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INTRODUCTION

Indiana

In 2004, THE CENTER FOR TOBACCO Policy Research (CTPR) partnered with Indiana and seven other states to evaluate how unstable state financial climates were affecting state tobacco control movements 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 movements on topics such as state financial and political climates, partner relationships, capacity, and the effects of funding reductions on program implementation.

Methods

Information about the Indiana tobacco control movement was acquired in the following ways: 1) a program background survey completed by the Indiana Tobacco Prevention and Cessation Agency (ITPC); and 2) key informant interviews with 15 key tobacco control partners. To identify these partners, ITPC named the agencies that played a significant role in the tobacco control movement.

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 movement. 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 April, 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Partners in Indiana’s Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Indiana Tobacco Prevention and Cessation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- American Cancer Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- American Heart Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Healthy Communities of Bartholomew County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Healthy Communities of St. Joseph County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indiana Alliance of Boys and Girls Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indiana Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indiana State Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ITPC Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Latino Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Madison Health Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marion County Tobacco Control Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MZD Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Smokefree Indiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Report Series

Previously, the CTPR disseminated preliminary evaluation findings in the report, Not letting the tobacco industry win: Indiana’s resolve to keep fighting, 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 movements.

Project LEaP Conceptual Model

This report series has been organized to reflect each of the areas identified by the model: tobacco control movement environment, resources, capacity, and sustainability. Throughout the series, we have included Indiana 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 Indiana reports is presented below. Please refer to the individual reports for more detail.

### 2004 Program Environment
- Indiana’s economic climate was described as poor due to the $1B budget deficit, a national recession, and unemployment.
- Some partners described Governor Kernan as unsupportive of tobacco control, although many said that it was too early to judge his support.
- The Legislature’s support for tobacco control activities was described as mixed, with some key champions and advocates intermingled with those that did not support the movement or were on the fence.
- The tobacco industry had a strong presence in the state that negatively affected the movement.

### 2004 Program Resources
- The reduction in state tobacco control funding resulted in significant modifications to many program components, including community and statewide programs.
- Despite the funding reduction, the tobacco control movement did continue to provide some funding to all 92 counties in Indiana in FY04 and funding for addressing tobacco-related disparities remained stable.
- Partners identified increasing staffing levels as one of the most important changes that would facilitate their tobacco control efforts.
- All partners highly regarded the tobacco control experience of their own staff.
- The current levels of program evaluation and surveillance activities were described as adequate, though funding for surveillance and evaluation had decreased some from the previous FY.

### 2004 Program Capacity
- ITPC’s passionate, knowledgeable, and experienced staff was a major strength to Indiana’s tobacco control movement.
- In addition to the lack of sufficient funding, the political limitations put on ITPC as a state based organization was a challenge to the movement.
- The tobacco control network was moderately effective due to budget cuts and confusion regarding partner roles.
- The effectiveness of the relationship between the state and the grassroots network was thought to vary depending on the individual county coalition.

### 2004 Program Sustainability
- Indiana’s profile showed a moderate level of sustainability, but was higher than most other Project LEaP states.
- Community Awareness & Capacity had the most evidence of sustainability as a result of a very effective grassroots network and the engagement of community members in the Indiana movement.
- Though Indiana had legislative champions, the poor political climate and uncertain Governor support resulted in the State Political & Financial Environment domain having the least amount of evidence of sustainability.
- Overall, the Project LEaP tobacco control movements’ level of sustainability were most affected by limited program and fiscal planning.

Inquiries should be directed to Nancy Mueller at (314) 977-4027 or ctpr@slu.edu.

The American Legacy Foundation (Legacy) and the Association of State and Territorial Chronic Disease Program Directors (CDD) provided financial support for this project. The information presented in these reports do not necessarily represent the views of Legacy or CDD, their staff, or Boards of Directors.

http://ctpr.slu.edu
ENVIRONMENT

Indiana

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, such as a state’s financial and political climates, have a significant role in state tobacco prevention and control movements. The state environment can affect the amount of resources allocated for a movement, how those resources are used, and the ability of a movement to effectively and efficiently function. This report presents the findings about Indiana’s tobacco control movement environment.

Prevalence of tobacco use is an important indicator of the tobacco control environment. By considering the amount of use and other related demographics in the state, we can better understand the setting in which the tobacco control movement operates. At the time of the Project LEaP evaluation, the prevalence of smoking among adults in Indiana was approximately 26.1% of the population, higher than the national average of 21.7% (ITPC Annual Report, 2004). As of 2002, approximately 23.4% of all high school students were current smokers, a decrease from 31.6% seen in 2000 (ITPC Annual Report, 2004). Overall, Indiana’s youth smoking rate is similar to the national average of 23% (ITPC Annual Report, 2004). In fact, it is estimated that 22.7M packs of cigarettes are illegally bought or smoked by youth in Indiana each year (TFK, 2002).

The state climate can also be affected by the high economic costs associated with smoking. In Indiana, smoking costs about $1.9B annually in healthcare expenses (TFK, 2002). This represents 16% of all Indiana Medicaid expenditures (ITPC Annual Report, 2004). In addition to healthcare costs, smoking also costs Indiana an estimated $2.5B per year in lost productivity (SAMMEC, 2001).

