may also choose to gather data on the size and demographics of the population affected by the relevant laws or ordinances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low $\rightarrow$ high $$$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
<td>$\bullet$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference**

Indicator 1.9.3

**Extent of Tobacco Advertising Outside of Stores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 9</td>
<td>Reduced tobacco industry influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>The level and type of tobacco advertising on the exteriors of retail stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Tobacco advertisements appear frequently outside U.S. stores. They can be on stores’ outside walls and windows, in parking lots, or on the street. The strategies for reducing tobacco advertising on the exteriors of retail establishments are often different from the strategies for reducing advertising and promotions inside stores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example data source(s)</td>
<td>Environmental scan of tobacco advertising and promotional practices in retail outlets. Operation Storefront: Youth Against Tobacco Advertising and Promotion Initiative Information available at: <a href="http://www.dhs.ca.gov/tobacco/html/Evaluation_Resources.htm">http://www.dhs.ca.gov/tobacco/html/Evaluation_Resources.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group(s)</td>
<td>Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example survey question(s)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Overall quality: low → high, Resources needed: $$ $$ $$ $$ $$, Strength of evaluation evidence: ●, Utility: ●, Face validity: ●, Accepted practice: ●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denotes that the experts’ rating was modified (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**References**

Proportion of Jurisdictions with Policies That Regulate the Extent of Tobacco Advertising Outside of Stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 9</td>
<td>Reduced tobacco industry influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>The proportion of local jurisdictions that have public policies that in some way regulate tobacco advertising on the exteriors of retail outlets (for example, some jurisdictions limit the percentage of store windows that may be covered with advertisements)(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Reducing exterior tobacco-related retail signs and displays will reduce young people’s exposure to tobacco advertising.(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example data source(s)</td>
<td>Policy tracking system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group(s)</td>
<td>Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring pertinent local tobacco laws, ordinances, or regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example survey question(s)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Note that in <em>Lorillard v. Reilly</em> (533 U.S. 525 [2001]), the U.S. Supreme Court held that most regulations regarding cigarette advertising are preempted by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, which makes it difficult for states and localities to regulate the extent and amount of retail tobacco advertising and promotion. Evaluators may also choose to gather data on the size and demographics of the population affected by the relevant laws or ordinances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$$(^\dagger)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\dagger\) Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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Indicator 1.9.5

Extent of Tobacco Industry Sponsorship of Public and Private Events

Goal area 1 Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 9 Reduced tobacco industry influences

What to measure The extent of tobacco industry sponsorship of public and private events (e.g., sports, recreation, music, family, or work-related events)

Why this indicator is useful The tobacco industry spends considerable resources sponsoring visible public events. This sponsorship increases exposure to advertisements for tobacco product advertising and buys legitimacy for the tobacco industry.

Example data source(s) ▶ Event sponsorship tracking system ▶ California Tobacco Industry Monitoring Evaluation: Project SMART Money
Information available at: http://www.ttac.org/enews/mailer09-30-03full.html#LinkF

Population group(s) Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by observation.

Example survey question(s) Not applicable

Comments Evaluators may want to assess the types of events that are being sponsored and the numbers of attendees.

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$$◊</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

◊ Denotes that the experts’ rating was modified (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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Indicator 1.9.6

**Proportion of Jurisdictions with Policies That Regulate Tobacco Industry Sponsorship of Public Events**

**Goal area 1**  Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 9**  Reduced tobacco industry influences

**What to measure**  The proportion of local jurisdictions with public policies that regulate tobacco industry sponsorship of public events

**Why this indicator is useful**  The tobacco industry spends considerable resources to sponsor highly publicized events. This sponsorship increases exposure to tobacco-product advertising and buys legitimacy for the tobacco industry.

**Example data source(s)**  Policy tracking system

**Population group(s)**  Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring pertinent local tobacco laws, ordinances, or regulations.

**Example survey question(s)**  Not applicable

**Comments**  Evaluators may also choose to gather data on the size and demographics of the population affected by the relevant laws or ordinances.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>$$$†</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**References**

Indicator 1.9.7

Extent of Tobacco Advertising on School Property, at School Events, and Near Schools

Goal area 1

Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 9

Reduced tobacco industry influences

What to measure

The extent of tobacco advertising on school property, at school events off campus, and within a designated distance from schools

Why this indicator is useful

Findings from a California study of retail tobacco advertising showed that stores near schools (within 1,000 feet) had significantly more tobacco advertising and promotional materials overall and more advertising on their exteriors than stores not near schools.\(^1\) Stores near schools also had a significantly higher probability of having tobacco advertising or promotions near candy and low to the ground (at the eye level of children) than stores not near schools.\(^1\)

Example data source(s)

- CDC School Health Profiles: School Principal Questionnaire (Profiles), 2002
- Environmental scan of tobacco advertising and promotional practices in retail outlets

Population group(s)

School principals

Example survey question(s)

Is tobacco advertising prohibited in each of the following locations? (Mark yes or no for each location.)

