INTRODUCTION

In 2004, THE CENTER FOR TOBACCO Policy Research (CTPR) partnered with Michigan and seven other states to evaluate how unstable state financial climates were affecting state tobacco control programs and to identify strategies to help states deal with tobacco control funding reductions. Using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, information was collected from the eight state tobacco control programs on topics such as state financial and political climates, partner relationships, program capacity, and the effects of funding reductions on program implementation.

Methods

Information about the Michigan tobacco control program was acquired in the following ways: 1) a program background survey completed by the Department of Community Health Tobacco Section (MDCH TS); and 2) key informant interviews with 13 key tobacco control partners. To identify these partners, MDCH TS named the agencies that played a significant role in the tobacco control program.

Though the partners listed are not considered a complete register of the tobacco control constituency in the state, they are representative of the types of agencies involved in the tobacco control program. On average, one individual from each partner agency participated in a single interview (in-person or telephone), which lasted approximately 64 minutes. The following table presents the partner agencies interviewed in May, 2004.

The Report Series

Previously, the CTPR disseminated preliminary evaluation findings in the report, Working to sustain Michigan’s tobacco control efforts, to tobacco control partners. The final evaluation findings are being presented in this series of four reports. The reports are organized around the project conceptual model that identifies the critical components of tobacco control programs.

This report series has been organized to reflect each of the areas identified by the model: tobacco control program environment, resources, capacity, and sustainability. Throughout the series, we have included Michigan specific results and comparisons from the other seven states. Quotes from participants (offset in color) were chosen as representative...
examples of the broader findings and to provide the reader with additional detail. To protect participants’ confidentiality, all identifying phrases or remarks have been removed. It is important to remember the findings represent the major themes or ideas from many partners and do not reflect the thoughts of any one individual or agency.

A brief summary of the major highlights from each of the four Michigan reports is presented below. Please refer to the individual reports for more detail.

**Program Environment**

- Michigan’s financial climate (FY 04/05) was poor due to a nearly $1B deficit. The state was experiencing rising Medicaid costs, decreased tax revenue, and high a unemployment rate.
- Tobacco control was a low political priority for Michigan which made it difficult to obtain passage of any tobacco control legislation.
- Governor Granholm was viewed as moderately supportive of tobacco control as evidenced by her backing of youth initiation efforts and the proposed excise tax increase.
- The Republican dominated Legislature has not been supportive of tobacco control.
- The majority of Michigan’s tobacco control champions were agencies or individuals working in tobacco control. No legislators were identified as champions.

**Program Resources**

- An unexpected budget reduction in FY03 reduced annual program funding from $5.5M to $4.8M, leading to reductions in staffing and activities.
- Tobacco control funding was unstable due to a poor state financial climate and a lack of support from the Legislature.
- The experience of tobacco control staff throughout the state was seen as a strength.
- Although there had been a small increase in surveillance and evaluation, partners described current efforts as moderately inadequate.

**Program Capacity**

- Partners reported that a formal plan for the overall program had not been completed due to the threat of funding reductions.
- MDCH Tobacco Section was highly regarded. Identified strengths included: quality staff, good relationships with local agencies, and strong coordination efforts. Insufficient funding and agency bureaucracy inhibited the agency’s efforts.
- The Michigan partners had a somewhat efficient contact network. Information was likely to be communicated from one side of the network to the other fairly quickly.
- The overall tobacco control network was viewed as only moderately effective due to the lack of public awareness, connectedness among some partners, and effectiveness on state level issues.
- The major strength of Michigan’s program is the people working in the tobacco control. Insufficient funding was the program’s greatest challenge.

**Program Sustainability**

- The overall sustainability score for Michigan benefited from a high level of *Program Surveillance & Evaluation* in the state. This was due to numerous surveillance efforts and plans for an upcoming program evaluation.
- Like many of the Project LEaP states, *Community Awareness & Capacity* was a strength in Michigan. The effective grassroots network and strong marketing component were evidence of this.
- Overall, the Project LEaP states’ levels of sustainability were most affected by limited funding stability and an inability to complete fiscal planning.
- Across Project LEaP states, the amount of political and public support was generally low, independent of the states’ overall fiscal health.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, such as a state’s financial and political climates, have a significant role in state tobacco prevention and control programs. The state environment can affect the amount of resources allocated for a program, how those resources are used, and the ability of a program to function effectively and efficiently. This report presents the findings about Michigan’s tobacco control program environment.

Prevalence of tobacco use is an important clue to understanding the tobacco control environment in a state. At the time of our evaluation, the prevalence of smoking in Michigan was approximately 26% of the adult population, with another 26% reporting they were former smokers (BRFSS, 2003). While the number of previous or non-smokers is comparable to the national average (78.3%), those currently smoking outnumber the national average by about 4%. According to the 2003 Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System, approximately 23% of all Michigan high school students (grades 9-12) reported being current smokers, a decrease from the 26% who reported smoking in 2001. Still, in 2002, an estimated 32.9M packs of cigarettes were illegally bought or smoked by youth in Michigan (TFK, 2002).

Not only does cigarette use deduct valuable years of life from Michigan’s residents, it also costs the state $1.78 in Medicaid expenses per pack sold (CDC State Highlights, 2002). In 1999, the total smoking attributable expenditures (SAEs) for Michigan were $2.6B (SAMMEC, 2001). Using 2000 U.S Census population estimates, these costs equal $701 per household, or $267 per adult in the state each year.

