Member Feedback, Advisory Council Input & Next Steps

What You Had to Say: Member Feedback on Draft White Papers

Five themes emerged from member feedback to the draft white paper on measuring reach. This feedback was gathered during two conference calls and via an online survey administered to collect written comments.

1. A conclusion section that sets forth the recommended standards is important.
2. Better defining the target audience for the white papers in general and for this paper in particular is critical.
3. Further discussion about and clarification of the specific interventions that should be included in the author’s definition of “evidence-based treatment” is needed.
4. Further discussion and clarification on how best to address the measurement of the various additional results resulting from quitline promotion and/or services (i.e., quitline “facilitated” reach) is important.
5. Further discussion on whether or not reaching 6% of the tobacco-using population in a state is realistic, is needed and how the author’s conservative measurement formula impacts this issue.

Member feedback to the first draft of the white paper on measuring quit rates was gathered in the same way and resulted in four critical suggestions for the author.

1. There is a need for an introductory section that briefly highlights the recommendations (for instance, an executive summary).
2. The need for more discussion and rationale for the recommended 7-month follow up timeframe.
3. The need to better define “registered for services,” especially as it relates to the recommended denominator.
4. The need for more discussion and rationale for the recommended 7-day point prevalence abstinence measure.

Tamatha Thomas-Haase presented this critical feedback from members during the August 18 and 19 Advisory Council meeting. White paper authors were also provided access to the online feedback submitted by members via SurveyMonkey.com.

Advisory Council Meets to Provide Feedback on Draft White Papers

On August 18 and 19 NAQC’s Advisory Council and invited guests met in Phoenix, Arizona to participate in a formal feedback and discussion process with the authors of two draft white papers, Measuring Reach of Quitline Programs and Measuring Quit Rates.

Highlights of Feedback Provided by the Full Council – Measuring Reach of Quitlines

The first day of the meeting opened with a presentation of the draft white paper, Measuring Reach of Quitline Programs, by the paper’s author. Following the presentation, primary reviewers presented their feedback to the author and additional comments were taken from the remaining advisory council members in a facilitated discussion. Below are the highlights from that discussion and the feedback given to the author.

There was great breadth and variety in the feedback to Dr. Sharon Cummins and in most cases, the variety could be attributed to the roles the council members serve in the community – service providers remained aware of how recommendations translate into their practice and potential challenges; funders remained focused on the impact of the
recommendations on their work with internal and external partners, especially where funding decisions are made; and researchers tended to take a more academic view to the standard measurement recommendations and their impact on future studies. Interestingly enough, the core issues of concern with the first draft rose to the surface by the close of the discussion and the author had a clear sense of the council’s recommended revisions.

Core feedback to the author included:

- There is a great need for common definitions and a common language when it comes to measuring and reporting both reach and quit rates. In this paper, further clarification on certain terms is needed. For example, what is meant by evidence-based treatment and what does the author recommend as the best survey to use when determining an estimate of tobacco use prevalence for the denominator?

- Quitlines experience various “levels” of reach. For example, the largest calculation of reach would be call volume (all of the calls that come in); the second largest calculation would be “promotional” reach (those who call and are tobacco users or those who are your target audience); and the smallest would be what the author calls “quitline reach” (those who receive service). The council wanted the author to clearly define the calculations for each of these various levels of reach; the purpose that each level serves; and the importance of having quitlines define or describe their “work funnel” when reporting these measures. Being more clear about the context will make allowances for difference among quitlines so that there is a less chance of pitting one against the other when comparisons are made.

- The council members agreed that the format of the paper should more clearly layout the final recommendations after each section rather than only at the end of the paper.

Discussion of the paper also resulted in important suggestions for NAQC to consider including:

- An introduction to the Quality Initiative, the intent of these papers and their primary target audience and how NAQC envisions implementation of the recommended standards, is a critical piece that should be included in the papers. This “introduction” should be written by NAQC as a preface to the entire 2008 Quality Initiative document.

- There is a great need for additional documents that are related to this white paper and not the responsibility of the author. For example, if the content of these white papers is to be used in the “real world” there should be companion pieces developed for the various internal and external partners that quitlines share.

- The Advisory Council noted the various quality-related issues that are present in the “work funnel” of quitlines described above and asked that we not forget about them as we move forward.