- In the school building
- On school grounds, including on the outside of the building, on playing fields, or other areas of the campus
- On school buses or other vehicles used to transport students
- In school publications (e.g., newsletters, newspapers, websites, in other school publications)

Is tobacco advertising through sponsorship of school events prohibited? Yes  No

Comments

None

Rating

Overall quality low

Resources needed $$$

Strength of evaluation evidence

Utility

Face validity

Accepted practice

Reference

Indicator 1.9.8

Extent of Tobacco Advertising in Print Media

Goal area 1  Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 9  Reduced tobacco industry influences

What to measure  The extent of tobacco advertisement in print media (e.g., magazines or newspapers)

Why this indicator is useful  The Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) regulated aspects of tobacco advertising in print media. However, one study found that after the MSA, the combined advertising expenditures of the four major tobacco companies increased in 19 magazines that have a youth focus. Another study found that 54% of teenagers' favorite magazines had cigarette advertisements.

Example data source(s)  Media Tracking Service (e.g., clipping service)  TNS Media Intelligence Competitive Media Reporting (CMR)

Population group(s)  Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking tobacco advertisements in print media.

Example survey question(s)  Not applicable

Comments  Evaluators may want to assess tobacco advertising by type of print media (e.g., magazines targeted to adults or magazines targeted to adolescents). Quantitative studies involve counting articles, measuring column-inches, or noting article placement. Qualitative studies require detailed content analyses to detect article themes. More information on how to collect data on this indicator is in reference 5 below.

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indicator 1.9.9

**Amount and Quality of News Media Stories About Tobacco Industry Practices and Political Lobbying**

**Goal area 1** Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 9** Reduced tobacco industry influences

**What to measure** Media coverage of tobacco industry practices and political lobbying

**Why this indicator is useful** Demonstrating the negative aspects of tobacco industry practices may influence young people’s behavior. For example, being aware that the tobacco industry is trying to manipulate behavior may reduce young people’s susceptibility to tobacco marketing and increase overall support for anti-tobacco policies, laws, or regulations.

**Example data source(s)** Media Tracking Service (e.g., clipping service)

**Population group(s)** Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by monitoring and tracking pertinent media coverage of tobacco industry practices.

**Example survey question(s)** Not applicable

**Comments** Quantitative studies involve counting articles, measuring column-inches, or noting article placement. Qualitative studies require detailed content analyses to detect article themes. More information on how to collect data on this indicator is in reference 5 below.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$\infty$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denotes no data.

**References**

Indicator 1.9.10

Number and Type of Master Settlement Agreement Violations by Tobacco Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 9</td>
<td>Reduced tobacco industry influences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What to measure: The number and type of Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) violations by tobacco companies

Why this indicator is useful: In 2000, all of the major tobacco manufacturers failed to comply with the MSA, which bans the tobacco companies from targeting young people through magazine advertisements. The companies are selectively increasing their magazine advertisements targeted to young people. Tracking these and other violations of the MSA will aid in the MSA’s enforcement.

Example data source(s):
- Tobacco industry monitoring system
- California Tobacco Industry Monitoring Evaluation: Project SMART Money
  Information available at: http://www.ttac.org/enews/mailer09-30-03full.html#LinkF

Population group(s): Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by monitoring and tracking tobacco industry practices.

Example survey question(s): Not applicable

Comments: None

Rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○ better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).
◊ Denotes that the experts’ rating was modified (see Appendix B for an explanation).
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Indicator 1.9.11

**Extent of Tobacco Industry Contributions to Institutions and Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 9</td>
<td>Reduced tobacco industry influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>The amount of funds contributed by the tobacco industry to institutions and groups (e.g., the hospitality industry, movie industry, sports organizations, and civic groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why this indicator is useful</td>
<td>Studies show that the tobacco industry has a history of collaborating with businesses and community organizations. The amount of the tobacco industry’s influence on these groups is directly related to the amount it contributes. Tracking this indicator will help to understand tobacco industry influence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Example data source(s) | - Public records of political contributions Information available from the Office of the State Secretary or equivalent in each state  
- Center for Responsive Politics (CRP) Information available at: http://www.opensecrets.org  
- Tobacco industry fiscal reports |
| Population group(s) | Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by reviewing public and tobacco industry records. |
| Example survey question(s) | Not applicable |
| Comments | Evaluators may want to categorize their findings by type of business or organization (e.g., the hospitality industry, movie industry, sports organizations, or civic groups) that received funds from the tobacco industry. More information on how to collect data on this indicator is in reference 5 below. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$\diamond$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

◊ Denotes that the experts’ rating was modified (see Appendix B for an explanation).