Another factor contributing to the state environment for tobacco control is the existence of smoke-free air (SFA) policies. As of 2002 approximately 61% of Indiana employees were protected by non-smoking polices in the worksite. This is a 4% increase from 1999 but is still 10% lower than the nationwide average (CPS, 2002). In addition, 60% of residents reported they had a rule that smoking was not allowed in their home, a 20% increase from 1999. This was still lower than the national average of 67% (CPS, 2002). According to the 2003-2004 ITPC Annual Report, only 5% of Indiana residents are protected by SFA policies (ITPC Annual Report, 2004).

State Economic Climate

One of the most important environmental aspects associated with tobacco control is the state economic climate. An overwhelming majority of partners (81.8%) indicated the economic climate in Indiana was poor. Everything is underfunded. Programs are being cut, not just in tobacco, but in all agencies. There’s just not enough money to go around. Many thought Indiana was in a worse situation than other states and has been slower
to recover from economic difficulties. Reasons given for the poor economic climate included a $1B state deficit and increased unemployment.

Although a few felt the economy was showing signs of improvement, many partners felt it would be at least two or three years before the state would see any change in the climate.

It will be at least two years because of the budget and the climate. I don’t think people will look at it until they get through 2007.

While the state climate caused a decrease in funding for most state agencies, some partners felt the tobacco control movement had taken the largest cut. In FY02 and FY03, the movement’s budget was $32M annually. In April of 2003, the state appropriated funding was cut to $10.8M for FY04. However, ITPC was able to use rollover money to supplement the budget. This yielded a total budget of $15.8M in FY04.

The reduction in ITPC funding caused a reduction in most programmatic aspects. Paid media was cut by 50%, enforcement by 63%, community programs by 50%, and evaluation by 60%. As a result of these cuts, the following tobacco control activities were affected:

- A statewide quitline was not developed;
- Statewide grants were nearly eliminated; and
- Training opportunities were reduced.

As an agency, we talked about a quitline, but I think that’s stopped now because we can’t even come close to thinking how much that’s going to cost and where we’re going to get the funding for it. So there’s a lot of different programs like it...that we wouldn’t be able to do.

The overall political climate in Indiana was mixed and was described as, “not a bad climate, but not a good climate either.” It was a challenge for tobacco control due to the poor state financial climate, a difficult relationship between politicians and tobacco control advocates, and the strong influence of the tobacco industry in Indiana.
It is a real extreme in terms of diversity of opinions on it. There are a lot of legislators that were supportive of it... Others were willing to say it was great, but is it more important than Medicaid? And then there are others that are very much against it.

Political Support
Many partners were uncertain about how supportive Governor Kernan was regarding tobacco control due to his short time in office and his lack of public support for the issue. Partners’ felt that tobacco control was a lower priority for the Governor compared to other health issues, including bioterrorism, medical care, and maternal and child health (see top right graphic). Others cited his pursuit of securitization, blockage of hiring staff, and poor relations between the Governor’s office and tobacco control advocates as evidence of his lack of support.

Most partners felt support was varied or mixed in the Legislature. There were some key champions and advocates, however, many Legislators did not support the movement or were “on the fence.”

There are a few good political supporters within the Legislature, but overall it’s pretty neutral. And if something comes up that seems more important, that might be where the money goes. That’s a little scary.

Others felt as a whole, the Legislature had not been very supportive. The two reasons given most often were: 1) the Legislature did not see tobacco control as a high priority, and 2) the tobacco industry had a lot of influence in Indiana. Other reasons given for the lack of support included:

- Legislators thought the movement had some funding and did not see why they needed more;
- Legislators questioned the amount the funding spent on media;
- In the previous year, some advocacy efforts had backfired which led to negative rumors spreading in the Legislature;
- Legislators tended to focus on short-term priorities and needs, which excluded tobacco.

We got into a big debate with the Legislature over whether billboards are good or not; whether they’re effective or not. And every legislator has their own idea about it. They saw seven million dollars as a lot of money to be spent in media.

Regardless of their perception of Legislative support, many partners thought that there was a lot of work to be done to gain more of it. They felt that it was important for the grassroots to educate the Legislature about the issues.

One of the things we’ve done is try to shift our focus on trying to show the Legislators how much it saves them in healthcare costs, Medicaid, stuff...
Partners only indentified a few legislative champions who had been instrumental in passing legislation and allocating funding. Representative Bill Crawford, the Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, was identified most often as the biggest champion of tobacco control in the Legislature. Senator Larry Borst was also selected as a champion for his role in the first allocation of MSA funds.

You've got the head of the Senate Finance Committee, who’s a Republican, who basically designed ITPC in his own head and wrote the legislation. And you have the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, who’s an African-American Democrat, who is at least as stalwart a champion.

