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Measure Evaluation 4.1
December 2009

This form contains the measure information submitted by stewards. Blank fields indicate no information was provided. Attachments also may have been submitted and are provided to reviewers. The subcriteria and most of the footnotes from the evaluation criteria are provided in Word comments within the form and will appear if your cursor is over the highlighted area. Hyperlinks to the evaluation criteria and ratings are provided in each section.

TAP/Workgroup (if utilized): Complete all yellow highlighted areas of the form. Evaluate the extent to which each subcriterion is met. Based on your evaluation, summarize the strengths and weaknesses in each section.

Note: If there is no TAP or workgroup, the SC also evaluates the subcriteria (yellow highlighted areas).

Steering Committee: Complete all pink highlighted areas of the form. Review the workgroup/TAP assessment of the subcriteria, noting any areas of disagreement; then evaluate the extent to which each major criterion is met; and finally, indicate your recommendation for the endorsement. Provide the rationale for your ratings.

Evaluation ratings of the extent to which the criteria are met
C = Completely (unquestionably demonstrated to meet the criterion)
P = Partially (demonstrated to partially meet the criterion)
M = Minimally (addressed BUT demonstrated to only minimally meet the criterion)
N = Not at all (NOT addressed; OR incorrectly addressed; OR demonstrated to NOT meet the criterion)
NA = Not applicable (only an option for a few subcriteria as indicated)

(for NQF staff use) NQF Review #: 0288 NQF Project: Cardiovascular Endorsement Maintenance 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De.1 Measure Title: Fibrinolytic Therapy Received Within 30 Minutes of ED Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De.2 Brief description of measure: Emergency Department acute myocardial infarction (AMI) patients receiving fibrinolytic therapy during the ED stay and having a time from ED arrival to fibrinolysis of 30 minutes or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-2 Type of Measure: Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De.3 If included in a composite or paired with another measure, please identify composite or paired measure N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De.4 National Priority Partners Priority Area: Patient and family engagement, Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De.5 IOM Quality Domain: Timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De.6 Consumer Care Need: Getting better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONDITIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY NQF

Four conditions must be met before proposed measures may be considered and evaluated for suitability as voluntary consensus standards:

A. The measure is in the public domain or an intellectual property (measure steward agreement) is signed. Public domain only applies to governmental organizations. All non-government organizations must sign a measure steward agreement even if measures are made publicly and freely available.

A.1 Do you attest that the measure steward holds intellectual property rights to the measure and the right to use aspects of the measure owned by another entity (e.g., risk model, code set)? Yes

A.2 Indicate if Proprietary Measure (as defined in measure steward agreement):

A.3 Measure Steward Agreement: Government entity and in the public domain - no agreement necessary  

A.4 Measure Steward Agreement attached: N

B. The measure owner/steward verifies there is an identified responsible entity and process to maintain and update the measure on a schedule that is commensurate with the rate of clinical innovation, but at least

Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable
NQF #0288

**Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable**

| C. The intended use of the measure includes both public reporting and quality improvement. |
| Purpose: Public reporting, Internal quality improvement, Payment incentive |

| D. The requested measure submission information is complete. Generally, measures should be fully developed and tested so that all the evaluation criteria have been addressed and information needed to evaluate the measure is provided. Measures that have not been tested are only potentially eligible for a time-limited endorsement and in that case, measure owners must verify that testing will be completed within 12 months of endorsement. |
| Testing: Yes, fully developed and tested |
| Have NQF-endorsed measures been reviewed to identify if there are similar or related measures? |
| Yes |

*(for NQF staff use)* Have all conditions for consideration been met?

**Staff Notes to Steward (if submission returned):**

**Staff Notes to Reviewers (issues or questions regarding any criteria):**

**Staff Reviewer Name(s):**

### 1. IMPORTANCE TO MEASURE AND REPORT

**Extent to which the specific measure focus is important to making significant gains in health care quality (safety, timeliness, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, patient-centeredness) and improving health outcomes for a specific high impact aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall poor performance. Measures must be judged to be important to measure and report in order to be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

**Evaluation criteria**

1a. High Impact

*(for NQF staff use)* **Specific NPP goal:**

1a.1 Demonstrated High Impact Aspect of Healthcare: Affects large numbers, Leading cause of morbidity/mortality

1a.2

1a.3 Summary of Evidence of High Impact: Time to fibrinolytic therapy is a strong predictor of outcome in patients with an acute myocardial infarction. Nearly 2 lives per 1,000 patients are lost per hour of delay (Fibrinolytic Therapy Trialists’ Collaborative Group, 1994). National guidelines recommend that fibrinolytic therapy be given within 30 minutes of hospital arrival in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (Antman, 2004).