Denotes no data.

**References**

Indicator 1.9.12

Amount of Tobacco Industry Campaign Contributions to Local and State Politicians

Goal area 1
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 9
Reduced tobacco industry influences

What to measure
The amount of funds contributed to local and state politicians by the tobacco industry

Why this indicator is useful
Studies show an association between political contributions from the tobacco industry and pro-tobacco legislation. Tobacco industry contributions are a significant predictor of the industry’s political influence, including its influence on votes for tobacco-related legislation. Tracking this indicator may help states counter the influence of the tobacco industry.

Example data source(s)
- Public records of political contributions
  Information available from the Office of the State Secretary or equivalent in each state
- Federal Election Commission (FEC)
  Searchable database available at: http://www.fec.gov
- Center for Responsive Politics (CRP)
  Information available at: http://www.opensecrets.org

Population group(s)
Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by reviewing public records.

Example survey question(s)
Not applicable

Comments
More information on how to collect data on this indicator is in references 4 and 5 below.

Rating

Overall quality low high

Resources needed

Strength of evaluation evidence

Utility

Face validity

Accepted practice

† † Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

◊◊ Denotes that the experts’ rating was modified (see Appendix B for an explanation).

Denotes no data.

References
Outcome 10

Reduced Susceptibility to Experimentation with Tobacco Products

Susceptibility to smoking is defined as the intention to smoke or the absence of a strong intention not to smoke. Studies show that susceptibility to experimentation is a valid and reliable predictor of future smoking behavior. Studies also show that susceptible young people (those who have not made a firm decision not to smoke) are more likely than other young people to experiment with smoking. Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that even low levels of smoking experimentation (two to four cigarettes smoked by age 10 years) substantially increase the likelihood of daily smoking in late adolescence. To reduce the percentage of young people who take up smoking, it is therefore necessary to prevent young people from becoming susceptible to experimenting with tobacco. In addition to tobacco industry influences, tobacco use by peers is strongly associated with early tobacco experimentation among children. Parental involvement in young people’s decision making about tobacco use is also an important contributor to reduced susceptibility to tobacco use.

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

1. Proportion of young people who think that smoking is cool and helps them fit in
2. Proportion of young people who think that young people who smoke have more friends
3. Proportion of young people who report that their parents have discussed not smoking with them
4. Proportion of parents who report that they have discussed not smoking with their children
5. Proportion of young people who are susceptible never-smokers

References


For Further Reading


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Generalizability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10.1</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who think that smoking is cool and helps them fit in</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.2</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who think that young people who smoke have more friends</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.3</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who report that their parents have discussed not smoking with them</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.4</td>
<td>Proportion of parents who report that they have discussed not smoking with their children</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>¥¿</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10.5</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who are susceptible never-smokers</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
<td>¥±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

Denotes no data.
Indicator 1.10.1

Proportion of Young People Who Think That Smoking Is Cool and Helps Them Fit In

**Goal area 1** Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 10** Reduced susceptibility to experimentation with tobacco products

**What to measure** Proportion of young people who believe that smoking cigarettes will improve their social standing

**Why this indicator is useful** Data indicate that adolescent cigarette smokers are significantly more likely to believe that smokers are more socially adept than nonsmokers. These data can be used to estimate norms regarding the social desirability of smoking.

**Example data source(s)** Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004

**Population group(s)** Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)** From YTS
Do you think smoking cigarettes makes young people look cool or fit in?
- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Probably not
- Definitely not

**Comments** None

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$3 \dagger$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\dagger\] Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**References**

### Indicator 1.10.2

**Proportion of Young People Who Think That Young People Who Smoke Have More Friends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 10</td>
<td>Reduced susceptibility to experimentation with tobacco products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What to measure**

Proportion of young people who believe that those who smoke have more friends than those who do not smoke.

**Why this indicator is useful**

Data indicate that cigarette smokers are significantly more likely to believe that those who smoke have more friends than those who do not smoke. These data can be used as an estimate of norms concerning the social desirability of smoking.

**Example data source(s)**

Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004

**Population group(s)**

Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**

Do you think young people who smoke cigarettes have more friends?  
- Definitely yes  
- Probably yes  
- Probably not  
- Definitely not

**Comments**

None

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**

Indicator 1.10.3

**Proportion of Young People Who Report That Their Parents Have Discussed Not Smoking with Them**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 10</td>
<td>Reduced susceptibility to experimentation with tobacco products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What to measure**
Proportion of young people who report that their parents have discussed the dangers of tobacco use with them in the past 12 months

**Why this indicator is useful**
Parental involvement in their children’s smoking decisions is a predictor of whether their children take up smoking. Teenagers who report that their parents are unconcerned about smoking or do not talk to them about it are more likely than other teenagers to take up smoking and to become regular smokers.