- Council members also urged one another to remain aware of the potential impact of this work – for example, how funding may be impacted by reporting a more conservative measure of reach and how these papers will influence and impact on future research.

Highlights of Feedback Provided by the Full Council – Measuring Quit Rates

The second day of the meeting opened with a presentation of the draft white paper, Measuring Quit Rates, by one of the paper’s authors. Following the presentation, primary reviewers presented their feedback to the author and additional comments were taken from the remaining advisory council members in a facilitated discussion.

The advisory council continued discussion of the quit rate paper for nearly two hours. While most comments were specifically related to clarifying or noting issue with particular recommendations, at times discussion turned away from providing feedback to the author and centered on important questions related to this and other quality measures. For instance, is it better to under-estimate quit rates/reach or over-estimate? What is the best way to increase response rates? What are the important uses of these recommendations for monitoring, evaluation and research? The quitline community uses quit rates for many things: evaluation, research, public relations and when writing bid responses. Should we have different measures for different audiences?
Core feedback to the authors included:

- The paper should better define important terms such as “consent”, “intake”, “lost to follow up” and what is “eligible for services.” Council members had many thoughts and differences on each of these terms.
- The section on sampling strategies should be further clarified and include a recommendation from the authors.
- The council wrestled quite a bit on the issue of what to do with those callers who have already quit. Some service providers believe that the “14-days” issue would be burdensome on quitline staff and many council members agreed that these callers account for so few of the calls to the quitline that including them in the quit rate calculation would make minimal impact – especially considering that quitting is seen by most on a continuum.
- The council members liked the idea of reporting multiple measures for multiple audiences and that both responder rates and ITT rates should be reported as the standard. More importantly to the council was providing critical context whenever reporting quit rates. For example, the quit rate was X%, the populations was X and the service provided was X.
- 30-day point prevalence should be used instead of 7-day. This was especially important to those who would be reporting to allies and legislators, as the 30-day measure is easier to explain and seems to be more meaningful to external partners.

Quality Framework for Quitlines

Following discussion on the Measuring Quit Rates paper, the council turned its’ attention to the white paper that will outline a quality framework for quitlines by providing initial thoughts to the paper’s author.

The following are critical elements for the framework paper as noted by both the author and advisory council members:

- Clear definitions are essential. Creating a common language will be difficult but important.
- Linking outcomes to the roles and responsibilities of funders and service providers.
- Recognizing that there are intended and unintended audiences and that “customer base” for service providers means both the funder and those who call the quitline.
- The power and importance of benchmarks; how we establish these and adopt benchmarking as a process.
- Recognize that funding is an issue and somehow provide a roadmap that guides funders. For instance, if you have X$ and you want to reach X% of your tobacco users, you should offer X mix of services.
- Importance of bridging between capacity and promotion.

The meeting closed with a brief review of the remaining tasks for the 2008 Quality Initiative.

2008 Quality Initiative Next Steps

The next phase of the 2008 Quality Initiative will include receiving final drafts of the reach and quit rate papers on September 29. These final drafts will be sent to all members and advisory council members the following day. Council members will meet on November 13 in Phoenix, and the final drafts will be presented for approval at that time.

The first draft of the framework paper is due October 13 and will be sent to all members and advisory council members the following day. Feedback from members will be gathered online and via conference calls on October 22 and 24 (see below for more information) and council members will provide feedback to the author on November 14 in Phoenix (following a similar process as the reach and quit rate papers). At this meeting the council will also begin discussing how best to build on the 2008 Quality Initiative as we move closer to 2009.
Conference Calls to Provide Feedback on DRAFT Framework Paper

October 22 from 3:30 – 5PM ET and October 24 from 12:30 – 2PM ET

Join us on either call to hear a brief introduction of the paper by the author and participate in a facilitated discussion of the paper’s strengths and weaknesses. A detailed summary of both calls will be written and distributed to all NAQC members, the author and presented to the NAQC Advisory Council during their November meeting. Your thoughts on this paper really matter!

REGISTER NOW FOR EITHER CALL by visiting the NAQC Web site. Once there, you will need to login as a member and click the “View Calendar” button at the top of the page. Then, please select the appropriate call date and register. Call materials will be sent to you prior to the call and posted to the calendar date.