**Staff Reviewer Name(s):**

**TAP/Workgroup Reviewer Name:**

**Steering Committee Reviewer Name:**

**Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable**

**Comment [KP1]:** 1a. The measure focus addresses:

- a specific national health goal/priority identified by NQF’s National Priorities Partners; OR
- a demonstrated high impact aspect of healthcare (e.g., affects large numbers, leading cause of morbidity/mortality, high resource use (current and/or future), severity of illness, and patient/societal consequences of poor quality).
### 1b. Opportunity for Improvement

1b.1 **Benefits**

- Improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure: Target is to administer drug within 30 minutes time for improved outcomes.

1b.2 **Summary of data demonstrating performance gap (variation or overall poor performance) across providers:**

After trending quarterly data for both national performance and benchmark performance, from Q4-08 to Q1-10, we have seen the following results: The measure has shown a constant gap in performance between the national rate and the benchmark rate since Q4-08. National Rates range from 51.6 through 55.1 percent.

1b.3 **Citations for data on performance gap:**

- 670 hospitals submitted 1,479 eligible cases.

1b.4 **Summary of Data on disparities by population group:**

- N/A

1b.5 **Citations for data on Disparities:**

- Q1 2010 Analysis Provider Level
- 670 hospitals submitted 1,479 eligible cases.
- Min 0
- 10th percentile 0
- 25th percentile 0
- Median 50
- 75th percentile 100
- 90th percentile 100
- Max 100

### 1c. Outcome or Evidence to Support Measure Focus

1c.1 **Relationship to Outcomes** *(For non-outcome measures, briefly describe the relationship to desired outcome. For outcomes, describe why it is relevant to the target population):* Target median times are less than or equal to 30 minutes for improved outcomes.

1c.2-3. **Type of Evidence:** Evidence-based guideline

1c.4 **Summary of Evidence** *(as described in the criteria; for outcomes, summarize any evidence that healthcare services/care processes influence the outcome):*

- Time to fibrinolytic therapy is a strong predictor of outcome in patients with an acute myocardial infarction. Nearly 2 lives per 1,000 patients are lost per hour of delay (Fibrinolytic Therapy Trials Collaborative Group, 1994). National guidelines recommend that fibrinolytic therapy be given within 30 minutes of hospital arrival in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (Antman, 2004).

1c.5 **Rating of strength/quality of evidence** *(also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom):* ABC Scale

1c.6 **Method for rating evidence:** ABC Scale

1c.7 **Summary of Controversy/Contradictory Evidence:** N/A

1c.8 **Citations for Evidence** *(other than guidelines):* - Fibrinolytic Therapy Trials Collaborative Group. Indications for fibrinolytic therapy in suspected acute myocardial infarction: collaborative overview of early mortality and major morbidity results from all randomized trials of more than 1000 patients. Lancet. 1994; 343:311-22.

1c.9 Quote the Specific guideline recommendation (including guideline number and/or page number): “The medical system goal is to facilitate rapid recognition and treatment of patients with STEMI such that door-to-needle (or medical contact-to-needle) time for initiation of fibrinolytic therapy can be achieved within 30 minutes” Page 597


1c.11 National Guideline Clearinghouse or other URL: N/A

1c.12 Rating of strength of recommendation (also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom):
A

1c.13 Method for rating strength of recommendation (If different from USPSTF system, also describe rating and how it relates to USPSTF):

ABC Scale
• Level A (randomized controlled trial/ meta-analysis):
High quality randomized controlled trial that considers all important outcomes. High-quality meta-analysis (quantitative systematic review) using comprehensive search strategies.
• Level B (other evidence):
A well-designed, nonrandomized clinical trial. A nonquantitative systematic review with appropriate search strategies and well-substantiated conclusions. Includes lower quality randomized controlled trials, clinical cohort studies, and case-controlled studies with nonbiased selection of study participants and consistent findings. Other evidence, such as high-quality, historical, uncontrolled studies, or well-designed epidemiologic studies with compelling findings, is also included.
• Level C (consensus/expert opinion):
Consensus viewpoint or expert opinion. Expert opinion is sometimes the best evidence available.