Another factor describing the tobacco control environment is the existence or lack of smoke-free air (SFA) policies. As of 2002 66% of Michigan employees were protected by non-smoking policies in the worksite and 58% of residents reported they had a rule that smoking was not allowed in their home (CPS, 2002). In comparison to 1999 data, these amounts indicate a relative percent change increase of 8% and 10%, respectively.

State Economic Climate

Perhaps one of the most important environmental aspects associated with tobacco control is the economic climate of a state. Partners stated that Michigan’s financial climate was poor. They reported that the state was experiencing a nearly $1B deficit because of rising Medicaid costs, decreased tax revenue, and the high rate of unemployment and manufacturing job loss. To improve the climate, partners were hopeful that the cigarette tax would be increased by $.75. This increase was under legislative consideration at the time of the
evaluation. However, even with the increase, most felt it would take at least two years for the state climate to show any marked improvement. Because of the current budget situation, partners feared that tobacco control was going to become a much lower priority.

Tobacco control is not on anybody’s radar screen as being most important...So there’s not much visibility for tobacco control right now.

The economic climate had negatively affected the program in the following ways:

- Loss of contracting opportunities;
- Loss of staff hours/increase in workload;
- Loss of programming and activities offered; and
- Decrease in salaries for state tobacco control staff.

State Political Environment

Another significant aspect of program environment is the political climate in the state. At the time of the evaluation, Governor Jennifer Granholm, a Democrat, became the first female chief executive in Michigan after winning the election in November of 2002. Michigan also had a bi-cameral Legislature compiled of 38 senators and 110 representatives. Both chambers had a Republican majority of about 58% each.

The Political Climate

Most tobacco control partners thought the political climate in Michigan was negative. The low priority of tobacco control in the state and the difficulty in passing tobacco control legislation reflected the poor political climate.

One of our main things that our program thinks is important is to get a clean indoor air act strengthened to cover all businesses. We can’t even get that on anybody’s radar screen because of the budget. That just overshadows everything.

Governor Support

Governor Granholm was viewed as moderately supportive of tobacco control. This support was evidenced by her backing of youth initiation efforts and the proposed tax increase. However, partners did recognize that it would be difficult for her to take a strong stand for tobacco control because of the budget deficit and opposition from the Legislature.

I think that she is supportive, but she has a giant list of issues that she’s trying to deal with, with almost no resources.
When [Governor Granholm’s] executive budget came out this past winter, the tobacco tax was one of her primary platforms. She not only wanted the increase, but also wanted that money to be dedicated to health, and she has not wavered on that.

The graphic to the right indicates how partners thought the Governor ranked tobacco control in relation to other important health issues. In general, partners felt she considered tobacco control as a lower priority than most other public health concerns.

**The State Legislature**

Overall, partners considered the Legislature as lacking support for tobacco control. This was reportedly due to the Republican dominated Legislature, which had been much more difficult to persuade regarding prevention efforts.

I don't feel they’re [the Legislature] very supportive. But I know there's a lot of other complexities with that, because the budget is in great deficit. But it’s interesting to me that they don’t want to tax [tobacco] to find more revenue to spend.

**Tobacco Control Champions and Support**

Even though the general political climate was viewed as unsupportive, partners indicated that the program had many champions in the state. However, no specific Legislators were identified as champions of the program. Champions identified were agencies that stood out as supporters of tobacco control including advocacy groups, coalitions, and tobacco control professionals at the local and state levels. Specific individuals, such as Mikelle Robinson and Jim Bergman, were also identified as champions of the program.

I think the individuals; the tobacco coalition people [are champions], just because they come from various perspectives, various walks of life, and they do a tremendous amount of work.

**The Tobacco Industry**

Many partners felt the tobacco industry had a fairly strong presence in the state. Particularly, it was thought to work through front groups such as the Restaurant Association and Chamber of Commerce. Industry influence was seen to affect the program through strong opposition of the tobacco tax initiative and smoke-free ordinances and the inadequate funding of the tobacco control program.

I'd say it’s pretty strong. They have organized retailers against the tax increase and they fund a lot of money to our restaurant associations, who are fighting smoke-free policies and road blocking any smoke-free restaurant laws.
Update

In June 2004, Governor Granholm signed a House bill to increase the state tobacco tax by $0.75. As of July 1, 2004 the $2.00 per pack tobacco tax made Michigan’s the fourth highest state tobacco tax, just behind Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Washington. The increase was projected to bring in an additional $97M in state revenue for the remainder of 2004 and $313M in 2005. With this increased revenue, the Tobacco Section was slated to receive a funding increase of $1.5M. These additional funds were to be used to distribute free nicotine replacement therapy to state quitline callers.

As of late, the previous revenue projections were overestimated. The state is once again putting forward funding reductions to balance the 2005 budget. While the Tobacco Section did receive increased funding, it was $0.5M less than first expected. Despite this, nicotine replacement patches are being distributed to quitline callers. However, funding for this activity is under scrutiny as a budget recovery strategy and the funding may be withdrawn.

