

2009 AND 2011 NATIONAL YOUTH TOBACCO SURVEYS

SUPPORTING STATEMENT: PART B

Submitted by:

Danice K. Eaton, MPH, PhD, Project Officer
Division of Adolescent and School Health
National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion
4770 Buford Hwy, NE, MS K-33
Atlanta, GA 30341
770-488-6143 (voice); 770-488-6156 (fax)
dhe0@cdc.gov

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Department of Health and Human Services

May 30, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

1. Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods
2. Procedures for the Collection of Information
 - a. Statistical Methodology for Stratification and Sample Selection
 - b. Estimation and Justification of Sample Size
 - c. Estimation and Statistical Testing Procedures
 - d. Use of Less Frequent than Annual Data Collection
 - e. Survey Instrument
 - f. Data Collection Procedures
 - g. Obtaining Access to and Support from Schools
 - h. Informed Consent
 - i. Quality Control
3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates and Deal with Nonresponse
 - a. Expected Response Rates
 - b. Methods for Maximizing Response and Handling Non-Response
4. Tests of Procedures or Methods to be Undertaken
5. Individuals Consulted on Statistical Aspects and Individuals Collecting and/or Analyzing Data
 - a. Statistical Review
 - b. Agency Responsibility
 - c. Responsibility for Data Collection

REFERENCES

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A. Authorizing Legislation
- B. 60-Day Federal Register Notice
- C. Public Comment on the 60-Day Federal Register Notice and CDC Response
- D. State Tobacco Control Reports that Cite National Youth Tobacco Survey Data
- E. Publications from Prior Cycles of National Youth Tobacco Survey
- F. National Youth Tobacco Survey Questionnaire
- G. National Youth Tobacco Survey Questionnaire Supplemental Documents
 - G1. Parental Permission Form Distribution Script
 - G2. Parental Permission Form and Fact Sheet (English Version)
 - G3. Parental Permission Form and Fact Sheet (Spanish Version)
 - G4. Parental Permission Form Reminder Notice (English Version)
 - G5. Parental Permission Form Reminder Notice (Spanish Version)
 - G6. Questionnaire Administration Guide
 - G7. Data Collector Confidentiality Agreement
- H. Recruitment Scripts for the National Youth Tobacco Survey
 - H1. State-level Recruitment Scripts for the National Youth Tobacco Survey
 - H2. District-level Recruitment Scripts for the National Youth Tobacco Survey
 - H3. School-level Recruitment Scripts for the National Youth Tobacco Survey
- I. Recruitment Scripts for the National Youth Tobacco Survey Supplemental Documents
 - I1. State-level Recruitment Script for the National Youth Tobacco Survey Supplemental Documents - State Letter of Invitation
 - I2. District-level Recruitment Script for the National Youth Tobacco Survey Supplemental Documents - District Letter of Invitation
 - I3. School-level Recruitment Script for the National Youth Tobacco Survey Supplemental Documents
 - I3a. School Letter of Invitation and NYTS Fact Sheet for Schools
 - I3b. Letter to Agreeing Schools
- J. Data Collection Checklist for the National Youth Tobacco Survey
- K. Data Collection Checklist for the National Youth Tobacco Survey Supplemental Documents
 - K1. Letter to Teachers in Participating Schools
 - K2. Make-up List and Instructions
- L. IRB Approval Letter
- M. Sample Table Shells
- N. Detailed Sampling and Weighting Plan

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

This study will employ a repeat cross-sectional design to develop national estimates of tobacco use behaviors and exposure to pro- and anti-tobacco influences among students enrolled in grades 6-12. The study represents the continuation of the NYTS cycles that took place in 1999, 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006. The NYTS came before OMB for the first time in 2003 after management of the survey was passed from Legacy to CDC.

As presented in this supporting justification, every effort has been made to maintain the methodology established in prior cycles of the NYTS to permit comparability across cycles. The primary objectives of the NYTS are to develop estimates of tobacco use behaviors and exposure to pro- and anti-tobacco influences among students enrolled in middle school and high school grades; to identify differences related to demographic characteristics (age, grade, gender, and race/ethnicity); and to determine whether there are time trends in tobacco use behaviors and exposure to influences that promote or discourage tobacco use. Data from the NYTS provide a comprehensive picture of the tobacco use behaviors of adolescents and their exposure to pro- and anti-tobacco influences. Such information is required to support CDC's responsibilities in providing technical assistance in the planning, monitoring, and evaluation of national, state, and local tobacco prevention and control programs.