1c.14 Rationale for using this guideline over others:
ACC/AHA Strength of Evidence and Meta Analysis.

TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Importance to Measure and Report?

Steering Committee: Was the threshold criterion, Importance to Measure and Report, met?

Rationale:

2. SCIENTIFIC ACCEPTABILITY OF MEASURE PROPERTIES

Extent to which the measure, as specified, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. (evaluation criteria)

2a. MEASURE SPECIFICATIONS

S.1 Do you have a web page where current detailed measure specifications can be obtained? S.2 If yes, provide web page URL:

2a. Precisely Specified

2a.1 Numerator Statement (Brief, text description of the numerator - what is being measured about the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a.2</td>
<td><strong>Numerator Time Window</strong> <em>(The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion in the numerator):</em> During the measurement period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2a.3 | **Numerator Details** *(All information required to collect/calculate the numerator, including all codes, logic, and definitions):*  
Patients with:  
- An E/M Code for emergency department encounter as defined in Appendix A, OP Table 1.0, and  
- Patients discharged/transferred to a short-term general hospital for inpatient care, or to a Federal healthcare facility, and  
- An ICD-9-CM Principal Diagnosis Code for AMI as defined in Appendix A, OP Table 1.1, and  
- ST-segment elevation or LBBB on the ECG performed closest to ED arrival, and  
- Fibrinolytic Administration as defined in the Data Dictionary |
| 2a.4 | **Denominator Statement** *(Brief, text description of the denominator - target population being measured):*  
Emergency Department AMI patients with ST-segment elevation or LBBB on ECG who received fibrinolytic therapy. |
| 2a.5 | **Target population gender:** Female, Male |
| 2a.6 | **Target population age range:** 18 years of age and older |
| 2a.7 | **Denominator Time Window** *(The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion in the denominator):* During the measurement period. |
| 2a.8 | **Denominator Details** *(All information required to collect/calculate the denominator - the target population being measured - including all codes, logic, and definitions):*  
Patients with:  
- An E/M Code for emergency department encounter as defined in Appendix A, OP Table 1.0, and  
- Patients discharged/transferred to a short-term general hospital for inpatient care, or to a Federal healthcare facility, and  
- An ICD-9-CM Principal Diagnosis Code for AMI as defined in Appendix A, OP Table 1.1, and  
- ST-segment elevation or LBBB on the ECG performed closest to ED arrival, and  
- Fibrinolytic Administration as defined in the Data Dictionary |
| 2a.9 | **Denominator Exclusions** *(Brief text description of exclusions from the target population):* Excluded Populations:  
- Patients less than 18 years of age  
- Patients who did not receive Fibrinolytic Administration within 30 minutes AND had a Reason for Delay in Fibrinolytic Therapy as defined in the Data Dictionary |
| 2a.10 | **Denominator Exclusion Details** *(All information required to collect exclusions to the denominator, including all codes, logic, and definitions):* See specifications at [http://qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=1196289981244](http://qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=1196289981244) |
| 2a.11 | **Stratification Details/Variables** *(All information required to stratify the measure including the stratification variables, all codes, logic, and definitions):* N/A |
| 2a.12-13 | **Risk Adjustment Type:** No risk adjustment necessary |
| 2a.14 | **Risk Adjustment Methodology/Variables** *(List risk adjustment variables and describe conceptual models, statistical models, or other aspects of model or method):* N/A |

*Comment [k9]:* 11 Risk factors that influence outcomes should not be specified as exclusions.  
12 Patient preference is not a clinical exception to eligibility and can be influenced by provider interventions.
2a.15-17 Detailed risk model available Web page URL or attachment:

2a.18-19 Type of Score: Rate/proportion
2a.20 Interpretation of Score: Better quality = Higher score
2a.21 Calculation Algorithm (Describe the calculation of the measure as a flowchart or series of steps): See specifications at http://qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=119628998124

2a.22 Describe the method for discriminating performance (e.g., significance testing): N/A

2a.23 Sampling (Survey) Methodology If measure is based on a sample (or survey), provide instructions for obtaining the sample, conducting the survey and guidance on minimum sample size (response rate):

Sampling Approaches
As previously stated in this section, hospitals have the option to sample from their population, or submit their entire population. Hospitals that choose to sample must ensure that the sampled data represent their outpatient population by using either the simple random sampling or systematic random sampling method and that the sampling techniques are applied consistently within a quarter. For example, quarterly samples for a sampling population must use consistent sampling techniques across the quarterly submission period.

• Simple random sampling - selecting a sample size (n) from a population of size (N) in such a way that every case has the same chance of being selected.
• Systematic random sampling - selecting every kth record from a population of size (N) in such a way that a sample size of n is obtained, where k = N/n rounded to the lower digit. The first sample record (i.e., the starting point) must be randomly selected before taking every kth record. This is a two-step process:
  a) Randomly select the starting point by choosing a number between one and k using a table of random numbers or a computer-generated random number; and
  b) Then select every kth record thereafter until the selection of the sample size is completed.

Each hospital is ultimately responsible that the sampling techniques applied for their hospital adhere to the sampling requirements outlined in this manual. Performance measurement systems are responsible for ensuring that the sampling techniques are applied consistently across their client hospitals.

Monthly Sampling Guidelines
It is important to point out that if a hospital elects to use the monthly sampling guidelines, the hospital is still required to meet the minimum quarterly sampling requirements. A hospital may choose to use a larger sample size than is required. Hospitals whose population size is less than the minimum number of cases per quarter for the measure set cannot sample (i.e., the entire population of cases must be selected). Given the potential for substantial variation in monthly population sizes, the monthly sample sizes should be based on the known or anticipated quarterly population size. When necessary, appropriate oversampling should be employed to ensure that the hospital meets the minimum quarterly sample size requirements. Refer to Table 3 below for guidelines in determining the number of cases that need to be sampled for each population per month per hospital based on the quarterly population size.

Table 3: Sample Size Guidelines per Month per Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population per Quarter Monthly Sample Size</th>
<th>Use all cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-125</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-150</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-175</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-200</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-225</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-250</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-275</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276-300</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-325</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326-350</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-375</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376-400</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable
### Data Source (Check the source(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)
- Paper medical record/flow-sheet
- Electronic administrative data/claims
- Electronic Health/Medical Record

### Data Source/data collection instrument
- Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument, e.g., name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.

### Level of Measurement/Analysis
- Check the level(s) for which the measure is specified and tested
  - Facility/Agency, Population: national

### Care Settings
- Check the setting(s) for which the measure is specified and tested
  - Hospital, Ambulatory Care: Emergency Dept, Ambulatory Care: Hospital Outpatient

### Clinical Services
- Healthcare services being measured, check all that apply
  - Clinicians: Nurses, Clinicians: PA/NP/Advanced Practice Nurse, Clinicians: Physicians (MD/DO)

### Testing/Analysis

#### 2b. Reliability testing

| Data/sample (description of data/sample and size) | Currently under going validation through the CMS Clinical Data Abstraction Center |
| Analytic Method (type of reliability & rationale, method for testing) | N/A |
| Testing Results (reliability statistics, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted) | N/A |

#### 2c. Validity testing

| Data/sample (description of data/sample and size) | Currently under going validation through the CMS Clinical Data Abstraction Center |

---

**Comment [KP10]:** 2b. Reliability testing demonstrates the measure results are repeatable, producing the same results a high proportion of the time when assessed in the same population in the same time period.

**Comment [K11]:** 8 Examples of reliability testing include, but are not limited to: inter-rater/abstractor or intra-rater/abstractor studies; internal consistency for multi-item scales; test-retest for survey items. Reliability testing may address the data items or final measure score.