Report Highlights

- Michigan’s financial climate (FY 04/05) was poor due to a nearly $1B deficit. The state was experiencing rising Medicaid costs, decreased tax revenue, and a high unemployment rate.
- Tobacco control was a low political priority for Michigan which made it difficult to obtain passage of any tobacco control legislation.
- Governor Granholm was viewed as moderately supportive of tobacco control as evidenced by her backing of youth initiation efforts and the proposed excise tax increase.
- The Republican dominated Legislature was not supportive of tobacco control.
- The majority of Michigan’s tobacco control champions were agencies or individuals directly working in tobacco control. No legislators were identified as champions.
- The tobacco industry had a strong presence in the state, particularly working through front groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Excise Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>$2.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>$2.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>$2.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>$1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>$1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>$1.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>$1.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>$1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>$1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>$1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>$1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>$1.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>$1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>$1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>$1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>$1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>$1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>$1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>$0.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>$0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>$0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>$0.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>$0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>$0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>$0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>$0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>$0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>$0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>$0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>$0.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>$0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>$0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>$0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$0.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>$0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>$0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>$0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>$0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>$0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>$0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>$0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>$0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>$0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>$0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>$0.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Scheduled to revert to $1.00 on 7/1/06.
2Effective 9/19/05.
3Effective 9/1/05.
4Temporary 10 cent increase expired 1/1/04.

Source: Tobacco Free Kids, 2005

To learn more about program resources, read the next report, *The Tobacco Control Program Resources: Michigan.*

Have questions or comments? Email Angela Recktenwald at ctp@slu.edu

This report was produced by the Center for Tobacco Policy Research at Saint Louis University.
THERE ARE MANY resources to draw on for tobacco control programs. Specifically a program may utilize: (1) monetary resources, (2) human resources, and (3) information resources. Monetary resources are important to tobacco control programs because they are needed to fund activities, contracts, and grants. However, it is also important to examine the human and information resources that programs possess and have access to. Without qualified and adequate staffing, programs can find it difficult to function effectively and to expand their efforts, even when adequate funding is present. Likewise, information resources, such as guidelines and proven methods, can significantly influence program success. The following report presents Project LEaP evaluation results regarding the three types of resources in Michigan’s tobacco control program.

Monetary Resources

At the time of the evaluation, Michigan’s tobacco control program was receiving $3.1M in state funding, all of which came from excise tax dollars. An additional $1.7M in program funding from the CDC Office on Smoking and Health brought Michigan’s total program funding to $4.8M for fiscal year 2004. Michigan’s total program funding was not enough to adequately fund all nine of the CDC’s Best Practices categories. In fact, all of the categories were funded below the CDC’s lower funding recommendations (see graphic below). The majority of the funds were allocated to Community Programs ($1.8M) and Counter-Marketing Programs ($1.2M).

During the previous two fiscal years (FY02 and 03) state tobacco control funding was budgeted at $5.5M each year. The reduction to $4.8M took place suddenly in the middle of FY03.

Funding Stability

Funding for the tobacco control program was viewed as unstable. Reasons for this included a poor state financial climate and the Legislature not seeing tobacco control as a priority.

Due to an almost $1B state budget deficit, some partners described the state financial climate as “grim,” “gloomy,” and “depressed.” Partners felt this poor climate resulted in the program cuts and a risk of future cuts for many state programs including tobacco control. They anticipated the state’s financial situation would last at least a
couple more years. Others thought program funding was fairly stable since the program had already lost a lot of money over the years. They did not think it could possibly be cut more without the Legislature being compromised politically. In addition, the program was receiving stable CDC funding.

It’s [state funding] not stable at all right now. One of the things that we were told if this tobacco tax increase did not go through is that it would decimate public health because we have to balance the state budget by law and they’re down hundreds of thousands of dollars.

**Future Funding**

Some partners felt future funding was largely dependent on the cigarette tax increase. They were hopeful that some of the money would go to tobacco control and many felt it was key to improving the state deficit. A few partners mentioned that the allocation of Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) funds to tobacco control would also greatly help the program. Finally, the continued threat of funding reductions made planning for the future challenging.

One of the things that we’ve been really mindful of doing is making sure that the decision-makers get to see the people who are affected by our services…So that the importance of the program stays in their minds.

(Note: In June 2004, MI’s cigarette tax was increased. Please refer to the Environment report for more information.)

**Human Resources**

In addition to monetary resources, an adequate number of experienced staff are important to program implementation. Since FY 03, nine out of 10 Michigan partners reported no staffing reduction due to budget constraints. The figure to the left illustrates the adequacy of staffing levels and staff’s level of tobacco control experience within all partners’ agencies. The blue dot indicates the average score of partners’ responses and the extending lines represent the range of their responses. Even though partners reported no staffing reduction, 70% of partners felt the adequacy of the staffing level was somewhat inadequate. Many felt the inadequacy of staffing level was a direct result of Michigan’s financial climate.

Regardless of the staffing inadequacy, 80% of partners rated the adequacy of tobacco control experience among staff as moderately adequate or higher. Also, staff were described as dedicated and committed to tobacco control:

It’s very intense everyday, but people are passionate about what they’re doing and they love being here.

**Staff Turnover and Morale**

For the majority of partners staff turnover remained unchanged from the previous fiscal year. Regarding staff morale, 64% of partners...
reported morale had stayed the same or had increased from the previous fiscal year (see adjacent graphic). Overall, staff morale was seen as high in most agencies due to staff optimism, experience, trust, and respect for others in tobacco control. Agencies with low staff morale cited reasons such as impending layoffs and internal barriers.

One of the things that’s happened is that with the new administration in place and previous tobacco control proponents in higher positions of authority, the hope had been that it would be a 180 degree turn in the climate for tobacco control. And that has not proved to be the case. I think part of the problem with morale has been the very great expectations that haven’t been realized.

Information Resources

Information resources that can be utilized by a program include surveillance data, case studies, and evidence-based guidelines. One example of evidence-based guidelines is the CDC’s *Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs (BP)*. All of the partners interviewed were familiar with the *BP*. During the interviews, partners were asked to prioritize the *BP* categories for their state. Administration and management was not included in this ranking since it is not exclusive of the other categories.