B.1 RESPONDENT UNIVERSE AND SAMPLING METHODS

The universe for the study will consist of public and private school students in grades 6 through 12 in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Students in public, Catholic and other private schools will be included in the universe.

The sampling frame for schools has been obtained from Quality Education Data, Inc. (QED). QED data encompasses both private and public schools and includes the latest data from the Common Core of Data from the National Center for Education Statistics. School-level data on enrollment by grade and minority race/ethnicity are available in this data set. Table B-1 displays the current U.S. distribution of schools by urban status and type of school.

Table B-1 Distribution of Schools by Urban Status and School Type

Urban Status	School Type			Total
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Catholic	Private	Public	
Unclassified	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	6 0.01 100.00 0.01	6 0.01
Urban	2,745 4.24 16.97 38.46	2,762 4.26 17.07 33.77	10,670 16.46 65.96 21.56	16,177 24.96
Suburban	3,828 5.91 13.1 53.63	4,347 6.71 14.88 53.14	21,040 32.46 72.02 42.51	29,215 45.07
Rural	565 0.87 2.91 7.92	1,071 1.65 5.52 13.09	17,782 27.43 91.57 35.92	19,418 29.96
Total	7,138 11.01	8,180 12.62	49,498 76.37	64,816 100.00

B.2 PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION OF INFORMATION

B.2.a Statistical Methodology for Stratification and Sample Selection

A national probability sample will be selected that will support national estimates by grade, gender, and grade by gender for students enrolled in grades 6-12. Additional details of the sampling plan are provided in Appendix N. The design will support separate estimates of the characteristics of white, black, and Hispanic students by school level (high school and middle school). The procedures for stratification and sample selection are consistent with those previously followed in the national YRBS and NYTS.

Sampling Frame. The sampling frame representing the 50 States and the District of Columbia will be stratified by urban status and by minority concentrations. The definition of urban status strata, distinguishing urban and non-urban areas, will be based on MSA versus non-MSA areas. The sample will be structured into geographically defined units, called PSUs, which consist of one county or a group of small, contiguous counties. The table below provides the distribution of eligible middle schools and high schools in the frame.

Selection of PSUs. A total of eighty (80) PSUs will be selected with probability proportional to the student enrollment in the PSU, giving disproportionate weight to black and Hispanic students. The PSUs will be allocated to the strata in proportion to the sum of the measures of size of the PSUs in the strata. This procedure will allocate relatively more PSUs to strata with greater densities of minority students. Therefore, it will increase the chances of high-minority PSUs being selected.

Selection of Schools. Schools will be classified by enrollment size as small, medium or large. Small schools contain an average of less than 25 students per eligible grade. The remaining schools are classified as medium if they have fewer than 50 students in any of the eligible grades for the level (middle school or high school); otherwise they are considered large schools.

Among large schools, two schools will be selected in each sample PSU, one middle school and one high school, with probability proportional to the weighted measure of enrollment by race/ethnicity. Therefore, a total of 160 large school (80 high schools and 80 middle schools) selections will be made at the second stage from the 80 sample PSUs. Among small schools, a separate random sample of 10 middle schools and 10 high-schools schools per level will be taken from 10 sub-sample PSUs. Similarly, 10 medium high-schools and 10 medium middle-schools will be selected from a sub-sample of 10 PSUs.

Selection of Students. All students in a selected classroom will be selected for the study.

Refusals. School districts, schools, or students who refuse to participate in the study will not be replaced in the sample. We will record the characteristics of schools that refuse along with reasons given for their refusal for analysis of potential study biases.

B.2.b Estimation and Justification of Sample Size

The NYTS is designed to produce the key estimates accurate to within $\pm 5\%$ at a 95% precision level. Estimates by grade, gender, and grade by gender meet this standard. The same standard is used for the estimates for racial/ethnic groups by school level.

We propose to replicate key aspects of the sampling design followed in the 2006 NYTS. Refinements typically occur in response to the changing demographics of the in-school population and to meet CDC's policy needs. For example, current trends of increasing percentages of minority students likely will lead to more efficient sampling of minority students and to smaller overall sample sizes. In addition, the proposed design will more effectively oversample black and Hispanic students by increasing the sampling intensity in those schools with high concentrations of these minority groups.

