



NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM

Cost and Efficiency: April 2018 Measure Review Cycle

*Standing Committee Meeting
June 29, 2018*

*Erin O'Rourke, Senior Director
Taroon Amin, Consultant
Kate McQueston, Senior Project Manager*

Agenda

- Welcome
- Introductions and Disclosure of Interest
- Portfolio Review
- Overview of Evaluation Process
- Consideration of Candidate Measures
- NQF Member and Public Comment
- Next Steps

Welcome

NQF Staff

- Project staff
 - ▢ Erin O'Rourke, Senior Director
 - ▢ Kate McQueston, Senior Project Manager
 - ▢ Taroon Amin, Consultant
- NQF Quality Measurement leadership staff
 - ▢ Elisa Munthali, Senior Vice President

Introductions and Disclosure of Interest

Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee

- Brent Asplin, MD, MPH (co-chair)
- Cheryl Damberg, PhD (co-chair)
- Kristine Martin Anderson, MBA
- Larry Becker
- Mary Ann Clark, MHA
- Troy Fiesinger, MD, FAAFP
- Nancy Garrett, PhD
- Andrea Gelzer, MD, MS, FACP
- Rachael Howe, MS, BSN, RN
- Jennifer Eames Huff, MPH, CPEH
- Sunny Jhamnani, MD
- Lisa Latts, MD, MSPH, MBA, FACP
- Jason Lott, MD, MHS, MSHP, FAAP
- Martin Marciniak, MPP, PhD
- James Naessens, ScD, MPH
- Jack Needleman, PhD
- Janis Orlowski, MD, MACP
- Carolyn Pare
- John Ratliff, MD, FACS, FAANS
- Andrew Ryan, PhD (*Inactive 2017-2018*)
- Srinivas Sridhara, PhD, MHS
- Lina Walker, PhD
- Bill Weintraub, MD, FACC
- Herbert Wong, PhD
- Dolores Yanagihara, MPH

Portfolio Review

Cost and Efficiency Portfolio of Measures

- This project will evaluate a measure related to cost and efficiency that can be used for accountability and public reporting for all populations and in all settings of care. The second phase of this project will address a topic area including:
 - *Transitions or Handoffs*
- NQF solicits new measures for possible endorsement.
- NQF currently has more than 50 endorsed measures within the cost and efficiency area. Endorsed measures undergo periodic evaluation to maintain endorsement – “maintenance”.

Cost and Efficiency Portfolio of Measures Under Review

Measures for Maintenance Evaluation

Transitions or Handoffs

- 0496 Median Time from Emergency Department (ED) Arrival to ED Departure for Discharged ED Patients

Overview of Evaluation Process

Roles of the Standing Committee During the Evaluation Meeting

- Act as a proxy for the NQF multistakeholder membership
- Work with NQF staff to achieve the goals of the project
- Evaluate each measure against each criterion
 - *Indicate the extent to which each criterion is met and rationale for the rating*
- Make recommendations regarding endorsement to the NQF membership
- Oversee portfolio of Cost and Efficiency measures
- Select 2-year or 3-year terms

Standing Committee Responsibilities

Oversee NQF's Cost and Efficiency Portfolio of Measures:

- Provide input on the relevant measurement framework(s)
- Know which measures are included in the portfolio and understand their importance to the portfolio
- Consider issues of measure standardization and parsimony when assessing the portfolio
- Identify measurement gaps in the portfolio
- Become aware of other NQF measurement activities for the topic area(s)
- Be open to external input on the portfolio
- Provide feedback about how the portfolio should evolve
- Consider the current portfolio when evaluating individual measures

Ground Rules for Today's Meeting

During the discussions, Committee members should:

- Be prepared, having reviewed the measures beforehand
- Base evaluation and recommendations on the measure evaluation criteria and guidance
- Remain engaged in the discussion without distractions
- Attend the meeting at all times
- Keep comments concise and focused
- Avoid dominating a discussion and allow others to contribute
- Indicate agreement without repeating what has already been said

Major Endorsement Criteria (page 28)

- **Importance to measure and report:** Goal is to measure those aspects with greatest potential of driving improvements; if not important, the other criteria are less meaningful (**must-pass**)
- **Reliability and Validity-scientific acceptability of measure properties:** Goal is to make valid conclusions about quality; if not reliable and valid, there is risk of improper interpretation (must-pass)
- **Feasibility:** Goal is to, ideally, cause as little burden as possible; if not feasible, consider alternative approaches
- **Usability and Use:** Goal is to use for decisions related to accountability and improvement; if not useful, probably do not care if feasible
- **Comparison to related or competing measures**

Process for Measure Discussion and Voting

- Brief introduction by measure developer (2-3 minutes)
- Lead discussants will begin Committee discussion for each criterion:
 - *Providing a brief summary of the pre-meeting evaluation comments*
 - *Emphasizing areas of concern or differences of opinion*
 - *Noting, if needed, the preliminary rating by NQF*
 - » This rating is intended to be used as a guide to facilitate the Committee's discussion and evaluation
- Developers will be available to respond to questions at the discretion of the Committee
- Full Committee will discuss, then vote on the criterion, if needed, before moving on to the next criterion

Voting on Endorsement Criteria

- Importance to Measure and Report (must-pass)
 - *Vote on evidence (if needed) and performance gap*
- Scientific Acceptability (must pass):
 - *Vote on Reliability and Validity (if needed)*
- Feasibility:
 - *Vote on Feasibility*
- Usability and Use (Use is a must pass for maintenance measures):
 - *Vote on usability and use*
- Overall Suitability for Endorsement

If a measure fails on one of the must-pass criteria, there is no further discussion or voting on the subsequent criteria for that measure; we move to the next measure.

