



NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM

Behavioral Health and Substance Use Standing Committee Web Meeting: NQF Prioritization Initiative

August 1, 2018

Agenda for Today's Meeting

- Welcome/Roll Call
- Review of NQF's Measure Prioritization Initiative
- Behavioral Health and Substance Use Portfolio Prioritization Scoring
- NQF Member and Public Comment
- Next Steps
- Adjourn

Project Team



Kyle Cobb, MS
Senior Director



Kirsten Reed
Project Manager

Shaonna Gorham, MS, PMP
Senior Project Manager



Desmirra Quinnonez
Project Analyst

Behavioral Health Standing Committee

- Peter Briss, MD, MPH, (Co-Chair)
- Harold Pincus, MD (Co-Chair)
- Mady Chalk, PhD, MSW
- David Einzig, MD
- Julie Goldstein Grumet, PhD
- Constance Horgan, ScD
- Lisa Jensen, DNP, APRN
- Dolores (Dodi) Kelleher, MS, DMH
- Kraig Knudsen, PhD
- Michael R. Lardieri, LCSW
- Tami Mark, PhD, MBA
- Raquel Mazon Jeffers, MPH, MIA
- Bernadette Melnyk, PhD, RN, CPNP/PMHNP, FAANP, FNAP, FAAN
- Laurence Miller, MD
- Brooke Parish, MD
- David Pating, MD
- Vanita Pindolia, PharmD, MBA
- Lisa Shea, MD, DFAPA
- Andrew Sperling, JD
- Jeffery Susman, MD
- Michael Trangle, MD
- Bonnie Zima, MD, MPH
- Leslie S. Zun, MD, MBA



NQF Prioritization Initiative

NQF's Strategic Direction




Learn more about NQF's Strategic Plan at
http://www.qualityforum.org/NQF_Strategic_Direction_2016-2019.aspx

What is the goal of the prioritization?

- Identify a list of the highest scoring priority measures.
- Identify prioritized sub-lists, sortable and filterable, by disease topics and for different stakeholder groups.
- Create a framework that organizes measures and measurement gaps into national priorities areas.
- Reduce the number of measures in use and encourage measure harmonization across the healthcare field by sharing prioritization scores with appropriate measure stakeholders.

NQF Prioritization Initiative



NQF Measure Prioritization Criteria

Prioritization Phase 1

Prioritization Phase 2

Outcome-focused (25%)

- Outcome measures and measures with strong link to improved outcomes and costs

Improvable (25%)

- Measures with demonstrated need for improvement and evidence-based strategies for doing so

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

Equity Focused

- Measures that are disparities sensitive

Breakdown of the Criteria

Outcome-focused

- Measures are scored based on measure type: Process/Structural, Intermediate clinical outcome or process tightly linked to outcome, Outcome/CRU

Improvable

- Measures are scored based the percentage of committee members votes on the “Gap” Criteria during measure evaluation and maintenance review for “High,” “Moderate,” or “Low.”


Meaningful to patients and caregivers


- Measures are scored based on if they are (1) a PRO and (2) if they are tagged as meaningful to patients.
- A meaningful change or health maintenance to the patients and caregivers encompasses measures that address the following areas: Symptoms, Functional status, Health related quality of life or well-being. Patient and caregiver experience of care (Including Financial Stress, Satisfaction, Care coordination/continuity of care Wait times, Patient and caregiver autonomy/empowerment) and Harm to the patient, patient safety, or avoidance of an adverse event

Support systemic and integrated view of care


- Measures are scored based on if (1) if they are a composite measure, (2) if they are applicable to multiple settings, (3) if they are condition agnostic, and (4) if they reflect a system outcome.
- A system outcome is defined as a measure that: Addresses issues of Readmission, Addresses issues of Care-coordination, Results from the care of multiple providers, or Addresses aspects to enhance healthcare value (including a cost or efficiency component)

Prioritization will be conducted within and across portfolios









NQF Prioritization Initiative: What's Next?

Activity	Date
Roll out at Spring 2018 Standing Committee Meetings	May-August 2018
Compile Phase I results from across Committees	August 2018
Measure Evaluation Annual Report Appendix	September 2018
Presentation/Update at NQF Annual Meeting	March 2019

Questions for Committee

- Do the initial scoring results yield the outcomes you might have expected?
 - ▣ *Are the highest and lowest impact measures scoring correctly based on the rubric?*
 - ▣ *Do you have any feedback on the way the rubric is generating results or suggestions for updates in future iterations?*
- Survey to be sent by email following the presentation.

NQF Member and Public Comment

Next Steps

Spring 2018/Cycle 2

Meeting	Date/Time
Commenting Period with Member Support	April 24, 2018 – August 22, 2018
Post-Comment Web Meeting	September 20, 2018, 2:00-4:00 pm ET
CSAC Review Period	October 5, 2018 – October 26, 2018
Appeals Period	October 30, 2018 – November 28, 2018

THANK YOU