**Comment [KP12]:** 2c. Validity testing demonstrates that the measure reflects the quality of care provided, adequately distinguishing good and poor quality. If face validity is the only validity addressed, it is systematically assessed.
670 hospitals submitted 1,479 eligible cases. National rate: 53.5

### Q1 2010 Analysis Provider Level

- **Max 100**
- 90th percentile 100
- 75th percentile 100
- Median 50
- 25th percentile 0
- 10th percentile 0

After trending quarterly data for both national performance and benchmark performance, from Q4-08 to Q1-10, we have seen the following results: the measure has shown a constant gap in performance between the national rate and the benchmark rate since Q4-08.

### 2f. Identification of Meaningful Differences in Performance

- **2f.1 Data/sample from Testing or Current Use (description of data/sample and size): N/A**
- **2f.2 Methods to identify statistically significant and practically/meaningfully differences in performance (type of analysis & rationale): N/A**
- **2f.3 Provide Measure Scores from Testing or Current Use (description of scores, e.g., distribution by quartile, mean, median, SD, etc.; identification of statistically significant and meaningfully differences in performance):**

After trending quarterly data for both national performance and benchmark performance, from Q4-08 to Q1-10, we have seen the following results: the measure has shown a constant gap in performance between the national rate and the benchmark rate since Q4-08.

**Q1 2010 Analysis Provider Level**

- 670 hospitals submitted 1,479 eligible cases.
  - Min 0
  - 10th percentile 0
  - 25th percentile 0
  - Median 50
  - 75th percentile 100
  - 90th percentile 100
  - Max 100

- 670 hospitals submitted 1,479 eligible cases. National rate: 53.5

Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable
Top 10% represented by benchmark results: 43 hospitals submitted 191 cases. Benchmark Rate: 98.4%

2g. Comparability of Multiple Data Sources/Methods

| Data/sample (description of data/sample and size): | N/A |
| Analytic Method (type of analysis & rationale): | N/A |
| Testing Results (e.g., correlation statistics, comparison of rankings): | N/A |

2h. Disparities in Care

| If measure is stratified, provide stratified results (scores by stratified categories/cohorts): | N/A |
| If disparities have been reported/identified, but measure is not specified to detect disparities, provide follow-up plans: | N/A |

TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties?

Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties, met?

| Rationale: |

3. USABILITY

Extent to which intended audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) can understand the results of the measure and are likely to find them useful for decision making. (evaluation criteria)

3a. Meaningful, Understandable, and Useful Information

| Current Use: | In use |
| Use in a public reporting initiative (disclosure of performance results to the public at large) (If used in a public reporting initiative, provide name of initiative(s), locations, Web page URL(s). If not publicly reported, state the plans to achieve public reporting within 3 years): CMS Hospital Outpatient Department Quality Data Reporting Program http://qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=1191255879384 |
| If used in other programs/initiatives (If used in quality improvement or other programs/initiatives, name of initiative(s), locations, Web page URL(s). If not used for QI, state the plans to achieve use for QI within 3 years): | N/A |
| Testing of Interpretability (Testing that demonstrates the results are understood by the potential users for public reporting and quality improvement) |
| Methods (e.g., focus group, survey, QI project): | N/A |
| Results (qualitative and/or quantitative results and conclusions): | N/A |

3b/3c. Relation to other NQF-endorsed measures

Comment [KP20]: 2g. If multiple data sources/methods are allowed, there is demonstration they produce comparable results.

Comment [KP21]: 2h. If disparities in care have been identified, measure specifications, scoring, and analysis allow for identification of disparities through stratification of results (e.g., by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender); OR rationale/data justifies why stratification is not necessary or not feasible.

Comment [KP22]: 3a. Demonstration that information produced by the measure is meaningful, understandable, and useful to the intended audience(s) for both public reporting (e.g., focus group, cognitive testing) and informing quality improvement (e.g., quality improvement initiatives). An important outcome that may not have an identified improvement strategy still can be useful for informing quality improvement by identifying the need for and stimulating new approaches to improvement.
### 3b. Harmonization

If this measure is related to measure(s) already endorsed by NQF (e.g., same topic, but different target population/setting/data source or different topic but same target population):

- **3b.2 Are the measure specifications harmonized? If not, why?**
  - **Yes.**

### 3c. Distinctive or Additive Value

3c.1 Describe the distinctive, improved, or additive value this measure provides to existing NQF-endorsed measures:

- Measure is applicable to the Outpatient setting, additionally the performance rate percentage is reported in addition to the median time.