**BP Priority**

*Statewide programs* were a high priority for partners in Michigan. Reasons for this prioritization included:

- Being the highest level at which the tobacco control program can be implemented;
- Providing support to community programs; and
- Reaching the greatest number of people.

That [statewide programs] is how you can have the greatest amount of impact, by successfully doing programming at the statewide level that hopefully filters down to the local level.

Some partners felt that statewide programs were currently a high priority for the state. However, limited funding made it a challenge to expand statewide tobacco control efforts. While others identified policy work and community programs as current priorities for Michigan.

*Enforcement programs* were identified as the lowest priority category for Michigan. Partners felt it was challenging to effectively implement enforcement, particularly with regard to youth access, and questioned its effectiveness for the long-term.

Enforcement has been shown to be one of the very least effective ways to reduce tobacco use and protect kids against tobacco use. Because in practice, enforcement tends to be spotty; very few enforcement programs
work; and it diverts resources from other, more effective approaches to tobacco control. If it's part of a very well-funded and comprehensive program, then it's certainly worth doing, but it usually isn't.

**Surveillance and Evaluation**

The Michigan Department of Community Health, Tobacco Section (MDCH TS) was dedicating approximately 5% of their total budget towards surveillance and evaluation activities. Several surveillance systems were in use, though some (i.e., media evaluation surveys) had recently been cut due to budget constraints. Four of the CDC BP categories were being evaluated. Three of the categories (school programs, chronic disease programs, and enforcement) were not being evaluated due to a lack of programs. MDCH TS described the level of surveillance and program evaluation in the state as moderately inadequate though there had been a slight increase in some surveillance and evaluation activities in comparison to the previous FY.

In addition to surveillance activities at the state level, surveillance of tobacco industry activity was occurring at the local level in Michigan. Some partners reported their agency was monitoring tobacco industry activities such as, advertising, lobbying, promotions, and event sponsorships.

**Sharing Information**

In the past year, MDCH TS indicated that Michigan’s state tobacco control program had some communication in order to share information with tobacco control programs from four other states. An additional resource for the tobacco control program was information regarding Massachusetts’s tobacco control efforts, which Michigan used as a model.

**Report Highlights**

- An unexpected budget reduction in FY03 reduced annual program funding from $5.5M to $4.8M, leading to reductions in staffing and activities.
- Tobacco control funding was unstable due to a poor state financial climate and a lack of support from the Legislature. Additional program funding would depend on the passage of the tobacco tax increase.
- The experience of tobacco control staff throughout the state was seen as a strength.
- Although there had been a small increase in surveillance and evaluation, partners described current efforts as moderately inadequate.

---

**Which Surveillance Systems Has Michigan Used?**

- BRFSS
- YRBSS
- Adult Tobacco Survey (ATS)
- Youth Tobacco Survey (YTS)
- School Health Education Profiles (SHEP)
- Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS)
- Smoke free air surveys
- Media evaluation surveys

---

**What Tobacco Industry Activities Does Your Agency Monitor?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of agencies monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Sponsorships</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Information Sharing Between Michigan and Other State Programs**

- MI used state as a model
- MI shares information with state

---

To learn more about the program capacity, read the next report, *Tobacco Control Program Capacity: Michigan*.

Have questions or comments? Email Angela Recktenwald at ctpr@slu.edu

This report was produced by the Center for Tobacco Policy Research at Saint Louis University. http://ctpr.slu.edu.
No matter how ideal the funding or environmental situations, a tobacco control program must have the capacity to utilize their resources and support. One important aspect of capacity is the system of relationships between program partners. The ability to achieve program goals is often dependent on the ability of partners to establish collaborative relationships, effective communication, and efficient resource distribution. In this report, we will evaluate the capacity of Michigan’s tobacco control program by reviewing the:

- Roles of the program partners;
- Strategic planning for the program;
- The partner relationships; and
- Program strengths and challenges.

**Partner Roles**

At the time of our interviews, the Michigan tobacco control program was comprised of a variety of agencies that had different roles. The program was led by the Tobacco Section of the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH TS). MDCH TS was responsible for program planning, implementation, and evaluation within the state. The agency maintained approximately 14 full-time staff and six part-time staff. The agency also funded efforts in six of the nine Best Practices components recommended by the CDC:

- Community based programs
- Statewide programs
- Cessation programs
- Counter-marketing efforts
- Surveillance & evaluation activities
- Administration & management

For the evaluation, MDCH TS was asked to identify agencies that play a significant role in the tobacco control program. The list of agencies is only a sample of those involved in tobacco control in Michigan and does not represent the entire tobacco control program. These agencies are listed in the adjacent graphic and described below.

The voluntary agencies at work in Michigan included the American Cancer Society and the American Lung Association. These two agencies worked in collaboration with each other and other agencies to provide political advocacy for tobacco control at the state and local levels. Like the voluntary agencies, Tobacco Free Michigan (TFM), the statewide coalition, also served as an advocacy group. However, TFM also reported one of its main roles was to bring tobacco prevention partners together.

The Capital Coalition and Tobacco Free Partners (TFP) represented the local coalitions...
of the program. Capital Coalition was CDC funded and provided licensure for tobacco vendors in one of only three counties in the state that did so. TFP worked in western Michigan to build partnerships that provided comprehensive tobacco control strategies. TFP, Capital Coalition, and the Faith Access to Community Economic Development Corporation (FACED) served as advocates for the tobacco control program. FACED also worked to coordinate faith-based tobacco control and to develop tobacco-free policies.