The Tobacco Industry

Most partners felt the tobacco industry had a strong presence and was negatively affecting the tobacco control movement. Many thought that, by working through front groups, the tobacco industry had a “hidden presence” or was “slick and quiet” in their activities. The industry used a number of influential strategies, including:

- Event sponsorship
- Opposing clean indoor air ordinances/lobbying
- Test marketing new products
- Promotional advertising/media

There’s a great deal of evidence that they [the tobacco industry] are very active in the state. They work with the petroleum industry; they work with the regional grocers; they work with the restaurant industry – so they’re always there. I think they’re pretty sneaky.

Report Highlights

- Indiana’s economic climate was described as poor due to the $1B budget deficit, a national recession, and unemployment.
- Some partners described Governor Kernan as unsupportive of tobacco control activities, although many partners said that it was too early to judge his support.
- The Legislature’s support for tobacco control activities was mixed, with some key champions intermingled with those that did not support the movement or were on the fence.
- Partners viewed the tobacco industry as having a strong presence in the state that negatively affects the tobacco control movement.
receiving $18.2M in total funding. This included $10.8M in MSA funding and an additional $7.4M from other sources, including:

- $1.4M from the CDC Office on Smoking and Health
- $1M from the American Legacy Foundation
- $5M of rollover from FY03

In comparison to FY03, funding for Indiana’s tobacco control movement had significantly decreased. In April 2003, the Indiana Tobacco Prevention Cessation agency (ITPC) received a 67% reduction in MSA funding ($32.5M in FY03 to $10.8M in FY04). This decrease in funding led to significant changes to the program. Previously, Indiana had addressed all of the categories from the CDC’s Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs (BP). After the funding cut, funding for many categories was decreased. The majority of program funds were allocated to Community Programs ($7.8M). Chronic Disease Programs did not receive any funding at the time of the evaluation.

In addition to changes to BP program categories, other ways the program was impacted by the decrease in MSA funding included:

- Planning for a statewide quitline was discontinued;
- Grant periods were shortened to 18 months;
- Enforcement was reduced by 63%;
- Local community grants were made competitive and funding was not guaranteed for every county;
- Statewide, regional, and pilot programs were nearly eliminated;
- The statewide media campaign budget was reduced by 50%; and
- Program evaluation activities were reduced.

I just see it [program implementation] now as treading water; trying to keep everything alive until we get this money back, if possible.

Despite these changes, the tobacco control movement did continue to provide some funding to all 92 counties in Indiana in FY04 and funding for addressing tobacco-related disparities remained stable. However, it was expected that the FY05 tobacco control budget would decline from FY04 since there would not be any carryover from FY04. This would impact the program’s ability to continue funding for all Indiana counties.

**Human Resources**

In addition to monetary resources, an adequate number of experienced staff are important to movement implementation. Partners identified increasing staffing levels as one of the most important changes that would facilitate their tobacco control efforts. Due to cuts in funding partners reported cutting staff positions, leaving vacant positions open, and scaling back on local and contractor staff hours.

It [funding cut] affected us a lot in the sense that the budget has been reduced so much. For example, our new counties, seven new counties; we couldn’t hire people full-time or part-time because the budget, that was allocated to those counties…Because there was not too much money. So, our consultants have a full-time job doing something, in some cases, completely different than is related to tobacco. And those people cannot allocate the time, 100 percent, to do that like we’d like. We’d like to have at least one person full-time in each county that we are working with. But that’s not the case.

The top left figure 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. Of those who indicated that their staffing levels were less than adequate, most had either reduced staff due to budget constraints, staff that worked only a portion of their time on tobacco control issues, or both. However, despite the range of responses regarding adequacy of staffing level, all partners agreed that staff...
tobacco control experience was highly regarded. This pattern was observed in all of the Project LEaP state (see graphic to the right).

**Staff Morale**

Initially, staff morale within partners’ agencies had dropped when the news of the budget cut reached them. Before the funding cut, the movement was showing success and there was great pride for their model efforts in tobacco control.

> We’ve lost a little bit of our confidence. We had a great thing rolling...then all of a sudden you get slammed and find out they [Legislature] don’t have the confidence in you that you thought they had and they might not know as much about you as they need to know.

Despite an initial dip in morale, many partners (47%) reported staff morale within their agencies remained relatively the same from the previous FY. For those who had reported staff morale as worse than the previous FY (37%), several reported that morale was improving.

> I think they [staff] recovered really well from it [budget cut]. They bounced back and said okay, we are not going to let the tobacco industry win...we’re going to make this happen regardless of the budget cuts.

A few partners implemented the following strategies to help with morale:

- Improving communication by having more in-person meetings;
- Providing more support to staff; and
- Offering flexible hours (e.g., flex time, comp time).

**Information Resources**

Information resources that can be utilized by a movement 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). ITPC was asked to rank the eight BP categories according to the order of importance for Indiana (administration and management was excluded because it is not mutually exclusive of the other categories).

**BP Priority**

*Community programs* was ranked as the highest priority, which was evident in the level of funding allocated to this category. However, Indiana has adapted the original BP categories to create the *Hoosier Model*. In this model, community programs include school based prevention programs and local cessation efforts. On the opposite end of the ranking, *statewide programs* and *chronic disease programs* were rated as lower priorities. *Statewide programs* were one of the hardest areas hit when funding for the tobacco control program was decreased. The
The reduction in state tobacco control funding resulted in significant modifications to many movement components, including community and statewide programs.