Across the five cycles of the NYTS, the school participation has averaged 89%, with a low of 83%. Student participation has averaged 90% with a low of 88%. We have assumed slightly lower, more conservative values in developing the sample design for the 2009: 85% for schools and 85% for students.

The proposed sample consists of 80 PSUs with 2 large schools selected per PSU at the second stage, for a total sample of 160 large schools augmented by a sample of 20 medium

schools and 20 small schools. The expectation is that approximately 85% or 170 of these schools will participate in the survey.

The anticipated total number of participating students is 19,877. Of the 80 large high schools and 80 large middle schools, 60 of each group will be classified as high-minority schools. We will select two classes per grade, (i.e., 6 classes in high-minority middle schools and 8 classes in high-minority high schools), to ensure that target precision levels are met for minority group estimates. Only one class per grade level will be selected for the 20 non-high minority high schools and 20 non-high minority middle schools. Note that the projected number of black students will be approximately 1,763 and 1,583 for high school and middle schools, respectively. Somewhat higher numbers are expected for Hispanic students, 1,991 for high schools and 1,753 for middle schools.

B.2.c. Estimation and Statistical Testing Procedures

Sample data will be weighted by the reciprocal of the probability of case selection and adjusted for non-response. The resulting weights will be trimmed to reduce mean-squared error. Next, the strata weights will be adjusted to reflect true relative enrollments rather than relative weighted enrollment. Finally, the data will be post-stratified to match national distributions of high school students by race/ethnicity and grade. Variances will be computed using linearization methods. NYTS data are also used for trend analyses where data for successive cycles are compared with statistical testing techniques. Statistical testing methods are used also to compare subgroup prevalence rates (e.g., male versus female students) for each cross-sectional survey. These tests will be performed with statistical techniques that account for the complex survey design.

Confidence intervals vary depending upon whether an estimate represents the full population or a subset, such as a particular grade, gender, or racial/ethnic group. Within a grouping, they also vary depending on the level of the estimate and the design effect associated with the measure. Based on the prior NYTS studies, as well as on precision requirements that have driven the sampling design, we can expect the following subgroup estimates to be within $\pm 5\%$ at 95% precision level:

- Estimates by grade, gender, and grade by gender
- Minority group estimates by school level for blacks and Hispanics

For the former estimates, these levels will flow from projected sample sizes of approximately 2,840 participating students per grade, and therefore, approximately 1,420 by gender within grade. For the latter estimates, the anticipated number of participants in each minority group is at least 1,583 per school level. For conservative design effect scenarios (design effects of 2.0 or less), estimates based on these subgroup sample sizes will be within ± 5 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

B.2.d Use of Less Frequent Than Annual Data Collection to Reduce Burden

The NYTS was designed from the outset as a biennial survey. Data must be collected no less frequently than biennially to detect any changes in tobacco use behaviors (e.g., modes of use, age of initiation, attitudes toward use, means of access, and cessation attempts), influences that promote and discourage tobacco use among youth, and corresponding tobacco prevention and control interventions. As witnessed during the 1990s, youth tobacco use can increase or decrease rapidly. Having access to the data gathered in the NYTS less frequently than biennially would increase the likelihood of failing to detect entirely such rapid changes in tobacco use behaviors and their influences, thereby missing the opportunity to limit an increase or accelerate a decrease. School systems and state and local health departments have the capacity to modify their tobacco prevention and control interventions rapidly, if circumstances require. Biennial conduct of the NYTS provides the minimum frequency with which such data are needed to inform decisions about the allocation of tobacco prevention and control resources.

B.2.e Survey Instrument

The NYTS questionnaire (Appendix F) contains 81 items, which can be roughly divided into the following groups. The first set of questions on the questionnaire gather demographic data. Most of the remaining questions address the following tobacco-related topics: tobacco use (cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, cigars, pipes, bidis, and clove cigarettes), knowledge and attitudes, media and advertising, minors' access and enforcement, school curriculum, cessation, and environmental exposure to tobacco smoke. The questions are in a multiple-choice format and will be administered as an 8-page optically scannable questionnaire booklet.