The Smoke-free Legal Project, Tobacco Control Law & Policy Consulting, and the Center for Tobacco Use Prevention & Research provided the program with legal assistance associated with tobacco control. Specifically, the Smoke-free Legal Project and the Center for Tobacco Use Prevention Research focused on smoke-free air (SFA) ordinances, while Tobacco Control Law & Policy Consulting focused on other forms of tobacco litigation.

Leade Health was contracted to provide quitline services by enrolling people into a tele-coaching program and performing follow-up. The group also provided monthly call reports regarding quitline usage. University of Michigan Health System provided smoking cessation treatments for adults and youth. They also helped other healthcare facilities in implementing smoke-free environments. Though not a contractor, the Henry Ford Health System was also identified as a lead cessation treatment agency that served approximately 800 persons per year.

### Strategic Planning

While Michigan did have a five year strategic plan, partners reported that planning for the anticipated funding cuts had not been completed. Some stated that they had not made plans relating to funding reductions because their agency was not concerned that its funding was in jeopardy. Still others reported they had been unable to plan because the previous funding reduction had taken place too quickly.

*We’re not doing any long range planning. We focus on the short-term and what’s going happen in the next three months. We’ve talked a little bit about what the future may hold and how our arrangement may look and our roles in the program. But we really can’t do any long-term planning because it’s so up in the air.*

Some planning activities had taken place within the program in the previous two years. Specifically, the program had made an effort to train contractors and
grantees on evaluation by building it into their contractual agreements. The program also made a concentrated effort to disseminate its results and to market itself to the public and political decision-makers.

Perceptions of MDCH TS

MDCH TS was highly regarded by its partners. Several strengths of MDCH TS were identified that facilitated the program. Partners stated that the agency:

- Was a great source for information;
- Had high quality staff;
- Worked well with the grassroots organizations; and
- Was a strong coordinating agency.

However, some aspects of the agency were identified as impediments to the program. These included a lack of sufficient funding and the bureaucracy of being a state agency.

The lack of funding in the program has certainly impeded results that we would like to be able to show our lawmakers and our advocates. It’s definitely a stumbling block when we continually go to the Legislature year after year and ask for this money that CDC recommends and they’re just not seeing [the results] in our state even with the money that we do have.

The Tobacco Control Network

Thirteen tobacco control partners were identified and evaluated as core members of Michigan’s program. Overall, the tobacco control network was considered to be only moderately effective. Partners gave a number of reasons for this, including:

- Lack of effectiveness on state level issues;
- Lack of connectedness among some of the partners; and
- Lack of tobacco control awareness among the public.

Well, I would say it’s moderately effective on some issues, and quite ineffective on others. We don’t have a very good record at working on state level issues...

Increased resources, such as funding and staff, were thought to be possible ways to increase the effectiveness of the network. Partners felt that replenishing the lost staff, or increasing the current staff, would facilitate increased involvement of network members.
I would say again, if there was increased funding which would allow for the lead agency to be able to do more things to facilitate the work of the network and training for network members, and things that would overall improve the network and the ability of the network to accomplish things.

State and Grassroots Relationship

Partners viewed the relationship between the state and grassroots partners as moderately to very effective. The collaboration between the state and the local agencies was one of the main reasons for its effectiveness. Although they felt that the relationship was effective, an overwhelming majority stated that funding would improve the effectiveness of the relationship between state and local partners.

Well, that’s been a key to most of the successes that we’ve enjoyed in Michigan. So it’s been very effective, taking into account the limited funding and resources available for the task.

I would say if there were more staff and more resources at the state to implement programs, we’d be farther ahead.

Network Relations

In order to learn more about relationships among Michigan partners, four areas of the tobacco control network were examined:

- Contact – Frequency of contact between agencies
- Money – How money flows between agencies
- Importance – Perceived importance of agencies in MI’s tobacco control efforts
- Integration – Extent to which agencies work together to achieve tobacco control goals

From the information provided by the partners, graphical representations and descriptive measures of different networks within the state were developed. For more technical details regarding the development and interpretation of the networks, please contact CTPR at ctpr@slu.edu.

Contact

The contact network shows how often participating partners communicated with each other. A line connects two partners if they had contact with each other on more than a quarterly basis. The size of the node (dot representing each agency) indicates the amount of influence a partner has over contact in the network. An
example of having more influence, or a larger node, was seen between TFP and Law & Policy. TFP did not have a direct connection to Law & Policy, but both had contact with MDCH TS. As a result, MDCH TS acted as a bridge between the two and has more influence within the network.

The Michigan contact network had a moderate level of contact between agencies, meaning that about half of the agencies in the network had more than quarterly communication with each other. MDCH TS and SFELP had nodes that were similar in size and the largest compared to the other agencies in the network. Therefore, these agencies were most influential and were central to the contact network. The network was less centralized than the average Project LEaP state contact network.

The contact network was also somewhat efficient (i.e., information was likely to be communicated from one side of the network to the other fairly quickly). Efficiency has to do with how many steps (e.g., agencies) it takes to get from one side of the network to the other. Things like information or money travel faster through networks if there are fewer agencies to travel through. In this case, information was likely to get from one side of the network to the other fairly quickly. The level of efficiency in this network was similar to other Project LEaP contact networks.

**Money**

In the money exchange network, an arrow between two agencies indicates the direction of money flow between partners. Overall, MDCH TS provided the most funding to other partners, which is consistent with its role as the lead agency. By providing the most funding to other partners, MDCH TS had the highest level of influence over funding in the network. Most agencies that received funding, received it from only one source within the network. However, TFM, the statewide coalition, received funding (e.g., membership dues) from many of the partners in the network.