Despite the funding reduction, the tobacco control movement did continue to provide some funding to all 92 counties in Indiana in FY04 and funding for addressing tobacco-related disparities remained stable.

Partners identified increasing staffing levels as one of the most important changes that would facilitate their tobacco control efforts.

All partners highly regarded the tobacco control experience of staff within their agencies.

The current levels of evaluation and surveillance activities were described as adequate even though funding for surveillance and evaluation had decreased some from the previous FY.
NO MATTER HOW ideal the funding or environmental situations, a tobacco control movement must have the capacity to utilize their resources and support. One important aspect of capacity is the system of relationships between movement partners. The ability to achieve 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 Indiana’s tobacco control movement by reviewing the:

- Roles of the movement partners;
- Strategic planning for the movement;
- Partner relationships; and
- Movement strengths and challenges.

**Partner Roles**

At the time of the evaluation, the Indiana tobacco control movement was comprised of a variety of agencies and roles. The movement was led by the Indiana Tobacco Prevention and Cessation Agency (ITPC).

ITPC was responsible for movement planning, implementation, and surveillance and evaluation related to tobacco control within the state. ITPC, with twelve full-time staff, addressed the issue of tobacco control by working to:

- Change cultural norms
- Prevent youth initiation;
- Promote cessation;
- Second-hand smoke policies;
- Support the enforcement of tobacco laws; and
- Address tobacco-related disparities (ITPC Website, 2005).

ITPC funded efforts in eight of the nine Best Practices components recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Funding allocated specifically for community programs and statewide programs was pooled and shared among community programs, school programs, statewide programs, and cessation programs. As a result, chronic disease programs was the only category not funded.

For the purpose of this evaluation, ITPC was asked to identify agencies that played a significant role in Indiana’s tobacco prevention and control movement. The list of agencies did not represent all of the tobacco control agencies within the state, only a representative sample. These agencies are listed to the left and described below.

**Participating Partners in Indiana’s Network**

- Indiana Tobacco Prevention and Cessation Agency
- American Cancer Society
- American Heart Association
- Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids
- Healthy Communities of Bartholomew County
- Healthy Communities of St. Joseph County
- Indiana Alliance of Boys and Girls Clubs
- Indiana Department of Health
- Indiana State Medical Association
- ITPC Executive Board
- Latino Institute
- Madison Health Partners
- Marion County Tobacco Control Partnership
- MZD Advertising
- Smokefree Indiana

Aside from ITPC, there were two other state level agencies involved in the evaluation:

- Indiana Department of Health (DOH)
- Smokefree Indiana
Smokefree Indiana received CDC funding from a contract with the DOH. The agency was able to compliment the ITPC activities by working in areas that ITPC was unable to address including identifying populations with tobacco-related disparities in Indiana.

The voluntary and advocacy groups at work in Indiana included the American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, and Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids. These groups had various roles within the movement including providing support for ITPC and technical assistance to coalitions working on local issues. They also coordinated and conducted advocacy for movement funding and supported Smoke-Free Air and tobacco prevention issues. In addition, they sponsored various programs within the state.

We do two major programs; one targeted all ages, which is the Great American Smoke Out, which is primarily kind of media prevention; the beginning of cessation kind of media blitz. And then Smoke Scream, which is targeted at middle schools.

Indiana did not have a statewide coalition due to a loss of RWJF funding for the coalition. However, Healthy Communities of Bartholomew County coalition, Marion County Tobacco Control Partnership, Indiana Latino Institute, and Madison Health Partners represented local coalitions in the state. Coalition roles included coordinating local policy, advocacy, and education activities. The Indiana Latino Institute educated the Latino communities using culturally appropriate materials. Madison Health Partners was a collaborative group that offered healthcare activities, including tobacco cessation, youth programs, and smokefree air advocacy.

ITPC identified three grantees and contractors who were significant partners in the movement:

- Boys & Girls Clubs of Indianapolis;
- Indiana State Medical Association (ISMA); and
- MZD Advertising.

Several of these grantees targeted specific audiences. The Boys & Girls Club was focused on educating youth and training youth in advocacy. ISMA supported advocacy activities and delivered cessation interventions to practicing physicians. MZD Advertising, the media contractor, trained coalitions around the state in advertising, marketing, and public relations.

The ITPC Executive Board was responsible for coordinating
and allocating resources from the Tobacco Use Prevention and Cessation Trust Fund. In addition, the Board evaluated funded programs in order to keep State government officials, policy-makers, and the general public informed.

It was part of the enabling legislation that developed an executive board to oversee the appointment of its [ITPC] executive director. So this agency is set up differently than other state agencies in that the agency is not appointed by the governor, and that was done purposely as a safeguard because of the highly political nature of tobacco control.