B.2.f Data Collection Procedures

Data will be collected by a small staff of professional data collectors, specially trained to conduct the NYTS. Each data collector will have direct responsibility for administering the survey to students. Data collectors will follow a questionnaire administration guide (Appendix G6). Teachers will be asked to remain at the front or back of the classroom and not to walk around the room monitoring the aisles during survey administration because doing so could affect honest responses and compromise anonymity. Teachers also will be asked to identify students allowed to participate in the survey and to make sure non-participating students have appropriate alternative activities. The rationale for this is to increase the candor and comfort level of students. The only direct responsibility of teachers in data collection is to distribute and follow up on parental permission forms sent out prior to the scheduled date for data collection in the school. Teachers are provided with a parental permission form distribution script (Appendix G1) to follow when distributing permission forms to students. The Data Collection Checklist (Appendix J) is completed by teachers to track which students have received parental permission to participate in the data collection. The teachers receive instructions on completing the Data Collection Checklist in the "Letter to Teachers in Participating Schools" (Appendix K1). The data collector will utilize the information on the Data Collection Checklist to identify students eligible for a make-up survey administration; this information will be recorded by the data collector on the "Make-up List and Instructions" document (Appendix K2). In general, our data collection procedures have been designed to ensure that:

- Protocol is followed in obtaining access to schools
- Everyday school activity schedules are disrupted minimally

- Administrative burden placed on teachers is minimal
- Parents give informed permission to participate in the survey
- Anonymity of student participation is maintained, with no punitive actions against non-participants
- Alternative activities are provided for nonparticipants
- Control over the quality of data is maintained

B.2.g Obtaining Access to and Support from Schools

All initial letters of invitation will be on CDC letterhead from the Department of Health and Human Services and signed by Howell Wechsler, Ed.D, M.P.H., Director, DASH, NCCDPHP at CDC. The procedures for gaining access to schools will have three major steps:

- Notify State health and education agencies in states with sampled schools and invite states to participate. Obtain written approval and support from both agencies. Confirm existence and grade range of selected schools. Also, for each school, confirm name of school district, school district address and phone, superintendent name, names of supportive school district contacts, and general guidance on working with the selected school districts and schools in the state. Request that the state notify school districts that they may anticipate being contacted about the survey.
- Once cleared at the state level, invite school districts in which selected schools are located to participate in the study. For Catholic schools and other private schools, invite the office comparable to the school district office (e.g., diocesan office of education). Obtain approval for participation at the district level. Confirm existence of school, grade range, and the principal's name, address, and telephone number. Request that the school district notify schools that they may anticipate being contacted about the survey. Request general guidance on working with the selected schools.
- Once cleared at the school district level, invite selected schools to participate. Confirm information previously obtained about the school. Present the burden and benefits of participation in the survey. After a school agrees to participate, develop a tailor-made plan for collection of data in the school (e.g., select classes; determine whether survey will be administered to selected class sections simultaneously or in serial). Obtain approval for participation at the school level. Ensure that all materials reach the school well in advance of when they are needed. Maintain contact with schools until all data collection activities have been completed.

Prior experience suggests the process of working with each state's health and education agencies, school districts and schools will have unique features. Communication with each agency will recognize the organizational constraints and prevailing practices of the agency. Scripts for use in guiding these discussions may be found in Appendices H1 (state-level), H2 (district-level), and H3 (school-level). Appendix I contains copies of letters of invitation to states (Appendix I1), school districts (Appendix I2), and school administrators (Appendix I3a). Appendix I also contains the NYTS Fact Sheet for Schools (I3a). A copy of the letter to be sent to schools once they have agreed to participate is found in Appendix I3b.

B.2.h Informed Consent

The permission form informs both the student and the parent about an important activity in which the student has the opportunity to participate. By providing adequate information about the activity, it ensures that permission will be informed. A copy of the permission form is contained in Appendices G2 (English version) and G3 (Spanish version). In accord with the No Child Left Behind Act, the permission form indicates that a copy of the questionnaire will be available for review by parents at their child’s school.

A waiver of written student assent was obtained for the participation of children because this research presents no more than minimal risk to subjects, parental permission is required for participation, the waiver will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the students because they are free to decline to take part, and it is thought that some students may perceive they are not anonymous if they are required to provide stated assent and sign a consent/assent document. Students are told “Participating in this survey is voluntary and your grade in this class will not be affected, whether or not you answer the questions.” Completion of the survey implies student assent.