Compared to money flow networks in other participating states, the Michigan money network had an above average level of connectivity. In other words, there was more exchanging of funds in Michigan than in other Project LEaP states.
Importance

The importance network shows how important partners thought other agencies were to the tobacco control program. An arrow connects two partners when the originating partner feels that the receiving partner is *extremely* important to the program. The lead agency MDCH TS was chosen by most partners as being extremely important to the program. ACS and ALA were also reported as extremely important by multiple agencies. Most agencies were selected by at least one other agency as being an extremely important part of the program. When compared to other participating states, the Michigan importance network was less connected than average.

Integration

The integration network shows the extent of the relationship between partners. A line between two partners means that the partners *at least coordinated* with each other to achieve program goals (see integration scale below). The Michigan integration network shows that, of the participating partners, MDCH TS worked with the most agencies. Of the Project LEaP states, Michigan had one of the least connected integration networks. This means that agencies were not working together at the coordination level as they were in other states.

**Michigan** had a highly centralized integration network. This means that a small number of agencies were very influential in the network. In Michigan, the lead agency was the most influential in the network.

**Strengths and Challenges**

Partners identified several strengths of Michigan’s tobacco control program. There was strong agreement that the chief strength of the program was its people. Partners and staff were described as dedicated, passionate, experienced, and able to do more with less. Partners also reported that the overall network was a significant
strength. Specifically, they felt there was:

- A very strong relationship with the voluntary organizations;
- A large representation of partners who participated in meetings; and
- A strong organizational structure.

We have many, many experienced people that are so committed to the work; that have good experience; good ideas; a lot of energy; and just haven’t taken no for an answer.

Inadequate funding was the most commonly reported challenge to the program. Partners stated they were spread too thin and were restricted in many activities and programming. Connected to the lack of funding, partners stated they received too little support in the political arena. They felt the Legislature used tobacco control as a political tool and that the program had not been able to generate the necessary positive political support.

I would say, you know, not enough money; not enough staff; not enough inroads sometimes into the right organizations.

Report Highlights

- Partners reported that a formal plan for the overall program had not been completed due to the threat of funding reductions.
- Some planning had taken place regarding training contractors and grantees on evaluation, and dissemination and marketing the program to decision-makers.
- MDCH Tobacco Section was highly regarded by its partners. Identified strengths included: quality staff, good relationship with local agencies, and strong coordination efforts.
- Insufficient funding and agency bureaucracy inhibited the agency’s efforts.
- The Michigan partners had a somewhat efficient contact network. Information was likely to be communicated from one side of the network to the other fairly quickly.
- The Michigan integration network was one of the most centralized of all Project LEaP states, indicating a small number of agencies were influential in the network.

What Does the Michigan Integration Network Show?

- MDCH TS worked with many other agencies in the network but overall the partners were not very integrated.
- The Michigan network was one of the most centralized of all Project LEaP integration networks, indicating a small number of agencies were influential in the network.

How Do Michigan’s Networks Compare to the Average Project LEaP State?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Centralization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than other LEaP states
The same as other LEaP states
More than other LEaP states

1How connected the overall network is; shown by the number of links between agencies
2How influence is distributed in the network; shown by the size of agency nodes
The overall tobacco control network was viewed as only moderately effective due to the lack of public awareness, connectedness among some partners, and effectiveness on state level issues.

The major strength of Michigan’s program is the people working in the tobacco control movement. They were described as dedicated and experienced. Insufficient funding was the program’s greatest challenge.
In recent years, sustainability has become a growing concern as state tobacco control programs are faced with increasingly limited resources. There are many definitions for sustainability, including the longevity of a program after its inception. From the available public health literature, sustainability includes:

- Maintaining service coverage at a level that will provide continuing control of a health problem;
- Continuing to deliver a program’s intended benefits over a long period of time;
- Becoming institutionalized within an organization; and
- Continuing to respond to community issues.

Often organizations spend considerable time and energy focused on program funding. While important, this alone will not sustain a program. When funding loss is experienced, programs are faced with significant challenges. Furthermore, those that have failed to build sustainability in other areas are more susceptible to capacity loss, diminished activities, or even program closure. Mounting state deficits and financial difficulties have placed many state tobacco control programs in precisely this situation. As a result, it is critical that programs integrate the concept of sustainability into their planning activities. Assessing current sustainability levels allows programs to evaluate their strengths and challenges and address them in the future. Programs will be better equipped to plan and make decisions that will help increase their staying power and shorten the rebuilding time should funding return.

The Sustainability Framework

Because little work has been done to aid tobacco control programs in assessing their sustainability, the Center for Tobacco Policy Research (CTPR) has developed a framework for this purpose. Based on a thorough review of the scientific and business literature, discussions with experts, and our own research, the framework consists of five major domains:

1) State Political & Financial Environment
2) Community Awareness & Capacity
3) Program Structure & Administration
4) Funding Stability & Planning
5) Program Surveillance & Evaluation

The framework’s main purpose is to help states in their strategic planning activities.
By assessing sustainability, programs can understand where they are, capitalize on their strengths, and address their challenges. A secondary use for the tool is to examine programs across states, allowing for greater information sharing among programs.

It is important to note that all five domains are interrelated. For example, a state’s environment regarding tobacco control often influences program funding stability and planning. In turn, a program’s ability to successfully implement its efforts, assessed through surveillance and evaluation, can often have an impact on state-level support. For that reason, one domain should not be weighed without consideration of the others. This collective approach results in a more comprehensive and accurate picture. To assess each domain, a set of measurable indicators has been identified (see The Sustainability Framework graphic to left).

