

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Moderator: SDOH Housing Instability & Food Insecurity
September 19, 2017
4:00 p.m. ET

Operator: This is Conference #: 85374774

Welcome, everyone, the webcast is about to begin. Please note today's call is being recorded. Please standby.

John Bernot: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you so much for taken the time out of you busy schedule to join us today for this orientation for the Food Insecurity and Housing Instability Project. My name is John Bernot. I'm one of the Senior Directors with The National Quality Forum.

We're going to take this next hour to hour and a half at the most to try to give you a good orientation of what we're hoping to accomplish with this project. And make sure you have plenty of time to ask any question.

What we'll do right now is we will go around the NQF staff have each one of us introduce ourselves and then turn it over to Vanessa, who will do a roll call from the panelist.

So at this point, I'll turn it over to Drew Anderson.

Andrew Anderson: Sure. Hi everyone this is Drew Anderson. I'm also another Senior Director here at NQF. I've worked on a variety of project in different topic areas and framework project which will be discussing today. I'm giving you an overview of what those comprise. So I'll turn it over to Jean-Luc.

Jean-Luc Tilly: Thanks, Drew. I'm Jean-Luc Tilly. I'm a Senior Project Manager here at NQF. I work some of the – across the gamut on our consensus development measure endorsement projects and our selecting measures for federal programs project and a couple of the kinds of framework projects that Drew is describing. Vanessa?

Vanessa Moy: Thank, Jean-Luc. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Vanessa Moy and I'm a Project Analyst. And I had an opportunity to work also on a few of the framework project.

So next steps, we're going to have if each of you panelist can introduce yourselves a little bit and I'll do a roll call. I won't do roll call for everyone that's on this panel because since we hosted two different orientation webinar. We had one yesterday and we're going to have one now.

This one that we're just – these two webinars, they are the same meeting materials and we just have hosted two of them based upon Doodle poll that we sent a couple weeks ago. So I'll just start the roll call right now. Is Traci Ferguson here by any chance?

Traci Ferguson: Yes, good afternoon. My name is Traci Ferguson, I'm a Chief Medical Director for Medical Management at WellCare Health Plan. Internist by training, worked at the hospital for 10 years before transitioning to managed care. And WellCare is a managed care organization that only focuses on sponsors, government sponsored health plans and Medicaid and low-income Medicare Advantage. So I've experienced on both the provider and payer side when it comes to helping patients find healthy – and afford healthy food selections and maintain housing. So I'm very excited to be a part of the panel.

Vanessa Moy: All right. Thank you. Welcome. Is Laura Gottlieb here?

Laura Gottlieb: Yes. This is Laura. So I'm a family doctor by background. I work as an associate professor at the University of California, San Francisco where I direct the Social Interventions Research & Evaluation Network, which is a national initiative to call, disseminate and catalyze better research and evaluation at the intersection of social medical care deliver. So our research is

really just focused on exactly what this panel is looking at. I'm excited to be here.

Vanessa Moy: Thank you. Is Romana Hasnain-Wynia here?

Romana Hasnain-Wynia: Hi, this is Romana Hasnain-Wynia. I am with Denver Health. I'm the Chief Research Officer. And we do a lot of work here at Denver Health, it's the large safety net integrated delivery system here in Denver. We have over 7,000 employees and a number of community-based healthcare clinics, a large hospital with about 600 beds and about 19 school-based clinics. And just do a lot of work with the patient population with a variety of social needs beyond what is provided within the context of the healthcare system.

So we've actually tried to put this into practice and are obviously very interested in the evidence that's being generated around how best to do this. I also serve on the Disparity Standing panel for NQF and have been a researcher in focusing on issues around equity and social determinants of health and disparities reduction for the last 25 years.

Vanessa Moy: Thank you. Is Lynn Knox here? OK. How about Amanda Reddy?

Amanda Reddy: Hi, everyone, this is Amanda Reddy. I'm an environmental epidemiologist by training, but I'm currently serving as the Executive Director for the National Center for Healthy Housing which is an organization that's 25 years old this month. And really founded on the premise that better health can be achieved through better housing and we do that through a combination of research advocacy and capacity building. And I'm really delighted to be a part of this conversation.