5.1 If this measure is similar to measure(s) already endorsed by NQF (i.e., on the same topic and the same target population), describe why it is a more valid or efficient way to measure quality:

- Measure is applicable to the Outpatient setting, additionally the performance rate percentage is reported in addition to the median time.

### TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Usability?

**Rationale:**

- **Steering Committee:** Overall, to what extent was the criterion, Usability, met?

### 4. FEASIBILITY

**Extents to which the required data are readily available, retrievable without undue burden, and can be implemented for performance measurement.**

| 4a. Data Generated as a Byproduct of Care Processes |
|-----------------------------------------------|---|
| **4a.1-2 How are the data elements that are needed to compute measure scores generated?** |
| Coding/abstraction performed by someone other than person obtaining original information (e.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims, chart abstraction for quality measure or registry) |
| **4b. Electronic Sources** |
| **4b.1 Are all the data elements available electronically?** |
| (elements that are needed to compute measure scores are in defined, computer-readable fields, e.g., electronic health record, electronic claims) |
| **4b.2 If not, specify the near-term path to achieve electronic capture by most providers.** |
| NQF #164 is currently undergoing electronic retooling. It is expected the retooling will be applicable to NQF measures 288 and 287. |

### 4c. Exclusions

4c.1 Do the specified exclusions require additional data sources beyond what is required for the numerator and denominator specifications?

- **No.**

4c.2 If yes, provide justification.

### 4d. Susceptibility to Inaccuracies, Errors, or Unintended Consequences

- **Yes.**
4d.1 Identify susceptibility to inaccuracies, errors, or unintended consequences of the measure and describe how these potential problems could be audited. If audited, provide results.

N/A

4e. Data Collection Strategy/Implementation

4e.1 Describe what you have learned/modified as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure regarding data collection, availability of data/missing data, timing/frequency of data collection, patient confidentiality, time/cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues:

Updates to data elements to provide clarification in abstraction and updates to selected references.

4e.2 Costs to implement the measure (costs of data collection, fees associated with proprietary measures):

N/A

4e.3 Evidence for costs:

N/A

4e.4 Business case documentation:

N/A

TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Feasibility?

Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, Feasibility, met?

Rationale:

4
c
p
m
n
RECOMMENDATION

(for NQF staff use) Check if measure is untested and only eligible for time-limited endorsement.

Steering Committee: Do you recommend for endorsement?

Comments:

Y
N
A

CONTACT INFORMATION

Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner)
Co.1 Organization
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 7500 Security Boulevard, Mail Stop S3-01-02, Baltimore, Maryland, 21244-1850

Co.2 Point of Contact
Wanda, Govan-Jenkins, MS, MBS, RN, Wanda.Govan-Jenkins@CMS.hhs.gov, 410-786-2699-

Measure Developer If different from Measure Steward
Co.3 Organization
Oklahoma Foundation for Medical Quality, 14000 Quail Springs Parkway, Suite 400, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 73134-2600

Co.4 Point of Contact
Wanda, Govan-Jenkins, MS, MBS, RN, Wanda.Govan-Jenkins@CMS.hhs.gov, 410-786-2699-

Co.5 Submitter If different from Measure Steward POC
Rebecca, Jones, MSN, RN, rjones@ofmq.com, 405-840-2891-342, Oklahoma Foundation for Medical Quality

Co.6 Additional organizations that sponsored/participated in measure development

Comment [KP30]: 4e. Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, etc.) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.1 Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members’ names and organizations. Describe the members’ role in measure development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.2 If adapted, provide name of original measure: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.3-5 If adapted, provide original specifications URL or attachment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance** |
| Ad.6 Year the measure was first released: 2008 |
| Ad.7 Month and Year of most recent revision: 07, 2010 |
| Ad.8 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? Bi-annual |
| Ad.9 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? 01, 2011 |
| Ad.10 Copyright statement/disclaimers: N/A |
| Ad.11-13 Additional Information web page URL or attachment: URL |
| http://qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=1196289981244 |