**Scoring Method**

Using the framework, CTPR has assessed sustainability for each of its Project LEaP states. Relevant qualitative and quantitative data collected during Project LEaP were used for this assessment as well as archival information (e.g., current strategic plans). For most indicators multiple data items were used in the assessment. Based on the compiled data, each indicator was assigned to one of three categories (see scoring example to the left):

- Limited evidence
- Some evidence
- Strong evidence

Once assigned, an average of the total indicator scores was calculated and used to place each domain in the appropriate category. The highest possible average score was 3, while the lowest was 1. At the time of this publication, sustainability data were available for analysis for seven of the eight Project LEaP states. Sustainability information for all eight states will be made available on the CTPR website (http://ctpr.slu.edu) in the near future.

**Michigan Sustainability Profile**

Michigan’s sustainability profile showed a moderate level of sustainability (2.0). For most of the domains, Michigan’s profile was similar to the other Project LEaP states. Of all the evaluated states, Michigan had the highest level of sustainability in one domain and the
lowest score in another. *Community Awareness & Capacity* was the highest scoring domain (2.6) for the state while *Program Structure & Administration* and *State Political & Financial Environment* were the lowest with scores of 1.6. Each of the five domains is described in more detail below.

**State Political & Financial Environment**

Michigan’s *State Political & Financial Environment* showed *limited evidence* (1.6) of contributing to program sustainability. Partners felt that the political climate was negative, but that the grassroots network was strong and active. The Legislature offered little or no support, and there were mixed opinions regarding support from the Governor. Forty percent of partners thought that the Governor showed no support, while 60% felt that she showed at least minimal support. The Governor was seen as supportive particularly when it came to preventing youth initiation and increasing the tobacco tax. Partners acknowledged that the Governor had competing priorities in the difficult financial climate and was also facing a Republican Legislature that was less supportive of tobacco control. This lack of political support threatened the sustainability of the Michigan program and resulted in a low domain score.

But our hands have been tied for many years with the Engler Administration with support. And now that we do have a more supportive Governor, the budget deficit has taken control over everything. It’s just at the top of everybody’s priority list to be dealt with first. Until we can deal with that adequately, I don’t think any other area is going to get much attention politically for support.

When compared to other partner states, Michigan’s experience was common. While some states reported slightly higher Governor support, Legislative support was typically considered minimal at best.

In addition to political support, the state financial environment plays a role in sustaining a program. The state was experiencing a financial shortfall, and all of the partners reported the financial climate was poor. Michigan was not alone; only one of the eight LEaP states had not experienced a budget deficit either currently or in the previous year. Also, with the exception of one, most states felt their economies were very poor and declining.

Our current financial climate is very poor. As I said before, next year we’re anticipating a billion-dollar deficit, which puts many programs at risk, including the state tobacco program. One thing

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Amount of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>No Data Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Champions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Opposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Financial Climate</td>
<td>Limited Evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is Community Awareness & Capacity?

Community involvement influences the success of program initiatives. A strong community environment includes having:

- Participation of community stakeholders;
- A publicly visible program; and
- An understanding of the community.

Community Awareness & Capacity

Based on a variety of aspects, the Community Awareness & Capacity domain had strong evidence (2.6) of contributing to Michigan’s sustainability. Although partners described a negative political climate, they also believed the grassroots network was considered effective in building community support and influencing political decision-makers. Most partners felt that the relationship between the state and grassroots partners was at least moderately effective. In relation to sustainability, the effective grassroots network allows for program recognition and engagement of community members and organizations.

Summary of Countermarketing/Media Strategies: State Comparison

They’re definitely working very collaboratively and strongly toward meeting with legislators to move tobacco-related advocacy issues into the forefront, especially right now with the tobacco tax that’s been proposed. There’s also very strong information sharing among the groups through a system called MichAlert.

Another way to increase program recognition is through public relations and marketing. Consistent with the goal of increasing marketing that was listed in their strategic plan, the program was thought to be very active in this area. They used magazines/newspapers, radio, and Internet advertising efforts as marketing tools. The Michigan program directed marketing efforts at political decision-makers, which was consistent with other evaluated states. However, all other Project LEaP states also targeted their marketing efforts toward the public.

Other influences that affected the Community Awareness & Capacity sustainability domain score included Michigan’s participation in several surveillance activities. These activities allowed Michigan to assess the characteristics and needs of the community:

- BRFSS
- YRBSS
- ATS
- YTS

Additional surveillance activities were conducted in relation to tobacco-related disparities. Michigan was consistent with most other Project LEaP states in their use of:

- BRFSS
- YRBSS
- ATS
- YTS
of multiple strategies to solicit information regarding populations with tobacco related disparities.

We started a multicultural network years ago and have been fostering the importance of culturally competent programs and messages. So to me, we just felt like those are both, first of all, really important and also most effective in reaching the populations that we need to reach in order to make a difference in tobacco control.

Program Structure & Administration

Michigan showed limited evidence (1.6) of sustainability for Program Structure & Administration. Because the lead agency was housed in the MDCH, a fiscal manager was shared with the other MDCH programs. Also, contracts and grants were managed with the use of fiscal guidelines and policies put forth by MDCH. While partners tended to agree with the program goals, no collective planning had taken place by which to achieve them. Partners felt that there was not enough time to plan and that the cut had not been anticipated. However, it should be mentioned that at the time of the evaluation a long-range plan was in place for the upcoming five years.