**Example data source(s)**
Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004

**Population group(s)**
Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**
In the past 12 months, how often have your parents or guardians discussed the dangers of tobacco use with you?
- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Very often

**Comments**
Evaluators may want to ask young people questions about parental rules about smoking and the perceived consequences of being caught smoking. Evaluators may also want to ask young people if their parents have discussed the dangers of tobacco use (not just smoking) with them.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$ \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$</td>
<td>$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$</td>
<td>$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$</td>
<td>$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**
Proportion of Parents Who Report That They Have Discussed Not Smoking with Their Children

Goal area 1  Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 10  Reduced susceptibility to experimentation with tobacco products

What to measure  Proportion of parents who report that they talked to their children at least once in the previous 6 months about what their children may or may not do regarding tobacco use

Why this indicator is useful  Parental involvement in their children’s smoking decisions is a predictor of whether their children take up smoking. In addition, asking parents about their children and smoking sensitizes parents to the importance of discussing tobacco use with their children.

Example data source(s)  Adult Tobacco Survey (ATS): CDC Recommended Questions: Supplemental Section G: Parental Involvement, 2003

Population group(s)  Parents of children aged less than 18 years

Example survey question(s)  From ATS
During the last 6 months, how many times have you talked to your child about what he/she can or cannot do when it comes to tobacco?

- Never
- Once
- Twice
- Three or more times
- Don’t know/Not sure
- Refused

During the last 6 months, how many times have you told your child he/she cannot use tobacco?

- Never
- Once
- Twice
- Three or more times
- Don’t know/Not sure
- Refused

Comments  None

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denotes no data.

References
Indicator 1.10.5

**Proportion of Young People Who Are Susceptible Never-smokers**

**Goal area 1**

Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 10**

Reduced susceptibility to experimentation with tobacco products

**What to measure**

Proportion of young people who have never tried a cigarette but have not made a firm decision not to smoke

**Why this indicator is useful**

Studies show that susceptible young people (those who have not made a firm decision not to smoke) are more likely than other young people to experiment with smoking.¹

**Example data source(s)**

Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004

**Population group(s)**

Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**

From YTS

- Have you ever tried cigarette smoking, even one or two puffs?
  - Yes  No

- Do you think that you will try a cigarette soon?
  - Yes  No

- Do you think you will smoke a cigarette at any time during the next year?
  - Definitely yes  Probably yes  Probably not  Definitely not

- If one of your best friends offered you a cigarette, would you smoke it?
  - Definitely yes  Probably yes  Probably not  Definitely not

**Comments**

Evaluators should ask all four example questions to create a susceptibility index.¹

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$§†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**Reference**

Decreased Access to Tobacco Products

As noted in the discussion of logic model component 8 (increased restriction and increased enforcement of restrictions on tobacco sales to minors), adopting and enforcing strong laws that restrict young people’s access to tobacco can reduce the proportion of retailers that illegally sell tobacco products to minors. As also noted in that discussion, reductions in illegal sales to minors may not automatically translate into reductions in minors’ self-reported access to tobacco products through commercial sources. In addition, reductions in illegal sales to young people would not be expected to affect minors’ access to tobacco products through noncommercial (social) sources. More importantly, it is unclear whether reductions in retail tobacco sales to minors result in reductions in the actual rate of tobacco use by young people. Although some studies indicate that this is the case, other studies fail to support such a link. The data suggest that to be successful in reducing young people’s tobacco use, efforts to reduce commercial access must achieve high levels of retailer compliance (perhaps as high as 90% or more). In practice, these levels may not always be attainable.

According to the Guide to Community Preventive Services, the most effective approach to preventing young people from gaining access to tobacco (as measured by minors’ self-reported tobacco purchase or use behaviors) includes a combination of strong local and state laws, vigorous and sustained enforcement of these laws, retailer education, and—most importantly—community mobilization to generate community support for efforts to reduce youth access to tobacco products. The Guide to Community Preventive Services notes that none of these interventions has been shown to be effective when implemented in isolation, in particular when implemented without a strong link to community mobilization initiatives.

The Guide to Community Preventive Services and Reducing Tobacco Use: A Report of the Surgeon General also underscore the importance of taking a comprehensive approach to reducing tobacco use among young people. Such an approach includes interventions to reduce the appeal of, and demand for, tobacco products among young people, as well as to restrict their access to these products. In addition, because young people are influenced by the social norms and environmental cues that they observe in adult society, efforts to reduce their tobacco use should be integrated into the broader framework of a comprehensive tobacco control program that also addresses tobacco use by adults.