Criterion #1: Importance to measure and report

Criteria emphasis is different for new vs. maintenance measures

New measures	Maintenance measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence – Quantity, quality, consistency (QQC)• Established link for process measures with outcomes	<p>DECREASED EMPHASIS: Require measure developer to attest evidence is unchanged evidence from last evaluation; Standing Committee to affirm no change in evidence</p> <p>IF changes in evidence, the Committee will evaluate as for new measures</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gap – opportunity for improvement, variation, quality of care across providers	<p>INCREASED EMPHASIS: data on current performance, gap in care and variation</p>

Criterion #2: Scientific Acceptability

New measures	Maintenance measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measure specifications are precise with all information needed to implement the measure	NO DIFFERENCE: Require updated specifications
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reliability• Validity (including risk-adjustment)	<p>DECREASED EMPHASIS: If prior testing adequate, no need for additional testing at maintenance with certain exceptions (e.g., change in data source, level of analysis, or setting)</p> <p>Must address the questions regarding use of social risk factors in risk-adjustment approach</p>

Criteria #3-4: Feasibility and Usability and Use

New measures	Maintenance measures
Feasibility	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measure feasible, including eMeasure feasibility assessment	NO DIFFERENCE: Implementation issues may be more prominent
Usability and Use	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use: used in accountability applications and public reporting	INCREASED EMPHASIS: Much greater focus on measure use and usefulness, including both impact and unintended consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Usability: impact and unintended consequences	

Voting During Today's Meeting

■ Voting Tools:

- All voting members can vote by accessing through a voting link emailed by CommPartners.
- Each of you will be assigned a **personalized link** to enter the meeting and vote.

■ Instructions:

- Please use your specific link to enter the meeting and to vote.
- Please note the voting feature will not work on a tablet – you must use a PC or Mac.
- If you are unable to access the webinar platform, you may indicate your vote through the chat box.

Achieving Consensus

- Quorum: 66% of the Committee
- **Pass/Recommended:** Greater than 60% “Yes” votes of the quorum (this percent is the sum of high and moderate)
- **Consensus not reached (CNR):** 40-60% “Yes” votes (inclusive of 40% and 60%) of the quorum
- **Does not pass/Not Recommended:** Less than 40% “Yes” votes of the quorum

CNR measures move forward to public and NQF member comment and the Committee will revote

Questions?

Consideration of Candidate Measures

0496 Median Time from ED Arrival to ED Departure for Discharged ED Patients

- **Measure Type:** Process
- **Description:** NQF #0496 calculates the median time from emergency department arrival to time of departure from the emergency room for patients discharged from the emergency department (ED). The measure is calculated using chart-abstracted data, on a rolling quarterly basis, and is publically reported in aggregate for one calendar year. The measure has been publically reported since 2013 as part of the ED Throughput measure set of the CMS' Hospital Outpatient Quality Reporting (HOQR) Program.

Related and Competing Measure Discussion

Related and Competing Measures

- If a measure meets the four criteria and there are endorsed/new related measures (same measure focus or same target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and same target population), the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure.

Related Measures

NQF #	0495	0497	N/A
Title	Median Time from ED Arrival to ED Departure for Admitted ED Patients	Admit Decision Time to ED Departure Time for Admitted Patients	Left Without Being Seen
Steward	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)	CMS	CMS
Measure focus	Time from ED arrival to ED departure	Duration between the decision to admit a patient and the time the patient is discharged from the ED	Patients who leave ED without being evaluated by a physician/advanced practice nurse/physician's assistant (physician/APN/PA)
Patient population	All patients	All patients	All patients
Exclusions	Patients who are not an ED Patient	Patients who are not an ED Patient	None
Measure timing	Lifetime history	Lifetime history	Lifetime history
Level of analysis	Facility	Facility	Clinicians: Other, Facility
Setting	Emergency Department and Services, Inpatient/Hospital	Emergency Department and Services, Inpatient/Hospital	Emergency Department and Services, Inpatient/Hospital
Data Source	Electronic Health Records, Other, Paper Medical Records	Electronic Health Records, Other, Paper Medical Records	Electronic Health Records, Claims

Public Comment

Next Steps

Activities and Timeline

***All times ET**

Cycle 2

Meeting	Date/Time
Committee Measure Evaluation Post-Meeting Evaluation Web Meeting	Thursday, July 12, 2018 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
Draft Report for Public Comment	August 7, 2018 – September 5, 2018
Committee Post-Comment Web Meeting	Wednesday, September 12, 2018 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm

Project Contact Info

- Email: efficiency@qualityforum.org
- NQF Phone: 202-783-1300
- Project page:
[https://www.qualityforum.org/Cost and Efficiency.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Cost_and_Efficiency.aspx)
- SharePoint site:
<http://share.qualityforum.org/Projects/costEff/SitePages/Home.aspx>

Thank You