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Background
Overview

- Phase 1 (2017-2018): Measure Prioritization
  - Identified priority measurement areas
  - Feedback on Prioritization Criteria
  - Applied scoring methodology to NQF portfolio

- Phase 2 (2019-2020): Measure Selection
  - Re-focused on Measure Selection
  - Streamlined and expanded Selection Criteria
  - Product Design and User Testing
NQF Measure Prioritization Criteria

Prioritization Phase 1

Outcome-focused (25%)
- Outcome measures and measures with strong link to improved outcomes and costs

Meaningful to patients and caregivers (25%)
- Person-centered measures with meaningful and understandable results for patients and caregivers

Support systemic and integrated view of care (25%)
- Measures that reflect care that spans settings, providers, and time to ensure that care is improving within and across systems of care

Improvable (25%)
- Measures with demonstrated need for improvement and evidence-based strategies for doing so

Support systemic and integrated view of care (25%)
- Measures that reflect care that spans settings, providers, and time to ensure that care is improving within and across systems of care

Future Phases

Equity Focused
- Measures that are disparities sensitive

Impact
- Measures that have large-scale societal effect on healthcare outcomes and/or costs

Implementation Burden
- Measures with less implementation cost, either financial, or in clinician time
### Phase 1: Application of Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Measure Title</th>
<th>Outcome Focused</th>
<th>Improvable</th>
<th>Patient and Caregiver Focused</th>
<th>Integrated View of Care</th>
<th>Total Score (0-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Depression Remission at Six Months</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Depression Response at Twelve Months- Progress Towards Improvement</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Depression Remission at Twelve Months</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Depression Response at Six Months- Progress Towards Improvement</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2602</td>
<td>Controlling High Blood Pressure for People with Serious Illness</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2607</td>
<td>Diabetes Care for People with Serious Mental Illness: Hemoglobin</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2608</td>
<td>Diabetes Care for People with Serious Mental Illness: Hemoglobin</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2606</td>
<td>Diabetes Care for People with Serious Mental Illness: Blood Pressure</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Depression Utilization of the PHQ-9 Tool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2634</td>
<td>Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility (IRF) Functional Outcome</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2860</td>
<td>Thirty-day all-cause unplanned readmission following procedure</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>5.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2888</td>
<td>Risk-Standardized Acute Admission Rates for Patients with Diabetes</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>5.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2599</td>
<td>Alchol Screening and Follow-up for People with Serious Illness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3132</td>
<td>Preventive Care and Screening: Screening for Depression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3148</td>
<td>Preventive Care and Screening: Screening for Clinical Depression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601</td>
<td>Body Mass Index Screening and Follow-Up for People with Diabetes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Diabetes Monitoring for People With Diabetes and Schizophrenia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2603</td>
<td>Diabetes Care for People with Serious Mental Illness: Hemoglobin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2609</td>
<td>Diabetes Care for People with Serious Mental Illness: Epilepsy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2604</td>
<td>Diabetes Care for People with Serious Mental Illness: Mood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Antidepressant Medication Management (AMM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2806</td>
<td>Pediatric Psychosis: Screening for Drugs of Abuse in the Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on Prioritization Phase 1

- Standing Committee Feedback (142 responses)
  - Percent of respondents who agree with the scoring results
    » 61% of respondents agree or strongly agree
    » 19% are neutral
    » 20% disagree or strongly disagree
  - Refine outcome-focused and meaningful to patient and caregivers

- CSAC Feedback
  - Account for impact
  - Clarify intended audience
  - Provide more guidance on how to distinguish between topically-similar measures that receive similar scores (i.e., Depression remission at 6 months vs 12 months)
  - Account for ease of implementation
  - Refine meaningful to patient and caregivers
Summary of Phase 1

- **Outcome:**
  - Strong support to develop guidance for prioritizing NQF’s measures
  - Strong pushback on the use of the scoring and the methodology.

- **Conclusion:**
  - No consensus on the scoring methodology
  - Resource constraints prohibit fully addressing stakeholder concerns in the near term
Phase 2 – Measure Selection Tool (MSeT)
NQF Preferred Measure Selection Tool (MSeT)

Problem: Overwhelming number of possible measures to select
- NQF has 500+ endorsed measures – of these measures, how can I decide which ones I should be using?

Goal: Narrow the universe of appropriate measure selections, based on individual user preferences and needs
# Measure Selection Attributes: “Meets” or “Does Not Meet”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome-focused</td>
<td>Does the measure reflect a change in clinical status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity for Improvement</td>
<td>Does the measure have a significant variation in performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient- and caregiver-focused</td>
<td>Is the measure result meaningful to patients and their caregivers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Integrated View of Care</td>
<td>Does the measure reflect a collaborative and coordinated health system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/Prevalence*</td>
<td>Does the measure address one or more pervasive and harmful conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Burden*</td>
<td>Does the measure have minimum impact on clinical workflow and limited upfront investment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Equity**</td>
<td>Does the measure address ongoing healthcare disparities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New in MSeT  
** Pause implementation
Implementation Approach

Develop binary “meets/does not meet” ruleset for each attribute

Assign attributes to NQF-endorsed measures

Make these tags available to external users
Overall Considerations

Does this approach solve the problem?

• *Goal: Guide users in sorting and selecting which NQF-endorsed measures to use*

What design elements will simplify usability?

Who do you think would want to use this? What are typical uses cases in measure selection?
Next Steps

-Develop “Use Cases” of likely user stories
-Finalize rules for attribute assignments
  - Test on select topic area portfolios
  - Assign attributes to all NQF-endorsed measures
-Design tool and test with focus groups
-Deploy in Spring 2020, possibly in conjunction with other NQF measure database updates
Discussion

▪ What are some examples of use cases for a measure selection tool? Who are these users affiliated with, and what are their priorities?

▪ What other information could help a user choose between measures? How might that information be displayed (one-to-one comparison of specifications? Highlights of key distinguishing features?)