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

- **1.11.1** Proportion of successful attempts to purchase tobacco products by young people
- **1.11.2** Proportion of young people reporting that they have been sold tobacco products by a retailer
- **1.11.3** Proportion of young people reporting that they have been unsuccessful in purchasing tobacco products from a retailer
- **1.11.4** Proportion of young people reporting that they have received tobacco products from a social source
1.11.5 Proportion of young people reporting that they purchased cigarettes from a vending machine

1.11.6 NR Proportion of young people who believe that it is easy to obtain tobacco products

References


For Further Reading


## Outcome 11

### Decreased Access to Tobacco Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Acceptable practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1</td>
<td>Proportion of successful attempts to purchase tobacco products by young people</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Quality" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Resources" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Utility" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Face Validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Acceptable Practice" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.2</td>
<td>Proportion of young people reporting that they have been sold tobacco products by a retailer</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Quality" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Resources" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Utility" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Face Validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Acceptable Practice" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.3</td>
<td>Proportion of young people reporting that they have been unsuccessful in purchasing tobacco products from a retailer</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Quality" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Resources" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Utility" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Face Validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Acceptable Practice" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.4</td>
<td>Proportion of young people reporting that they have received tobacco products from a social source</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Quality" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Resources" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Utility" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Face Validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Acceptable Practice" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.5</td>
<td>Proportion of young people reporting that they purchased cigarettes from a vending machine</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Quality" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Resources" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Utility" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Face Validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Acceptable Practice" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.6 NR</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who believe that it is easy to obtain tobacco products</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Quality" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Resources" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Utility" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Face Validity" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Acceptable Practice" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation). 
**Denotes no data. 
NR Denotes an indicator that is not rated (see Appendix B for an explanation).
## Indicator 1.11.1

### Proportion of Successful Attempts to Purchase Tobacco Products by Young People

**Goal area 1**  
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 11**  
Decreased access to tobacco products

**What to measure**  
The proportion of retailers not in compliance with policies prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to minors

**Why this indicator is useful**  
Decreasing the rate at which young people are successful in purchasing tobacco may contribute to a reduction in tobacco use by young people.

**Example data source(s)**  
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Compliance Checks  

**Population group(s)**  
Tobacco retailers

**Example survey question(s)**  
Not applicable

**Comments**  
Evaluators must consider a number of factors when determining the proportion of successful purchase attempts, including (1) variations in the sampling frame (e.g., number, type, and location of stores), (2) number of successful and unsuccessful purchase attempts per store, and (3) real and apparent ages of minors attempting to purchase tobacco.

---

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$\text{++}$</td>
<td>$\text{+++}$</td>
<td>$\text{+}$</td>
<td>$\text{+}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\dagger$ Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

---

**References**

Indicator 1.11.2

Proportion of Young People Reporting That They Have Been Sold Tobacco Products by a Retailer

Goal area 1: Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 11: Decreased access to tobacco products

What to measure: The proportion of young people who report having been sold tobacco products by a retailer in the previous 30 days

Why this indicator is useful: Even if most retailers in a community comply with laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco to young people and only a few continue to sell tobacco products to minors, young people’s access to tobacco products through retail stores may remain unacceptably high. Young smokers will seek out the retailers that are willing to sell to them. Measuring this indicator helps determine the extent to which illegal sales of tobacco to young people are occurring.

Example data source(s):
- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
- CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

Population group(s): Young people aged less than 18 years

Example survey question(s):
- From YTS: During the past 30 days, where did you buy the last pack of cigarettes you bought?
  - I did not buy a pack of cigarettes during the past 30 days
  - A drugstore
  - A gas station
  - A convenience store
  - A grocery store

- From YTS and YRBSS: During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own cigarettes?
  - I did not smoke cigarettes during the past 30 days
  - I bought them in a store such as a convenience store, supermarket, discount store, or gas station
  - I bought them from a vending machine
  - I borrowed (or bummed) them from someone else
  - A person 18 years or older gave them to me
  - I took them from a store or family member
  - I got them some other way
  - I gave someone else money to buy them for me

Comments: None

Rating:
- Overall quality: low → high
- Resources needed: $$
- Strength of evaluation evidence: ◯
- Utility: ◯
- Face validity: ◯
- Accepted practice: ◯

Reference:
Indicator 1.11.3

Proportion of Young People Reporting That They Have Been Unsuccessful in Purchasing Tobacco Products from a Retailer

Goal area 1  Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 11  Decreased access to tobacco products

What to measure  Proportion of young people who report that they were refused sale of cigarettes because of their age during the previous 30 days

Why this indicator is useful  Measuring this indicator helps determine the extent to which local and state policies and enforcement activities are reducing young people’s access to tobacco products.¹

Example data source(s)  Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004

Population group(s)  Young people aged less than 18 years

Example survey question(s)  From YTS
During the past 30 days, did anyone ever refuse to sell you cigarettes because of your age?
☐ I did not try to buy cigarettes in a store during the past 30 days
☐ Yes, someone refused to sell me cigarettes because of my age
☐ No, no one refused to sell me cigarettes because of my age

Comments  Evaluators may also want to assess the type of retailer (e.g., gas station, convenience store, or grocery store) that sold tobacco to a minor.