Strategic Planning

At the time of the evaluation, the movement was in the fourth year of a five-year strategic plan. The ITPC Executive Board had recently approved the process for developing the next five-year plan. The current strategic plan had changed within the last fiscal year in many areas, including:

- Distribution of resources and prioritization of program outcomes;
- Potential funding sources;
- Staffing and external partnerships; and
- Efforts to change policy.

Although the plan did not include provisions for implementing the movement at different funding levels, the ITPC Executive Board met to develop different funding scenarios in preparation for the funding cut. In contrast, many partners reported that they had not planned for the cuts they received. They felt there was no way to plan for them and had not expected the reduction to be so large.

I don't think that we anticipated the magnitude of the cut...I don't think that we thought that it would have been that low. At the time, we were actually preparing to go on the road to do trainings for the next wave of funding for local community grants, and had to put the hold on that because of the budget.

After the cut occurred, ITPC and its partners spent time prioritizing program activities to decide where to spend and cut dollars. Also, the scope of the movement was narrowed to focus on a few areas instead of being comprehensive.

It has been maybe tweaking and redesigning the program so that if you are going to only serve a certain population of kids or a certain number of kids, what population should that be? There has been that discussion of where do you put the energy.
Despite the funding cuts, ITPC reported not providing technical assistance or trainings in the previous two years on how to acquire additional sources of funding. However, ITPC has continually provided assistance or trainings on how to evaluate activities and programs. ITPC also made an effort to market the movement to political decision-makers and the public.

Perceptions of ITPC

Partners described ITPC as dedicated and critically important to the tobacco control movement in Indiana. Some of the specific characteristics of ITPC that facilitated the movement were:

- Effective structure and partnerships;
- Good communication with legislators;
- Strong collaboration with MZD;
- Implementation of the BP categories; and
- Useful technical assistance and training.

Many partners identified the ITPC Board, leadership, and staff as major assets to Indiana’s tobacco control movement. The communication and flow of information from ITPC to all of its partner agencies was viewed as a strength.

What helps is the quality of staff at ITPC, their approachability. They are a very solid group and they usually have a lot of good insight and advice and they are always sending us stuff in terms of facts and resources and they have done a great job in that area.

Impediments to ITPC’s efforts included its relationship with the state government and the lack of funding and staff. Specifically, partners thought ITPC was limited in some of its efforts (e.g., advocacy) as a result of its political ties as a state based agency.

It’s strictly a problem of the relationship between a state agency, in this case ITPC, and state government. And the influence that government has on politics, the influence that they have in impeding and impairing the implementation of the state-of-the-art tobacco control policies. That’s the major problem.

The Tobacco Control Network

Fifteen tobacco control partners were identified as core members of Indiana’s movement. Partners considered the overall tobacco control network in Indiana to be moderately effective due to the following reasons:

- There was some confusion regarding the roles of some of the agencies;
Partners were unaware of the activities of others in the network; and

It took time to adjust to the budget cuts.

We’re not always working collaboratively, but our communication is good...Some agencies work better together than others do because they have maybe a longer established relationship. But as a whole, we’re effective as far as encompassing everybody.

Several partners felt that the network was improving as time passed. Overall, increased stable funding was seen as the best way to improve the network. However, other ways to improve its effectiveness were suggested, including:

- Strengthening collaborative efforts among partners to ensure one common goal; and
- Improve communication among partners, especially at the grassroots and county levels.

**ITPC and Grassroots Relationship**

The relationship between ITPC and the local grassroots partners was viewed as mixed. Many stated that the grassroots network was at least somewhat effective. Others thought that the effectiveness of the network varied across counties. They felt that each county in Indiana had its own coalition and the effectiveness of the network depended on the characteristics of each county’s coalition. In addition to increased funding, partners suggested more training opportunities and an increase in the amount of policy work at the local level would help improve the effectiveness of the relationship.

A lot of things are going on around the state and people are still passionate on a local level for their own programs and trying to improve the conditions in their own communities. In terms of support for the entire program, the existence and continued health and funding, I’m not sure it’s been very effective.

**Network Relations**

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

- Contact – Frequency of contact between agencies
- Money – How money flows between agencies
- Importance – Perceived importance of agencies in Indiana’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 had over contact in the network. An example of having more influence, or a larger node, was seen between DOH and TFK. DOH did not have a direct connection with TFK, but both had contact with ITPC. As a result, ITPC acted as a bridge between the two and had more influence, and a larger node, within the network.

Indiana had a moderate level of contact between agencies. About half of the agencies in the network had more than quarterly communication with each other. ITPC had contact with the most partners, which is consistent with its role as lead agency. This indicates that ITPC exerted a large amount of control and was most central to the network. MZD and a number of other agencies were also moderately influential. The level of communication among agencies in Indiana appears to be typical among the Project LEaP states.

The contact network was also very 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 the network if there are fewer agencies to travel through. Indiana had one of the most efficient contact networks among the Project LEaP states.

**Money**

In the money exchange network, an arrow between two agencies indicates the direction of money flow between partners. Overall, ITPC provided the most funding to other partners. By doing so, ITPC had the highest level of influence over funding in the network.