**Date of Submission (MM/DD/YY):** 12/07/2010
1c. The measure focus is:

- an outcome (e.g., morbidity, mortality, function, health-related quality of life) that is relevant to, or associated with, a national health goal/priority, the condition, population, and/or care being addressed;

OR

- if an intermediate outcome, process, structure, etc., there is evidence that supports the specific measure focus as follows:
  - **Intermediate outcome** - evidence that the measured intermediate outcome (e.g., blood pressure, Hba1c) leads to improved health/avoidance of harm or cost/benefit.
  - **Process** - evidence that the measured clinical or administrative process leads to improved health/avoidance of harm and if the measure focus is on one step in a multi-step care process, it measures the step that has the greatest effect on improving the specified desired outcome(s).
  - **Structure** - evidence that the measured structure supports the consistent delivery of effective processes or access that lead to improved health/avoidance of harm or cost/benefit.
  - **Patient experience** - evidence that an association exists between the measure of patient experience of health care and the outcomes, values and preferences of individuals/ the public.
  - **Access** - evidence that an association exists between access to a health service and the outcomes of, or experience with, care.
  - **Efficiency** - demonstration of an association between the measured resource use and level of performance with respect to one or more of the other five IOM aims of quality.

4 Clinical care processes typically include multiple steps: assess → identify problem/potential problem → choose/plan intervention (with patient input) → provide intervention → evaluate impact on health status. If the measure focus is one step in such a multi-step process, the step with the greatest effect on the desired outcome should be selected as the focus of measurement. For example, although assessment of immunization status and recommending immunization are necessary steps, they are not sufficient to achieve the desired impact on health status - patients must be vaccinated to achieve immunity. This does not preclude consideration of measures of preventive screening interventions where there is a strong link with desired outcomes (e.g., mammography) or measures for multiple care processes that affect a single outcome.

3 The strength of the body of evidence for the specific measure focus should be systematically assessed and rated (e.g., USPSTF grading system [http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstf07/methods/benefit.htm](http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstf07/methods/benefit.htm)). If the USPSTF grading system was not used, the grading system is explained including how it relates to the USPSTF grades or why it does not. However, evidence is not limited to quantitative studies and the best type of evidence depends upon the question being studied (e.g., randomized controlled trials appropriate for studying drug efficacy are not well suited for complex system changes). When qualitative studies are used, appropriate qualitative research criteria are used to judge the strength of the evidence.

2d. Clinically necessary measure exclusions are identified and must be:

- supported by evidence of sufficient frequency of occurrence so that results are distorted without the exclusion;

AND

- a clinically appropriate exception (e.g., contraindication) to eligibility for the measure focus;

AND

- precisely defined and specified:
  - if there is substantial variability in exclusions across providers, the measure is specified so that exclusions are computable and the effect on the measure is transparent (i.e., impact clearly delineated, such as number of cases excluded, exclusion rates by type of exclusion);

if patient preference (e.g., informed decision-making) is a basis for exclusion, there must be evidence that it strongly impacts performance on the measure and the measure must be specified so that the information about patient preference and the effect on the measure is transparent (e.g., numerator category computed separately, denominator exclusion category computed separately).
rationale/data support no risk adjustment.

13 Risk models should not obscure disparities in care for populations by including factors that are associated with differences/inequalities in care such as race, socioeconomic status, gender (e.g., poorer treatment outcomes of African American men with prostate cancer, inequalities in treatment for CVD risk factors between men and women). It is preferable to stratify measures by race and socioeconomic status rather than adjusting out differences.

14 With large enough sample sizes, small differences that are statistically significant may or may not be practically or clinically meaningful. The substantive question may be, for example, whether a statistically significant difference of one percentage point in the percentage of patients who received smoking cessation counseling (e.g., 74% v. 75%) is clinically meaningful; or whether a statistically significant difference of $25 in cost for an episode of care (e.g., $5,000 v. $5,025) is practically meaningful. Measures with overall poor performance may not demonstrate much variability across providers.