

Pulmonary and Critical Care: Off-Cycle Second Quarter Meeting

August 31, 2017

Standing Committee

Dale Bratzler, DO, MPH (Co-chair) David Lang, MD (Co-chair) Gerene Bauldoff, PhD, RN, FAAN Kenneth Benson Curtis Collins, PharmD, MS Bruno DiGiovine, MD Todd Dorman, MD, FCCM Kim Elliott, PhD, CPH William Brendle Glomb, MD, FCCP, FAAP Stephen Grossbart, PhD James Harris, PhD Edgar Jimenez, MD, FCCM

Ella Kazerooni, MD, MS Thomas Lampone, MD Richard Murray, MD James O'Brien, MD, MS Patricia J. Ohtake, PT, PhD Susan Pollart, MD Crystal Riley, PharmD, MHA, MBA, CPHQ, CHPIT Christine Schindler, PhD, RN, CPNP-AC/PC, WCC David Stockwell, MD, MBA Chana West, RN, MSN Donald Yealy, MD, FACEP



- Provide an update on the CDP Redesign
- Introduce new patient-reported measure definition
- Review current Pulmonary and Critical Care patientreported measure landscape

CDP Redesign

NQF Consensus Development Process (CDP)

Changes to NQF's Endorsement Process

NENI

Key Changes in the Measure Endorsement Process

- Additional Opportunities to Submit
- Intent to Submit
- Measure Evaluation Review Cycle
- Methods Panel Review
- Measure Evaluation Technical Report (Content and Structure)
- Continuous Pubic Commenting Period with Member Expression of Support
- Enhancing Training and Education

NQF Consensus Development Process (CDP) Measure Submission



Measure Review Cycle Frequency

Increased Opportunities to Submit

Timely Submission Requirements

Intent to Submit

Schedule of Measure Review Cycle



Intent to Submit

Measure stewards/developers notify NQF at least three months prior to the measure submission deadline of their intent to submit a measure.

- Objective:
 - Allow NQF to adequately plan for measures
 - Provide developers technical assistance prior to submitting measures
- Information to be included:
 - Planned submission date (cycle and year)
 - Measure name
 - Measure description
 - Measure title
 - Measure type

- Submission type
- Level of analysis
- Data source
- Numerator/Denominator statement

shift

Online Submission

15 New Measure Review Topical Areas

	All Cause Admission/ Readmissions	Behavioral Health			All Cause	Behavioral	
Cancer	Cardiovascular	Care Coordination	Infectious Disease		Admission/ Readmissions	Health & Substance Use	Cancer
Cost and Resource Use	Endocrine	Eyes, Ears, Nose and Throat Conditions	Palliative and End-of Life Care		Cardiovascular	Cost and Efficiency ^A	Geriatric and Palliative Care ^B
Gastrointestinal	Genitourinary	Health and Well Being	Musculoskeletal		Neurology	Patient Experience & Function	Patient Safety ^c
Neurology	Patient Safety	Pediatrics	Perinatal		Pediatrics	Perinatal and Women's Health	Prevention and Population Health ^D
Person and Family- Centered Care	Pulmonary and Critical Care	Renal	Surgery		Primary Care and Chronic Illness	Renal	Surgery

Denotes expanded topic area

A Cost & Efficiency will include efficiency-focused measures from other domains

^B Geriatric & Palliative Care includes pain-focused measures from other domains

^C Patient Safety will include acute infectious disease and critical measures

 $^{\mathsf{D}}$ Prevention and Population Health is formerly Health and Well Being

NQF Consensus Development Process (CDP) Candidate Consensus Standards Review

Scientific Methods Panel

Methods Review by Staff

Full Measure Review by Committee

Shortened Measure Evaluation Technical Report

Technical Review

Measure Workflow



Complex vs. Non-Complex Measures

Complex Measures

- Outcome measures, including intermediate clinical outcomes
- Instrument-based measures (e.g., PRO-PMs)
- Cost/resource use measures
- Efficiency measures (those combining concepts of resource use and quality)
- Composite measures

Non-Complex Measures

- Process measures
- Structural measures
- Previously endorsed complex measures with no changes/updates to the specifications or testing

Measure Evaluation Technical Report Content and Structure



Measure Summaries

Standing Committee Measure Review deliberation details

Full Measure Specifications for all reviewed measures

NQF Consensus Development Process (CDP) Continuous Commenting Period and Member Support

Extended opportunity for public and NQF member commenting

12+ week Continuous Commenting Period – comments submitted throughout the period at any time

NEW Member Benefit

- NQF members can express their support ('Support' or 'Do Not Support') for each measure to inform the committees recommendation.
- Replaces previous NQF Member Voting Period



Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC)

NQF Board-Approved Advisory Committee

- Provides guidance to NQF Leadership regarding enhancements to the CDP
- > Maintains measure evaluation criteria
- Renders final endorsement decision



NQF Consensus Development Process (CDP) Appeals Period

□ 30-Day Appeals Period

Any interested party may file an appeal on an endorsed measure with the Appeals Board during this period.