Compared to money flow networks in other participating states, the Indiana network was similar. In other words, there was a similar amount of exchanging of funds in Indiana as in other Project LEaP participating states. However, unlike some of the other Project LEaP states, several partners...
in the Indiana money network received funds from more than one source in the network.

**Importance**

The importance network shows how important partners thought other agencies were to the overall tobacco control movement. An arrow connects two partners when the originating partner felt that the receiving partner was **extremely** important to the movement. As indicated by the fairly uniform node size, most agencies were viewed as equally important to the network. ITPC was selected by the most agencies as extremely important in the network, followed by the ITPC Board, MZD, ACS, and TFK. The majority of agencies were selected by at least one other agency as being an extremely important part of the movement. When compared to other participating states, the Indiana 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 movement goals (see integration scale below).

The Indiana integration network shows that, of the participating partners, ITPC worked with the most agencies. The ITPC Board and ACS were also highly connected, indicating that they worked closely with many of the other agencies. Overall, the integration network was highly connected, meaning that many of the agencies worked with multiple partners. Indiana was also not very centralized; there were many agencies that were influential in the network, rather than just a few as in more centralized networks. The network was also very efficient.

**Strengths and Challenges**

The people working in tobacco control were viewed as a major strength of Indiana’s tobacco control movement. They were described as having a lot of commitment and passion for tobacco control. In particular, the ITPC staff and their director, Karla Sneegas, were highly regarded.
The tobacco control network was also a major strength. In particular, they pointed out that community programs/local coalitions were located in all 92 counties. Although the network was considered strong, partners identified the lack of collaboration and communication among partners as a challenge for the movement.

The other strength they have is by having the dollars across the state in all the different communities, it is a huge strength. Because instead of just running some agency from the state level, they’re really running it through every one of these community based grants, and it’s a very good way to get it totally connected throughout the whole state.

Partners also identified the following strengths:

- The existence of the Hoosier Program Model;
- The structure of ITPC;
- The existence of the media component; and
- The recognition of secondhand smoke as a priority.

Indiana’s political environment, including a lack of support from the Legislature and the strong tobacco industry influence, was a major challenge. In addition, partners felt that the state’s poor economic climate, which led to the lack of funding, was a major barrier for the movement.

We need to work on that communication piece with the state legislators so they understand better how important it is that we continue to be funded and on why we need to be funded.

Report Highlights

- ITPC’s passionate, knowledgeable, and experienced staff was named as a major facilitator to Indiana’s tobacco control movement.
- The political relationship between ITPC and the state government, which kept ITPC from some activities (e.g., advocacy) was considered an impediment to the movement.
- Partners viewed the tobacco control network as moderately effective due to budget cuts and confusion regarding partner roles.
- The effectiveness of the relationship between the state and the grassroots network was thought to vary depending on the individual county coalition.
- Indiana had well connected contact, money, and integration networks, but the importance network had fewer connections than most LEaP states.
IN RECENT YEARS, sustainability has become a growing concern as state tobacco control movements are faced with increasingly limited resources. There are many definitions for sustainability, including the longevity of a movement 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 its 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 movement funding. While important, this alone will not sustain a movement. When funding loss is experienced, movements 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 closure. Mounting state deficits and financial difficulties have placed many state tobacco control movements in precisely this situation. As a result it is critical that movements integrate the concept of sustainability into their planning activities. Assessing current levels of sustainability allows movements to evaluate their strengths and challenges, and begin to address them in the future. Movements 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 movements 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 elements or domains:

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

The main purpose of the framework is to help states in their strategic planning activities. By assessing sustainability, movements can obtain a better understanding of where they are, how they can capitalize on their strengths, and address their challenges.
A secondary use for the tool is to examine movements across states, allowing for greater information-sharing among movements.

It is important to note that all five domains are interrelated. For example, a state’s environment regarding tobacco control often influences movement funding stability and planning. In turn, a movement’s ability to be successfully implemented, assessed through surveillance and evaluation, can often have an impact on state-level support. For that reason, it is critical that one domain 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 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 was 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):

- 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.

**Indiana Sustainability Profile**

Indiana’s profile showed a moderate level of sustainability (2.2). Compared to the other Project LEaP state profiles, Indiana’s was the highest rated level of sustainability. Community Awareness & Capacity was the highest scoring domain for the state, while State Political & Financial Environment was the lowest. Each of the five domains and their scores are described in more detail on the following pages.
State Political & Financial Environment Domain

Indiana’s State Political & Financial Environment showed limited evidence of contributing to the movement’s sustainability. There was no data collected that indicated clear public support for the movement, however overall political support was considered mixed. Most partners were uncertain about former Governor Kernan’s support of tobacco control as a result of his short time in office and that he had not come out publicly for or against the issue.

I couldn’t make a very good guess on his [the Governor’s] priorities with regards to tobacco control. I can say that, from my knowledge he’s shown some desire to be assistant in the tobacco control arena, but I can’t give you a quantitative answer because there’s nothing that I can point to that says, okay, this means he’s supportive.