Rating  Overall quality Resources needed Strength of evaluation evidence Utility Face validity Accepted practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>high</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Denotes low agreement among reviewers: that is, fewer than 75% of the valid ratings for this indicator were within one point of each other (see Appendix B for an explanation).

Reference
Indicator 1.11.4

**Proportion of Young People Reporting That They Have Received Tobacco Products from a Social Source**

**Goal area 1**  
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 11**  
Decreased access to tobacco products

**What to measure**  
Proportion of young people who report getting their cigarettes from a social source such as a friend, family member, or schoolmate during the previous 30 days

**Why this indicator is useful**  
Although increasing enforcement of laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors reduces illegal sales, studies also suggest that more than half of high-school-aged smokers report obtaining cigarettes from social sources.¹

**Example data source(s)**

- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
- CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

**Population group(s)**  
Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**

From YTS and YRBSS

During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own cigarettes?

- I did not smoke cigarettes during the past 30 days
- I bought them in a store such as a convenience store, supermarket, discount store, or gas station
- I bought them from a vending machine
- I gave someone else money to buy them for me
- I borrowed (or bummed) them from someone else
- A person 18 years old or older gave them to me
- I took them from a store or family member
- I got them some other way

**Comments**  
None

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$&quot;</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference**

Indicator 1.11.5

Proportion of Young People Reporting That They Purchased Cigarettes from a Vending Machine

**Goal area 1**
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 11**
Decreased access to tobacco products

**What to measure**
The proportion of young people who usually purchased their cigarettes from a vending machine during the previous 30 days

**Why this indicator is useful**
Accessible vending machines provide virtually unrestricted access to cigarettes and can be used by even the youngest children. As of 2004, 46 states and the District of Columbia restricted minors’ access to tobacco through vending machines, and 30 states and the District of Columbia banned vending machines in locations that are accessible to young people.1

**Example data source(s)**
- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
- CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

**Population group(s)**
Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**

**From YTS**
During the past 30 days, where did you buy the last pack of cigarettes you bought?

- [ ] I did not buy a pack of cigarettes during the past 30 days
- [ ] A grocery store
- [ ] A drugstore
- [ ] A convenience store
- [ ] A vending machine
- [ ] I bought them over the Internet

**From YTS and YRBSS**
During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own cigarettes?

- [ ] I did not smoke cigarettes during the past 30 days
- [ ] I borrowed (or bummed) them from someone else
- [ ] A person 18 years or older gave them to me
- [ ] I bought them in a store such as a convenience store, supermarket, discount store, or gas station
- [ ] I took them from a store or family member
- [ ] I got them some other way
- [ ] I gave someone else money to buy them for me

**Comments**
None

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$5$</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

□ Denotes no data.

**Reference**
Indicator 1.11.6\textsuperscript{NR}

**Proportion of Young People Who Believe That It Is Easy to Obtain Tobacco Products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people\footnote{NR}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 11</td>
<td>Decreased access to tobacco products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to measure</td>
<td>The degree to which young people believe that it is easy or difficult to obtain tobacco products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why this indicator is useful** Changing the social norms regarding tobacco use by young people requires changing the perception among young people that tobacco products are easily obtained. If young people perceive that obtaining tobacco products is difficult, they are less likely to try to obtain such products.

**Example data source(s)** California Youth Tobacco Survey (CA YTS), 1999

**Population group(s)** Young people aged less than 18 years\footnote{NR}

**Example survey question(s)** Do you think it would be easy or hard for you to get cigarettes if you wanted some?
\(\square\) Easy  \(\square\) Hard  \(\square\) Don’t know/Not sure  \(\square\) Refused

**Comments** This indicator was not rated by the panel of experts and, therefore, no rating information is available. See Appendix B for an explanation.

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(\square\) Denotes no data.

\textsuperscript{NR} Denotes an indicator that is not rated (see Appendix B for an explanation).

