



**Quitline-Related Research and Evaluation  
Quarterly Conference Call  
Tuesday, November 23, 2010  
Call Summary**

**Welcome and purpose of calls**

Jessie Saul, NAQC Director of Research, welcomed everyone to the call, and gave some brief background on the purpose for the call series. Over its history, NAQC has focused more of its efforts on education, training, and communications with the network of quitlines in the US and Canada than on research-related issues. Over the past couple of years, NAQC has received an increasing number of requests for resources and communication mechanisms aimed specifically at members of the research community. This series of conference calls is designed to provide an opportunity for researchers, evaluators, and those interested in quitline research and evaluation to connect, network, and share their recent, current, and upcoming activities. While the initial goal was to provide the call series as a benefit of membership, NAQC has decided to keep the call series open to anyone interested in quitline-related research and evaluation, regardless of their membership status with NAQC.

**Presentation of Pre-Call Survey Results**

In advance of the conference call, NAQC distributed a brief (3-question) survey to potential participants. Jessie presented the results of the survey during the call. The powerpoint presentation as well as all other call materials are available at <http://www.naquitline.org/?page=QuarterlyResearch>. The purpose of the survey was to

- Identify topics of interest to quitline research community
- Collect examples of current research and evaluation work
- Use results to structure first and future calls

When asked what topics they wanted to have discussed during the conference calls, over half of respondents endorsed the following:

- Research studies and evaluation projects
- Methodological issues
- Topics for future research and evaluation

- New technologies for conducting research and evaluation
- Funding sources for quitline research

When asked how participants hope to benefit by participating in calls, responses could be grouped in the following categories:

- *Learn about research topics/keep up on what is new in the field*
- *Help shape the research agenda*
- *Learn about/discuss research methods*
- *Networking*
- *Identify potential collaborators*
- *Funding*
- *Data*

Current research and evaluation projects included the following:

- Adaptations of NAQC MDS
- Evaluation of media impact on call volume and web registrations
- Media evaluations
- Policy impact on cessation programs
- Who uses quitlines? (overall and for various specific populations)
- Relapse prevention
- Reducing alcohol use to promote smoking cessation
- Impact of combination NRT
- Satisfaction and experience evaluations
- Utilization evaluation (how many calls did clients receive)/dose-response studies
- Barriers and supports to fax referral system/provider education for fax referral
- Cost studies/cost analyses
- Impact of referral type on treatment outcomes
- Network analytic processes to understand how quitlines become aware of practices, and decide whether to implement some of those practices
- Testing innovative promotional strategies
- Testing combinations of innovative programs (e.g., text messaging, etc.), combinations of evidence-based cessation programs

Discussion ranged from additional projects that people are working on, to topics people would like to see worked on.

- John Mahalik – is anyone doing anything on weight control and smoking cessation?

- Scott Leischow - Assessing role and impact of telephone based pharmacist medication management intervention in relationship to quitline intervention/counseling. ASHline is doing now.
- Jana Peterson (University of Missouri, Kansas City) is interested in accessibility, use of quitlines by people with disabilities. (future) [college of nursing - web-based program for hearing impaired people has been created. Contact Scott.] Especially interested in health literacy issues and reach to those populations.
- Sharon Campbell (Propel, U Waterloo) - anyone looking at how to evaluate online support programs, how to link users that go to online if they also call a quitline? StatCan has a process - unique identifier created, but haven't implemented that in the quitline. Can we follow people from how they come in and then where they go, and back and forth? Another issue is how do you evaluate it if they may not go all the way through the program?
  - NCI is doing a factorial design of smokefree.gov website in March. [Erik Augustson to send out methodology? Yes, when final]
  - California is - working with ORI on a 2x2 design (phone vs. none, online vs. none) for smokeless tobacco users
  - Lys Severtson - U of WY has done some of that analysis for phone and web. Lys to send contact info to Sharon.
  - Lija Greenseid from PDA – PDA has done 4 outcome evaluations of ClearWay Minnesota's web program. Some of the evaluation questions involve looking at overlap (phone and web, in-person and web).
- Scott Leischow:
  - Arizona and other states focused ARRA funds on treatment with behavioral health population. Those funds can't be used for research, but the ASHLine in Arizona has been working with the behavioral health system in AZ to implement that.
  - Also developed initial design of 2x2 intervention study, will develop as a pilot, and submit a grant application focusing on that. Also, focus on HIV+ smokers, ways we might be able to intervene. Working on the design.
- Sharon Campbell - Grant submitted to look at what happens to call volume and caller characteristics if Canadian 1-800-number policy comes through. What promotions occur with and without the 800 number. Does 800 number create or reduce inequities in who calls? (income, gender, etc.) Steady pressure from advocacy groups and media to have government rethink delay of number on cigarette packs. [Would be interesting to have similar methodology in US if FDA includes 800 number on warning labels]

- Sue Zbikowski, Free & Clear
  - study with Fred Hutchison looking at Acceptance Commitment Therapy (ACT) vs. CBP to see if ACT can be as successful delivered by phone.
  - Another - wave of hospitalization f/up grants. U of Kansas, testing 2 protocols. One for fax referral vs. warm transfer where counseling starts while hospitalized. Early phases of planning for that.
  - Grants submitted - addressing weight for smokers. Oklahoma study - found weight concerns could show some improvements in cessation outcomes (not stat) and attenuation of weight gain. Results were most pronounced for diabetes patients. The current grant is a replication study. Another (being resubmitted)- concurrent vs. sequential weight loss and cessation.

## NEXT STEPS

Discussion then focused on what logical next steps might be for continuing this type of conversation, or compiling a list of current research efforts.

- Canadian researchers would be comfortable sharing research ideas after proposal has gone in. But if I wanted to speak to a specific QL researcher, I would probably phone person directly. There are issues with the size of the community and getting reviewers for proposals that would make widespread sharing of ideas prior to funding more difficult.
- It could be difficult to sustain an up-to-date list like this.
- The conversation is interesting. Might lead to contacts to explore collaboration. If there is a way to share research designs once they are far enough along to share them, would be very useful to do. This venue would be good to facilitate that process.
- It would be more helpful to hear from people in greater detail about research that is almost done or preparing for publication. I would like to hear about the challenges people are facing, what solutions they found, and have others contribute to what they have done in similar (or different) ways. Could this be a mini journal club? We might consider doing something like this on a monthly basis. A “coffee break” format was discussed where one person presents for 10-15 minutes on an article they wrote, a methodology they are using, or a study that has been funded, followed by 10-15 minutes of discussion. The American Evaluation Association uses this format for practical presentations of tools, reflection on published work, or presentations of new research topics or literature.
  - There was general consensus that this type of format would be more attractive and feasible than a longer call less frequently.

- Continuing the conversation would be feasible for NAQC, whereas some of the other types of resources (e.g., listing of current research projects) might be much more resource-intensive.
- This could be a good opportunity for fostering collaboration, and could yield grant funding in the future. It has the potential to advance both science and practice.

It was suggested that NAQC get additional feedback on revising the format for future calls.

There was general consensus that it would be beneficial for the research community to continue to invite both NAQC members and non-members to participate in these discussions. It was suggested that NAQC might provide a brief introductory session for those less familiar with quitlines so they could come better prepared for the discussion.

**Action steps:**

- **NAQC will send out a link to a brief survey assessing people's interest in various formats, frequencies, and durations of meetings moving forward.**
- **NAQC will set the next meeting date and time and post this on its website.**
- **NAQC will revise the web page for this group's activities in accordance with suggestions that were made during the call. (see <http://www.naquitline.org/?page=QuarterlyResearch>)**