Most partners thought the support from the Legislature was mixed or varied. While there were some key champions or movement advocates, there were many legislators who were considered “on the fence” or opposed to the movement. Specific champions included advocacy groups that were influential in the political decision-making process as well as individual legislators, including:

- Representative Bill Crawford
- Representative Charlie Brown
- Representative Brian Hasler
- Senator Larry Borst
- Senator Pat Miller

We still have work to do with our policy-makers. We’re making some progress, but now we’re starting to work on those who haven’t been with us or who have straddled the fence; we need their political power behind this program in order for it to continue.

Overall, the state was facing a poor economy. There had been budget shortfalls in the previous and current FYs and many partners saw no relief in sight. As a result, state programs, such as ITPC, found themselves under a strategic hiring freeze, which kept some key positions from being filled and impeded progress from being made. All but one of the eight Project LEaP states had also experienced a budget deficit either currently or in the previous year. Most states felt their economies were very poor and declining.

They’re [the State of Indiana] broke. They’ve got close to a one billion dollar deficit. Indiana seems to have lagged the recovery that some of the other parts of the country are seeing. So it’s bad; it’s impacting everything in a negative way.
What is Community Awareness & Capacity?

Involvement of the community influences the success of movement initiatives. A strong community environment includes having:

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

Community Awareness & Capacity Domain

Based on a variety of aspects the Community Awareness & Capacity domain had strong evidence (2.8) of contributing to movement sustainability. It was unclear as to the level of movement recognition in the state, but most partners thought the media showed some support of the movement and that the grassroots network had been somewhat effective at building community support. In relation to sustainability, an effective grassroots network allows for movement recognition and engagement of community members. Indiana’s network was formally organized. It was considered very effective in its efforts to influence political decision-makers but only somewhat effective in its overall tobacco control activities. Because a coalition existed in each county in the state, community members were also considered engaged in the movement. However, the effectiveness of the relationship between the state and grassroots partners was reported to vary depending on the characteristics of each county coalition.

This experience was not frequently reported by other Project LEaP states. In fact, the majority reported a strong relationship between the state and grassroots partners. However, similar to Indiana, most states felt their networks were somewhat to very effective in their activities.

They’ve [the grassroots network] developed very nicely. We have a coalition in all 92 counties which is something that we didn’t have before. There’s still a lot that needs to be done to train the people that make up the infrastructure, to help them be more effective in what they do and lead them to understand what works the best. And by that I mean getting them more converted to a policy-oriented agenda and not just a service delivery agenda.

Another way to increase movement recognition is through public relations and marketing. The Indiana movement was seen to actively market itself to both political decision-makers and the public. Media outlets utilized in movement dissemination included:

- Newspapers/magazines
- Billboards
- Radio
- Television
- Internet marketing

Other influences that helped to determine the Community Awareness & Capacity domain score included Indiana’s participation in several surveillance activities. The movement participated in a variety of general surveillance activities.
including the BRFSS, YRBS, CPS, ATS, and YTS. In addition, it had attempted to obtain information about populations with tobacco-related disparities in many ways. Specifically, the movement solicited information from interactions and meetings with the populations and their representatives, feedback from partners, and internal agency review. These activities indicated a concentrated effort by the movement to understand the communities in which it works and to use that information to better reach community members.

Indiana’s marketing efforts were consistent with other Project LEaP states. While some reported the use of many marketing modes, others reported two or fewer. In relation to tobacco-related disparities, Indiana was above average in its efforts. In general, most of the other states used fewer than four strategies to assess the communities in which they worked.

**Structure & Administration Domain**

For **Structure & Administration**, Indiana showed strong evidence (2.6) of sustainability. One indicator within this domain is the presence of a structure for fiscal management. At the time of the evaluation, ITPC had a full time fiscal manager on staff to monitor its fiscal concerns and grants. Because the agency is a state based agency, it made use of the fiscal guidelines and policies set forth by the State of Indiana. However, it had also developed other policies specific for the tobacco control movement.

In relation to movement goals, most partners agreed with those outlined by ITPC. In addition, ITPC had met with its executive board, national partners, and its local partners to discuss movement planning and prioritization. In fact, many of the partners mentioned excellent communication and flow of information from ITPC to its partners.

They [ITPC] brought together a very large group of organizations just about a month ago to talk about how they could help pass the smoke-free air ordinance here in Marion County. It was a meeting that took a lot of time and brought people together, and they made that a priority.

The Indiana movement had a strategic plan set in place during the LEaP evaluation. From 2003 to 2004 the plan had been modified to reflect changes in staffing, funding distribution, potential funding resources, external partnerships, and prioritization of goals. Importantly, the plan was not only flexible, as evidenced above, but also reflected the long range goals of the program.

In most other Project LEaP states, partners also agreed with the lead agency’s movement goals. Also, many states showed
What is Funding Stability & Planning?

For a movement 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 movement.

Indiana Funding Stability & Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Amount of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Stability</td>
<td>Some Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Independence</td>
<td>Limited Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Some Evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence of collective planning to achieve goals. All but two states had a strategic plan in place during the evaluation. Like Indiana, most of these plans were flexible and included both the short and long-term goals for the movement.