B.2.i Quality Control

Table B-2 lists the major means of quality control. As shown, the task of collecting quality data begins with a clear and explicit study protocol and ends with procedures for the coding, entry, and verification of collected data. In between these activities, and subsequent to data collector training, measures must be taken to reinforce training, to assist field staff who runs into trouble, and to check on data collection techniques. Because the ultimate aim is production of a high quality database and reports, various quality assurance activities will be applied during the data collection phase.

B.3 METHODS TO MAXIMIZE RESPONSE RATES AND DEAL WITH NONRESPONSE

B.3.a Expected Response Rates

The study requires a final yield of approximately 19,000 students. It is necessary to draw an initial sample that is considerably larger than this target number to compensate for school and student non-participation. On prior cycles of the NYTS, school participation averaged 89%, with a low of 83%; student participation averaged 90% with a low of 88%. For the 2009/2011 NYTS, we conservatively have assumed 85% school and 85% student participation. A \$500 incentive will be offered to each participating school.

Table B-2

Major Means of Quality Control

Survey Step	Quality Control Procedures
Mail Out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check inner vs. outer label for correspondence (5% sample) • Verify that any errors in packaging were not systematic (100%)

Previsit Logistics Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review data collection procedures with school personnel in each school to ensure that all preparatory activities were performed properly (100%)
Receipt Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verify that a sample of forms received the prior day were logged in and are stored in the proper location (5%) Require entry of staff ID in receipt control and all other transactions (100%)
Telephone Contacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor early sample of scheduling and follow-up telephone calls to ensure that the caller follows procedures, elicits proper information, and has proper demeanor (10%)
Manual Editing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verify initial editing by all editors until standards are achieved (100%) Spot check editing by editor (5%)
Computer Scanning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key enter questionnaires that are not scannable (100%) Remove any scannable form that reflects intentional misuse by a respondent (100%)

NYTS participation rates traditionally have been relatively high compared to other federally funded, national, school-based, health related surveys of high school students. For example, the widely cited *Monitoring the Future* survey (formerly known as the *High School Senior Survey*) achieves substantially lower participation rates. The participation rates established by the national YRBS and the NYTS are the product of the application of proven and tested procedures for maximizing school and student participation.

As indicated in A.16.c, it is desirable to complete data collection before the final month of school (i.e., by mid-April to mid-May, depending on location). Many schools are very busy then with standardized testing and final exams; in addition, attendance can be very unstable, especially among twelfth grade students.

B.3.b Methods for Maximizing Responses and Handling Nonresponse

We distinguish among six potential types of nonresponse problems: refusal to participate by a selected school district, school, teacher, parent, or student; and collection of incomplete information from a student.

To minimize refusals at all levels--from school district to student--we will use a variety of techniques, emphasizing the importance of the survey. Given the subject matter is tobacco, we expect that a few school districts or schools will need to place the issue of survey participation before the school board. To increase the likelihood of an affirmative decision, we will: (1) work through the state agencies to communicate its support of the survey; (2) indicate that the survey is being sponsored by CDC; (3) convey to the school district or school that the survey has the endorsement of many key national educational and health associations, such as the National PTA, American Medical Association, National Association of State Boards of Education, Council of Chief State School Officers and the National School Boards Association; (4) maintain both a toll-free hotline to answer questions from the school board and a readiness to appear in

person if necessary when the survey is under consideration; (5) offer a package of educational products to each participating school, as recommended by OMB in approving the 1998 YRBS in alternative schools (OMB No. 0920-0416, expiration 12/98) and implemented on NYTS ever since; (6) comply with all requirements from school districts in preparing written proposals for survey clearance; (7) convey a willingness to appear in person, if needed, to present the survey before a school board, research committee, or other local entity tasked with reviewing the survey; and (8) offer schools a monetary incentive of \$500.

The sampling plan does *not* allow for the replacement of schools that refuse to participate due to concern that replacing schools would introduce bias. All participating state departments of health and education, school districts, and schools also will be sent a copy of the published survey results.

Maximizing responses and dealing with refusals from parents, teachers, and students require different strategies. To maximize responses, we will recommend that schools help to advertise the survey through the principal's newsletter, PTA meetings, and other established means of communication. Reminders will be sent to parents who have not returned parental permission forms within an agreed upon time period (e.g., 3 days); those who do not respond to the reminder will be sent a second and final reminder. The permission form will provide a telephone number at CDC that parents may call to have questions answered before agreeing to give permission for their child's participation. Permission forms will be available in English, Spanish, and any other languages, spoken by a large percentage of parents in a given school district. Field staff will be available on location to answer questions from parents who remain uncertain of permission. Bilingual field staff will be used in locations with high Hispanic concentrations (e.g., California, Florida, New York City, and Texas).