The Appeals Board reviews all appeals submitted to NQF for consideration.

Appeals Board renders final decision

NQF Consensus Development Process (CDP)

Consensus Development Process:

Two Cycles Every Contract Year



Patient-Reported Measures

NQF Framework: PRO to PRO-PM Definitions & Acronyms

$PROM \rightarrow PRO-PM$ patient-reported instrument, tool. PRO-based performance outcomes single-item measure measure information on the patient, way to collect information way to aggregate the information told by the patient, told by the patient that has been shared and without interpretation without interpretation collected into a reliable, valid measure of performance EXAMPLE: Patients with Clinical Depression Symptom: depression Patient Health Questionnaire Percentage of patients with (PHQ-9©), a standardized diagnosis of major depression or tool to assess depression dysthymia and initial PHQ-9 score >9 with a follow-up PHQ-9 score <5 at 6 months (NQF #0711)

Background

- PRO-PM criteria established in 2012
- Based on four key PRO domains:
 - health-related quality of life (including functional status),
 - symptoms and symptom burden (e.g. pain, fatigue),
 - experience with care, and
 - health behaviors (e.g., smoking, diet, exercise)
- PRO-PMs require evidence that the target population values the measured PRO and finds it meaningful
- PRO-PMs require both item and score-level testing

Instrument-Based Measures

- "Instrument" is a generic term that researchers use for a measurement device (e.g. survey, test, questionnaire, scale). Instruments are used for consistently presenting and obtaining data from respondents, and the derived data from an instrument may include ratings or ranking output that is included in the calculation of a performance measure
 - May collect information from a variety of individuals including patients, observers (family, or care takers), clinicians
 - Instruments specific to patient-report outcomes may be referenced as PROMs (patient-reported outcome measure)

Expanded Definition

- Instrument-based measures that use patients as the data source (e.g. via a PROM) are now further classified as: structure, process, outcome
 - PRO-PMs are specific to outcome measures that rely on data collected from patients
- Instrument-based performance measures may also rely on data collected from clinicians (e.g. the six minute walk test)
- Instrument-based measures should use the evidence requirements for the measure type + demonstrate evidence that the instrument is of value to the target population when it is a PROM

Current Measurement Landscape

Pulmonary & Critical Care PRO-PMs

Endorsed:

- NQF#0700 Health-related Quality of Life in COPD patients before and after Pulmonary Rehabilitation
 - » Measured by the Chronic Respiratory Disease Questionnaire (CQR) or a similar tool
 - » Measure steward: American Association of Cardiovascular Pulmonary Rehabilitation
- In development (not endorsed):
 - Controlling the Impact of COPD on health status
 - » Measured by the COPD Assessment Test (CAT) or Clinical COPD Questionnaire (CCQ)
 - » Measure steward: Minnesota Community Measurement

Pulmonary & Critical Care PRO-PMs cont.

- In development (not endorsed):
 - Functional Status Assessments and Target Setting for Patients with COPD
 - » Measured by a validated functional status assessment or global health assessment tool
 - » Measure steward: CMS
- Not recommended for endorsement by Committee (2013):
 - Optimal Asthma Care--Control Component: Percentage of patients ages 5-50 (pediatrics ages 5-17) whose asthma is well-controlled
 - » Measured by one of four age appropriate patient reported outcome tools: Asthma Control Test (ACT) score of 20 or above- ages 12 and older; Childhood Asthma Control Test (C-ACT) score of 20 or above- ages 11 and younger; Asthma Control Questionnaire (ACQ) score of 0.75 or lower- ages 17 and older; Asthma Therapy Assessment Questionnaire (ATAQ) score of 0- only applicable for children and adolescents

Global Assessment PROM Examples

- VR-12
 - Definition: generic instruments to measure health related quality of life.
 - Steward: Boston University with the support and endorsement of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
- PROMIS Global Health
 - Definition: brief, precise, valid, reliable fixed or tailored tools for patient-reported health status in physical, mental, and social well-being for adult & pediatric populations.
 - Steward: National Institutes of Health

Functional Status Assessment (FSA) PROM Examples

- COPD Assessment Test (CAT)
 - Definition: 8-item questionnaire designed to quantify the impact of COPD symptoms on the health status of patients. The CAT provides a score of 0-40 to indicate the impact of disease.
 - Steward: GlaxoSmithKline
- COPD Clinical Questionnaire (CCQ)
 - Definition: 10-item tool that focuses on the clinical status of the airways as well as functional limitations and psychosocial dysfunction.
 - Steward: University Medical Center Groningen

Quality Imperative

Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts

~William Bruce Cameron



But.....

You can't improve what you don't measure

~ W. Edwards Deming