Funding Stability & Planning Domain

**Funding Stability & Planning** for Indiana was considered to have *some evidence* (1.7) of sustainability. Though funding dramatically changed from FY03 to FY04 (from $33.3M to $18.2M), funding from FY02 to FY03 had remained constant. However, it was expected to decrease once more in the following fiscal year. These changes indicated funding instability and affected the overall efforts of the movement.

I mean, it’s [the budget] strained. We don’t have the funding that a lot of our partners would like. So they can’t do a lot of the things they wanted to do. We talked about a quit line, but I think that’s stopped now because we can’t even come close to funding it.

In response to the reductions, the movement had shifted its focus toward changing tobacco control policies in the state. Contract periods were also changed from 24 to 18 months, and there was a reprioritization of efforts. In addition, grantees were asked to consider a specific focus for their efforts instead of striving to be comprehensive. However, it is important to note that the movement had not developed an overall plan for implementing its efforts at different funding levels.

Like Indiana, most states encountered significant reductions in funding and at the least a serious threat of funding loss. The majority had made plans to respond to funding reductions. Specifically, states attempted to diversify funding sources, refocus efforts, reprioritize activities, and increase movement marketing. Partners from other Project LEaP states also attempted to increase their fiscal independence. Strategies employed by them included pooling partner resources to increase the performance of their funds and decrease overlap.

We started off at the beginning [of the program] talking about comprehensive tobacco control. [After the reduction] when we put out our Request for Proposals, we had to ask our partners to concentrate on one, two, or three areas and not so much a comprehensive approach. So we gave them permission to make it less comprehensive and concentrate on the areas that they thought they could do the best in.

Regarding capacity, there was some evidence that the program had the ability to sustain itself. Although the staff was experienced, the number was inadequate for
movement needs. Also, the funding reduction had caused a decrease in most community efforts by about 30%. Specifically, paid media and evaluation activities were cut in half, training opportunities were reduced, enforcement was reduced by 63%, and materials and supplies were diminished.

**Surveillance & Evaluation Domain**

Indiana’s movement had *some evidence* of sustainability in regard to *Surveillance & Evaluation*. This was based on many aspects, including plans to conduct evaluation and disseminate the findings. ITPC’s annual report indicated that its executive board had developed an evaluation plan and shared the resulting information with both the public and decision-makers. Also, the movement participated in six key surveillance activities, which was considered adequate for its needs. These activities included the BRFSS, YRBS, ATS, YTS, Smoke-free Air and Media surveys.

Partners also thought the evaluation efforts in the state were somewhat adequate for movement needs. Not only had the movement completed an overall evaluation in the previous fiscal year, but it was also evaluating several of the CDC Best Practices categories. Expressly, the program was monitoring activities in:

- Community based programs
- School based programs
- Statewide programs
- Cessation efforts
- Counter-marketing efforts
- Enforcement efforts

We have strong evaluation of the minority grantees. And because we have a fair number of rural partners, particularly in the southern part of the state where we probably even grow tobacco in some spots, it’s important we are evaluating our community directors in those areas...because that’s where the rubber meets the road.

The information obtained through these activities was used to educate the public and decision-makers. Indiana, like most Project LEaP states, participated in a high number of surveillance and evaluation activities. Also, most states used the results to educate both political decision-makers and the public. Partners in these states generally felt the evaluation and surveillance efforts were somewhat inadequate overall.

**Sustainability Across Project LEaP States**

Indiana’s level of sustainability, though higher, is not...
dramatically different from that seen in other Project LEaP states. For most domains, sustainability varied across states (see graphic to left). Nearly all states fell within the some evidence of sustainability range for most domains. There were two domains in which strong evidence was found: Community Awareness & Capacity and Structure & Administration. The differences in the scores for the Community Awareness & Capacity domain were minimal and indicated that most Project LEaP states had experienced strong community participation and support.

In contrast, the Structure & Administration domain showed variability in the scores between states. While most states had at least some evidence of sustainability, two, including Indiana, were found to have strong evidence and one to have limited evidence. Planning set many states apart in this domain. Not only did some states lack a strategic plan, but for others there was no evidence of planning efforts between movement partners. The same variance was seen in the State Political & Financial Environment domain. Reasons for this included varying levels of governor support and the different degrees of influence the tobacco industry had in each state.

The Surveillance & Evaluation domain showed little difference between states. Most states found themselves limited in the amount of surveillance and evaluation activities they could participate in as a result of funding reductions. Also, many had used the results to broadly market themselves.

Report Highlights

- Indiana’s profile showed a moderate level of sustainability, but was higher than most other Project LEaP states.

- Community Awareness & Capacity had the most evidence of sustainability as a result of a very effective grassroots network and the engagement of community members in the Indiana movement.

- Though Indiana had legislative champions, the poor political climate and uncertain Governor support resulted in the State Political & Financial Environment domain having the least amount of evidence of sustainability.

- Overall, the Project LEaP tobacco control movements’ level of sustainability were most affected by limited movement and fiscal planning.