**Reference**
Outcome 12

Increased Price of Tobacco Products

Studies show an inverse relationship between cigarette price and smoking prevalence by young people and adults. Increasing state or local excise taxes on cigarettes is an effective method of increasing the real price of cigarettes. However, maintaining higher real prices requires further tax increases to offset the effects of inflation and industry practices designed to control retail product prices.\(^1\)\(^2\) Recent efforts to offset industry pricing practices have focused on supporting minimum retail pricing laws.\(^3\) Econometric studies show price elasticity for tobacco use among adolescents of \(-0.76\), which means that a 10% increase in price would result in a 7.6% decrease in tobacco use.\(^4\) In addition, to directly motivate people to quit or not start tobacco use, price increases can indirectly reduce tobacco use if a portion of the excise tax revenue is dedicated to the state’s tobacco control program.\(^4\)

Although young people usually start using tobacco by first experimenting with cigarettes, some begin by experimenting with other tobacco products such as spit tobacco (smokeless), bidis, small cigars, and loose tobacco (roll-your-own). All tobacco products are taxed. To prevent tobacco users from shifting to cheaper tobacco products, increasing taxes on all tobacco products is important.\(^5\) Tax increases on tobacco products increase the real price of tobacco products and thus reduce young people’s demand for such products.

Listed below is the indicator associated with this outcome:

- **1.12.1** Amount of tobacco product excise tax

References


For Further Reading


### Increased Price of Tobacco Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.12.1</td>
<td>Amount of tobacco product excise tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 12 □

**KEY OUTCOME INDICATORS** for Evaluating Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs
Indicator 1.12.1

**Amount of Tobacco Product Excise Tax**

**Goal area 1**
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 12**
Increased price of tobacco products

**What to measure**
(1) The state excise tax per pack of cigarettes and (2) the percentage of the total price of a pack of cigarettes that is attributable to tax

**Why this indicator is useful**
Increasing tax on tobacco products reduces tobacco consumption and prevalence, especially among the most price-sensitive populations (e.g., young people).\(^1\)\(^2\)
Increasing cigarette excise taxes is an effective method of increasing the real price of cigarettes, although maintaining high prices requires further tax increases to offset the effects of inflation.\(^1\)\(^2\)

**Example data source(s)**
- CDC State Tobacco Activities Tracking and Evaluation (STATE) system
  - Data available at: http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/STATEsystem. Select “economics” and “cigarette sales.”
- Campaign For Tobacco-Free Kids (CTFK)
  - Information available at: http://tobaccofreekids.org/research/factsheets
- State departments of revenue

**Population group(s)**
Not applicable. This indicator is best measured by tracking and monitoring state excise taxes on tobacco products.

**Example survey question(s)**
Not applicable

**Comments**
States can also independently track the price of tobacco products by collecting scanner data (obtained from product bar codes), which provide information on product price, brand, and promotions. However, the cost of this type of data collection can be prohibitive.

To gather more complete data on tobacco price, evaluators can also collect data on other tobacco products such as spit tobacco (smokeless), bidis, small cigars, and loose tobacco (roll-your-own).

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**
Reduced Initiation of Tobacco Use by Young People

Tobacco use begins primarily during adolescence, decades earlier than when the death and disability associated with tobacco use are likely to occur. Few people begin to use tobacco as adults; almost 90% of adult smokers began by age 18 years.\(^1\) The earlier young people begin using tobacco products, the more likely they are to use them as adults and the longer they are likely to be users.\(^1,2\) Both the duration and amount of tobacco use are related to eventual chronic health problems, with duration posing the stronger risk.\(^3,4\) The processes of nicotine addiction further ensure that many of today’s adolescent smokers will use tobacco regularly when they are adults.\(^1\)

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

- **1.13.1** Average age at which young people first smoked a whole cigarette
- **1.13.2** Proportion of young people who report never having tried a cigarette

References


## Outcome 13

### Reduced Initiation of Tobacco Use by Young People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.13.1</td>
<td>Average age at which young people first smoked a whole cigarette</td>
<td>$S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13.2</td>
<td>Proportion of young people who report never having tried a cigarette</td>
<td>$S$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator 1.13.1

**Average Age at Which Young People First Smoked a Whole Cigarette**

#### Goal area 1
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

#### Outcome 13
Reduced initiation of tobacco use by young people

#### What to measure
The average age at which young smokers first smoked a whole cigarette

#### Why this indicator is useful
The age at which someone first smokes a whole cigarette is significantly related to that person’s long-term smoking habits. The younger people are when they start using tobacco, the more likely they are to use tobacco products as adults.\(^1\)

#### Example data source(s)
- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
- CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

#### Population group(s)
Young people aged less than 18 years

#### Example survey question(s)
From YTS and YRBSS
How old were you when you smoked a whole cigarette for the first time?
- I have never smoked cigarettes
- 8 years or younger
- 9 or 10 years
- 11 or 12 years
- 13 or 14 years
- 15 or 16 years
- 17 years or older

#### Comments
To gather more complete data on tobacco use, evaluators can also ask questions about the use of other tobacco products such as spit tobacco (smokeless), bidis, small cigars, and loose tobacco (roll-your-own).