Teacher refusals to cooperate with the study are not expected to be a problem because schools already will have agreed to participate. Refusals by students who have parental permission to participate are expected to be minimal. No punitive action will be taken against a nonconsenting student. Nonconsenting students will not be replaced. Data will be analyzed to determine if student nonresponse introduces any biases.

To minimize the likelihood of missing values on the survey, students will be reminded in writing in the questionnaire booklet and verbally by the survey administrator to review the optically scannable questionnaire before turning it in to verify that: (1) each question has been answered, (2) only one oval is filled in for each question with the exception of questions instructing the respondent to choose one or more answers (e.g. the question on race asks the student to mark each race that applies); and (3) each response has been entered with a No. 2 pencil, fills the oval, and is dark. A No. 2 pencil will be provided to each survey participant to reduce the likelihood that responses will not scan properly, which would produce missing values. In addition, when completed questionnaires are visually scanned later at project headquarters, any oval that is lightly filled in will be darkened (unless they appear to be erasures) and stray marks will be erased before the forms are scanned. Missing values for an individual student on the survey will not be imputed.

B.4 TESTS OF PROCEDURES OR METHODS TO BE UNDERTAKEN

The NYTS core questionnaire items—those identified for use both nationally and at the state level—originally were subjected to cognitive analyses by RTI in 1999. This cognitive analysis directly affected the first NYTS questionnaire fielded in 1999. Cognitive analyses of a small number of new questions were conducted in the fall of 2003. A limited pretest of the NYTS 2004 questionnaire was conducted in August, 2003. In April 2005, a pretest of the NYTS 2006 questionnaire was conducted by the contractor in the Prince George’s County, Maryland in accord with OMB guidelines. The pretests sharpened the articulation of certain survey questions and confirmed the existing empirical estimate of the survey burden.

The NYTS questionnaire has been used extensively in five prior national school-based surveys, three of which did not fall under OMB purview because they were funded by Legacy. The state YTS containing the same core items as the NYTS has been implemented by states since as early as 1998, with one state (i.e., Florida) having conducted the YTS during ten consecutive school years.

B.5 INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED ON STATISTICAL ASPECTS AND INDIVIDUALS COLLECTING AND/OR ANALYZING DATA

B.5.a Statistical Review

Statistical aspects of the study have been reviewed by the individuals listed below.

Michael T. Errecart, Ph.D. (deceased)
Macro International Inc.

Ronaldo Iachan, Ph.D.
Senior Statistician
Macro International Inc.
11785 Beltsville Drive, Suite 300
Calverton, Maryland 20705
(301) 572-0538
Ronaldo.Iachan@macrointernational.com

B.5.b Agency Responsibility

Within the agency, the following individual will be responsible for receiving and approving contract deliverables and will have primary responsibility for data analysis:

Danice K. Eaton, MPH, Ph.D.
Lieutenant Commander
United States Public Health Service
SERB/DASH/NCCDPHP/CDC
4770 Buford Highway NE, MS K-33
Atlanta, GA 30341
Voice: 770-488-6143
Fax: 770-488-6156
E-mail: DEaton@cdc.gov

Within the agency, the following individual will have primary responsibility for data analysis:

Heather Ryan
Health Scientist
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Office on Smoking and Health, Epidemiology Branch
4770 Buford Highway NE, MS-K50
Atlanta, Georgia 30341
(770)488-5572 phone
(770) 488-5848 fax
hryan@cdc.gov

B.5.c Responsibility for Data Collection

The representative of the contractor responsible for conducting the planned data collection is:

Katherine H. Flint, M.A.
Senior Technical Director
Macro International Inc.
11785 Beltsville Drive, Suite 300
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Phone: (301) 572-0333
Fax: (301) 572-0986
E-mail: Katherine.H.Flint@macrointernational.com

REFERENCES

American Cancer Society (2002). *Cancer Prevention & Early Detection: Facts and Figures 2003*. Atlanta, GA: American Cancer Society.