In most of the other LEaP states, partners tended to overwhelmingly agree with the lead agency’s program goals. However, many had made plans to achieve the goals as a group. Lastly, all but two other states had a strategic plan in place at the time of the evaluation, the majority of which were quite flexible and reflected the programs’ short and long-term goals.

It [the funding cut] has affected it [planning] from the standpoint that we’re not doing any long-range planning. We focus on the short-term and what’s going happen in the next three months with participation in the quitline, etc. We’ve talked a little bit about what the future may hold…But we really can’t do any long-term planning because it’s so up in the air.

Funding Stability & Planning

There was some evidence (1.8) that Funding Stability & Planning contributed to sustainability in Michigan’s program. Funding had changed in the past three years, going from $5.5M to $4.8M, but was expected to remain stable in the coming year. Partners indicated that there were some threats to funding and that they had several strategies to protect it, including:

- Promoting the program’s successes of to legislators;
What is Funding Stability & Planning?

For a program to consider long-term provision of services, it must first have some financial stability. Funding stability and planning includes:

- Level funding available on a long-term basis;
- Strategies to deal with funding changes;
- Identification of various funding streams; and
- Funding to implement the program.

- Looking for varied sources of funding; and
- Developing economic arguments for the support of tobacco control.

Regarding program capacity, there was little evidence that the program had the ability to sustain itself. Partners listed a number of program areas that were impacted when funding was reduced including:

- Less funding was available for local programs and coalitions;
- Staffing was reduced;
- Goals were scaled back; and
- No new programs were implemented.

Partners felt that activities in all of the Best Practices categories were reduced and that there was no way to implement a comprehensive program due to the lack of funding.

Except one, the other Project LEaP states had experienced large changes in their programs as a result of funding reductions or the threat of a reduction. Most of these states reported reduced staff, a refocusing of their program towards policy, and the reduction or elimination of many of their core programs (e.g., statewide programs, community efforts).

When you have more work or activities and you have less money, it affects your ability to do all the things that you want to do to make it effective. We had a larger youth component that was a part of our work, and every year we were able to really engage more youth in our youth environmental team. And we have not been able to engage the youth at that level as we were a couple of years ago before the budget was impacted.

All Project LEaP states encountered at least a threat to funding, and some had been unable to plan due to the quick occurrence of their budget reduction. However, the majority of states had conducted some planning efforts, including attempts to diversify funding sources, refocus efforts, reprioritize, and increase program marketing.

Well, the cuts that have already been absorbed, and the potential for cuts, has certainly limited what the program is able to do. And then in looking ahead, there is no sense that there’s going to be money restored in the near future, which makes it difficult to plan for anything other than just the status quo and hoping that you can hang on to the status quo.
There was, however, some evidence of sustainability in a few areas within Michigan’s program funding. The Michigan program showed evidence of fiscal independence with technical assistance offered to identify outside funding sources. In addition, the Michigan program promoted their successes to legislators and worked on economic arguments for supporting tobacco control.

Program Surveillance & Evaluation

Program Surveillance & Evaluation in Michigan had some evidence (2.3) of sustainability. Plans to complete a comprehensive program evaluation in the following 24 months and participation in seven key surveillance efforts were also reported. These included the BRFSS, YRBSS, CIA, ATS and PRAMS. Still, surveillance was considered moderately inadequate in the state. However, the program had used the information provided from its surveillance efforts to inform political decision-makers about program outcomes. Past evaluation and plans for future evaluation made this a strong domain when considering the overall sustainability of the Michigan program.

We are putting money into evaluation and surveillance surveys and things like that, too. So we’re trying to think much smarter about how we can accomplish these goals with less money; with less time; with fewer contracts out there; and just be more focused.

Like Michigan, many of the other LEaP states also reported a plan to conduct a comprehensive program evaluation. Though several of the evaluated states had high surveillance and evaluation scores, Michigan’s was the highest.

Sustainability Across Project LEaP States

Michigan’s program sustainability was similar to that seen in other Project LEaP states. For most domains, sustainability varied across states (see graphic on page 8). Nearly all states fell within the some evidence of sustainability range for most domains. There were two domains in which strong evidence was found for any state: Community Awareness & Capacity and Program Structure & Administration. The differences in the scores for the Community Awareness & Capacity domain were minimal and indicating that most Project LEaP states had experienced strong community participation and support.

In contrast, the Program Structure & Administration domain showed variability in scores. While most states...
had at least some evidence of sustainability, two states were on the high end while two were on the low end of the scoring range. Planning set many states apart in this area. Not only did some states lack a strategic plan, but some had no evidence of informal planning between program partners. The same variance was seen in the Program Surveillance & Evaluation domain. Reasons for this included minimal surveillance and evaluation activities as a result of funding difficulties and no dissemination of evaluation results as a program marketing strategy.

The Funding Stability & Planning domain also showed differences between states. Funding was inadequate, according to CDC guidelines, for all Project LEaP states. However, stability (i.e., developing strategies to address funding change and actively seeking varied funding sources) set some states apart from the rest.

Report Highlights

- The overall sustainability score for Michigan benefited from a high level of Program Surveillance & Evaluation in the state. This was due to numerous surveillance efforts and plans for an upcoming program evaluation.

- Like many of the Project LEaP states, Community Awareness & Capacity was a strength in Michigan. The effective grassroots network and strong marketing component were evidence of this.

- Overall, the Project LEaP states' levels of sustainability were most affected by limited funding stability and lack of fiscal planning.

- Across Project LEaP states, the amount of political and public support was generally low, independent of the states' overall fiscal health.