#### Rating
- **Overall quality**
- **Resources needed**
- **Strength of evaluation evidence**
- **Utility**
- **Face validity**
- **Accepted practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>$$$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reference
## Indicator 1.13.2

### Proportion of Young People Who Report Never Having Tried a Cigarette

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal area 1</th>
<th>Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 13</td>
<td>Reduced initiation of tobacco use by young people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What to measure**
Proportion of young people who have never tried a cigarette, not even one or two puffs.

**Why this indicator is useful**
Reducing the number of minors who experiment with tobacco will decrease the number who become established smokers.\(^1\)

**Example data source(s)**
- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
- CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

**Population group(s)**
Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**
From YTS and YRBSS
Have you ever tried cigarette smoking, even one or two puffs?

- Yes
- No

**Comments**
To gather more complete data on tobacco use, evaluators can also ask questions about the use of other tobacco products such as spit tobacco (smokeless), bidis, small cigars, and loose tobacco (roll-your-own).

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>$\phantom{●}$</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference**
Outcome 14

Reduced Tobacco-use Prevalence Among Young People

Smoking by young people is associated with serious health problems, such as reduced lung capacity and physical fitness. Smoking by young people also increases the likelihood that they will continue to smoke through adulthood, increasing their risk of tobacco-related diseases such as lung and other cancers, heart disease, and emphysema.

Because the number of years of cigarette smoking produces a greater risk of disease than the number of cigarettes smoked per day, it is critically important to work on both preventing young people from starting to smoke and increasing the number and percentage of young smokers who quit.

Listed below are the indicators associated with this outcome:

► 1.14.1 Prevalence of tobacco use among young people
► 1.14.2 Proportion of established young smokers

References


For Further Reading


### Reduced Tobacco-use Prevalence Among Young People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Indicator Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.14.1</td>
<td>Prevalence of tobacco use among young people</td>
<td>$\text{low}$</td>
<td>$\text{better}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14.2</td>
<td>Proportion of established young smokers</td>
<td>$\text{low}$</td>
<td>$\text{better}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 1.14.1

Prevalence of Tobacco Use Among Young People

Goal area 1 Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

Outcome 14 Reduced tobacco-use prevalence among young people

What to measure Proportion of young people who have smoked on at least 1 day during the previous 30 days

Why this indicator is useful Reducing tobacco use among young people decreases their chances of smoking as adults.

Example data source(s) Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

Population group(s) Young people aged less than 18 years

Example survey question(s) From YTS and YRBSS
During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?
- 0 days
- 1 or 2 days
- 3 to 5 days
- 6 to 9 days
- 10 to 19 days
- 20 to 29 days
- All 30 days

Comments Evaluators may also want to collect data on young people who ever smoked a cigarette and young people who frequently smoke.
To gather more complete data on tobacco use, evaluators can also ask questions about the use of other tobacco products such as spit tobacco (smokeless), bidis, small cigars, and loose tobacco (roll-your-own).

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References
### Indicator 1.14.2

#### Proportion of Established Young Smokers

**Goal area 1**
Preventing initiation of tobacco use among young people

**Outcome 14**
Reduced tobacco-use prevalence among young people

**What to measure**
Proportion of young people who smoked 100 cigarettes or more during their lifetimes

**Why this indicator is useful**
Young people who are established smokers are at high risk of becoming addicted to cigarettes and continuing to smoke as adults.

**Example data source(s)**
- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS): CDC Recommended Questions: Core, 2004
- CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), 2003

**Population group(s)**
Young people aged less than 18 years

**Example survey question(s)**

- During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?
  - 0 days
  - 1 or 2 days
  - 3 to 5 days
  - 6 to 9 days
  - 10 to 19 days
  - 20 to 29 days
  - All 30 days

- During the past 30 days, what brand of cigarettes did you usually smoke?
  - I did not smoke cigarettes during the past 30 days
  - I do not have a usual brand
  - Camel
  - Marlboro
  - Newport
  - Virginia Slims
  - GPC, Basic, or Doral
  - Some other brand

- About how many cigarettes have you smoked in your entire life?
  - None
  - 1 or more puffs but never a whole cigarette
  - 1 cigarette
  - 2 to 5 cigarettes
  - 6 to 15 cigarettes (about half a pack total)
  - 16 to 25 cigarettes (about 1 pack total)
  - 26 to 99 cigarettes (more than 1 pack, but less than 5 packs)
  - 100 or more cigarettes (5 or more packs)

**Comments**
To gather more complete data on tobacco use, evaluators can also ask questions about the use of other tobacco products such as spit tobacco (smokeless), bidis, small cigars, and loose tobacco (roll-your-own).

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality</th>
<th>Resources needed</th>
<th>Strength of evaluation evidence</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Face validity</th>
<th>Accepted practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**