American Legacy Foundation (2000a). *Cigarette Smoking Among Youth: Results from the 1999 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 1*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2000b). *Pathways to Established Smoking: Results from the 1999 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 3*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2000c). *The Relationship Between Cigarette Use and Other Tobacco Products: Results from the National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 4*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2000d). *What Youth Think About Smoking: Results from the 1999 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 2*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2000e). *Youth Access to Cigarettes: Results from the 1999 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 5*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2001a). *Cigarette Smoking Among Youth: Results from the 2000 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 7*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2001b). *Youth Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke. First Look Report 6*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2002). *Using Multiple Strategies in Tobacco Use Prevention Education. First Look Report 8*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2003a). *The Relationship between Cigarette Use and Other Tobacco Products: Results from the 2000 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 10*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2003b). *Youth Tobacco Cessation: Results from the 2000 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 11*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2004). *Cigarette Smoking among Youth: Results from the 2002 National Youth Tobacco Survey. First Look Report 13*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Legacy Foundation (2005). *Beyond Cigarettes: The Use Of Other Tobacco Products. First Look Report 15*. Washington, DC: American Legacy Foundation.

American Medical Association (2006). *Annual Tobacco Report 2006*. Available at: <http://www.ama-assn.org/ama1/pub/upload/mm/471/bot15A06.doc> .

Asian Pacific Partners For Empowerment and Leadership (2000). *Critical Policy Issues on Tobacco Prevention and Control for the Asian American and Pacific Islander Community*. Oakland, CA: Asian Pacific Partners For Empowerment and Leadership.

CDC (2001). Youth tobacco surveillance—United States, 2000. *MMWR*; 50(SS-4).

CDC (2003). Cigarette smoking-attributable morbidity—United States, 2000. *MMWR*; 52(35):842-44.

CDC (2004a). Smoking-attributable mortality, morbidity, and economic costs (SAMMEC): adult and maternal and child health software. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

CDC (2004b). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Annual Performance Plan and Report. Atlanta, GA: CDC.

CDC (2005a). Annual smoking-attributable mortality, years of potential life lost, and productivity losses – United States, 1997-2001. *MMWR*; 54(25):625-628.

CDC (2005b). Tobacco use, access, and exposure to tobacco in media among middle and high schools students – United States, 2004. *MMWR*; 54(12):297-301.

CDC. (2006a). Tobacco Use Among Adults – United States, 2005. *MMWR*; 55(42):1145-1148.

CDC (2006b). *National Strategic Plan for Tobacco Control - FY2006-FY2008*. Atlanta, GA: CDC.

CDC (2006c). Youth Tobacco Surveillance – United States, 2001-2002. *MMWR*; 55(SS-3).

CDC (2007). *Best Practices for Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs – 2007*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health.

CDC, NCHS (2008). Public use data file and documentation: multiple causes of death for ICD-10 2005 data [CD-ROM].

Education Research Services (2006). *Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2005-06*. Alexandria, VA: Education Research Services.

Goodman, E & J Capitman (2000). Depressive symptoms and cigarette smoking among teens. *Pediatrics*; 106(4):748-55.

Starr, G, T Rogers, M Schooley, S Porter, E Wiesen & N Jamison (2005). *Key Outcome Indicators for Evaluating Comprehensive Tobacco Control Programs*. Atlanta, GA: CDC.

Taurus, J.A., F.J. Chaloupka, G.A. Farrelly, et al. (2005). State tobacco control spending and

youth smoking. *American Journal of Public Health*; 95:338-344.

USDHHS (2000). With understanding and improving health and objectives for improving health. In: *Healthy People 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

USDHHS (1994). *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Young People: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Service, Public Health Service, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health.

USDHHS (2004). *The Health Consequences of Smoking: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Service, Public Health Service, CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health.

USDHHS, HRSA (2004). Promising Practices in MCH Needs Assessment: A Guide Based on a National Study. Available at <ftp://ftp.hrsa.gov/mchb/naguide.pdf>.

USDHHS, NIH & NCI (2007). President's Cancer Panel 2006-2007 Annual Report *Promoting Healthy Lifestyles: Policy, Program, and Personal Recommendations for Reducing Cancer Risk*. Bethesda, MD: National Cancer Institute.

USDHHS, NIH & NIDA (2007). *Director's Report to the National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse – February, 2007*. Available at: <http://www.nida.nih.gov/DirReports/DirRep207/DirectorReport2.html>.

Upadhyaya HP, Deas DD, Brady KT & Kruesi M (2002). Cigarette smoking and psychiatric comorbidity in children and adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*; 41(11):1294-1305.