Vanessa Moy: Thank you. Is Sarah Hudson Scholle here? OK.

Sarah Hudson Scholle: Hi, everyone, this is Sarah Hudson Scholle, I'm Vice President for Research and Analysis at the National Committee for Quality Assurance. I do a variety of health equity issues. And I'm also a member of the NQF Disparities Committee.

Vanessa Moy: Thank you, great. Is there anyone else on the line that I may have missed or just joined in? OK, I'll pass it to Jean-Luc now who would give an overview of NQF.

Jean-Luc Tilly: OK, great. Thanks, Vanessa. Yes, we just wanted to give you a kind of quick introduction to NQF. It sounds like a few of you have worked with us before. So this won't be news to you but we did want to kind of give a little bit of background about the organization and what our objectives are.

So NQF has been around for nearly two decades now. We're non-profit, non-partisan membership-based organization. You know, it is funded by a variety of stakeholders in this case, the Urban Institute and Vanessa will tell you more about that, but primarily the US Congress, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

Our responsibility is to, you know, bring together public and private sector organizations to reach consensus on how to measure health care quality as a nation really to make it better, safer and more affordable.

You know, the best way to think of NQF is really as a form which is to say a group that bring together some 430 organizational members which includes you know, hospitals, medical groups, health plans, physician societies as well as, you know, 800 some odd expert volunteers such as ourselves that work on our different committees and expert panels and workgroups.

And finally NQF had really (stressed) a transparent forum which is to say everything we do including this meeting is publicly available, a transcript and recording will be made available and so forth. You know, with the goal of advancing the work that we're doing here very broadly and to the public at large.

NQF really has kind of a three-part mission to improve the quality of American healthcare so that's building consensus on national priorities and goals for our performance improvement and then working in partnership to achieve them, endorsing national consensus standards or performance measures to measure and publicly report healthcare performance. And, you

know, promote the attainment of these national goals and priorities that we set through a variety of education and outreach programs.

And so we've worked across – really, four different kind of measurement areas. So the first really and kind of are our defining processes, the consensus development process where we endorse clinical healthcare quality standards. You know, it's a very rigorous process, we walk measures through five different criteria, you know, the criteria based on the evidence supporting the measure, criteria supporting the scientific acceptability measures, the feasibility. Those measures are evaluated by standing committees composed of a variety of different stakeholders across 15 different kind of topic areas.

We also work on the measure applications partnership where we, you know, convene as workgroups across the different federal programs that are part of Medicare reimbursement basically to kind of encourage alignment in the measure selection across those programs and evaluate the measures proposed for those programs annually on the measures and the considerations ones.

And then finally, we do a couple different – other activities so that the National Quality Partners put out a variety of kind of action teams for example around antimicrobial stewardship. And then, projects such as these, the measurement science kind of framework type projects where we kind of venture on to areas that are less well-developed and try and put forward really the best thinking on a particular topic area and help to identify measure concepts that would benefit from development or otherwise, you know, get consensus on – and extra consensus really on what kind of steps the field needs to take to move forward.

And so, which kind of brings us to the particulars of this project, the measurement science project and Vanessa will walk you through that.

Vanessa Moy: OK. So I will just give a brief overview of the project, so the project objectives and project scope.

We are collaborating with Urban Institute which with funding also from CMS with NQF to develop a measurement framework that allows for the systematic assessment of food insecurity and housing instability. This measurement

framework will provide a structure to help us organize available measures. It is where gaps in measurement exist and prioritization for future measurement development.

Also to support this effort, NQF will convene an expert panel with expertise in measurement, disparities, food insecurity and housing instability. We will also conduct an environmental scan of performance measures and literature review to construct a straw man framework using an existing conceptual framework. We'll also identify gaps in measurement and we'll also propose measure concepts that can be translated into performance measures.

So just a little bit about the project timeline. During the last week of September 25th, we'll be conducting key informant interview. And in the upcoming slides, Drew will explain more about the purpose of the key informant interview which is part of the environmental scan portion of the project.

Then on October 11th, we'll have a memo that summarizes the environmental scan findings that we have conducted. Also, on October 18th, there will be an upcoming in-person meeting here in the NQF office in Washington DC.

The next thing is on November 3rd, we'll be submitting a draft measurement framework to Urban Institute. This draft measurement framework will be based upon the discussions from the in-person meeting.

Next is on November 3rd to 17th, there will be a 14-day public comment period by – with on the draft measurement framework. You guys would be able to comment on that draft measurement framework as well along with the public.

Then on the week of November 27th, we're planning to host a second webinar with all of you based upon the comments received on the measurement framework report.

And last week, I sent a Doodle poll for you guys to have to schedule that webinar number two. So if you guys could fill out that Doodle poll by this

Thursday that would be great so we can schedule that webinar number two that's coming up soon in November.

Also, around mid-December, NQF internally have a CSAC or Consensus Standards Approval Committee meeting where as a project team, we will provide the informational update on the measurement framework project. And then lastly on December 15th, we'll be publishing our final reports.

OK. I would just hold this call for a second. If you guys have any questions or anything for us before we move on to the roles of NQF staff and you guys as the expert panelists.

OK, I guess – so I'll go briefly over the roles of ...

Sarah Hudson Scholle: This is Sarah Scholle, I got a question.

Vanessa Moy: Sure.

Sarah Hudson Scholle: Is Urban the only funder or is there another funder for this work?

Andrew Anderson: So it's actually – the work is actually being funded by CMS through Urban, so we're collaborating with Urban with their funding from CMS.

Sarah Hudson Scholle: Great. Thanks.

Vanessa Moy: Thank you. So we'll go over the roles now – you guys are the expert panelist, you'll serve as experts working with NQF staff to achieve the goals of the project. And you'll also help us to review meeting materials and participate in all meetings at the in-person meeting as well. And you'll also guide and provide inputs on the environmental scan such as the keywords and measure concepts. You'll also help us to develop the measurement framework as well as identify and prioritize measures or measure concepts related to food insecurity and housing instability. And lastly, it also helps provide recommendations for the future activities related to the measurement of food insecurity and housing as well.

So as an NQF project team staff, we'll work together with you, the panelists, to achieve the project goals, such as organize and staff meetings and

conference calls, guide you, the panelists, to build consensus; we'll also ensure communication among all project participants, we'll also facilitate necessary communication and collaborations between the different NQF projects and external stakeholders, we'll also respond to NQF member and public queries about the project; maintain documentation of the project activities, draft and edit reports or the memos and project material; and lastly, we'll publish the final project report.

Also throughout this project, the draft report will be posted on to the project page where NQF – where we welcome public comments from the public and NQF members as well, which they also play a role in this project. So for NQF membership in the public, they are also engage in this project and work by reviewing the draft reports and also providing feedback to us and you, the panelists. Also they'll have an opportunity to participate in web meetings and in-person meetings during opportunities for public comment period.

So I'll turn it over now to John Bernot who will go over the framework project that NQF have worked on before.

John Bernot: Great. Thanks, Vanessa. You can go to the next slide.

Vanessa Moy: OK.

John Bernot: So for those of you who have work of NQF, we have found that one of the challenges of running a framework project is that they are very different from the other types of work we do. And so if you haven't been involved on the framework side of things, you'll notice a lot of different is going forward. So we want to take this opportunity to really explain what a framework project is, what the expectations will be of the – both NQF as well as of the committee members.

I also want to let you know, this is a pretty small group. So if there's any point that you have a question, just go ahead and speak up and ask and I'll stop there. Otherwise, we'll take sometime at the end and we will have plenty of time for the question and answers.

But as we heard about this piece, again, not an endorsement project, we're not going through that scientific rigor. If anything, these are much more creative, much more innovative projects. They tend to be operating in an area where there's not enough evidence-based unlike the MAP or the CDP endorsement process. We can get a funding on this from whether it would be from CMS, whether it would be in collaboration such as groups like the Urban Institute or private funding, and we've done a number of these framework projects which we'll show you shortly.

But as I mentioned, the main thing about these three areas where we just do not have enough structure yet and there's – despite the fact, we're going to do an environmental scan and do a lot of research on here, we still need experts like yourself on the call to comment and say, OK, we are yet – not yet at a place where we can operate efficiently in measurement science. So we will actually be creating a framework that makes it easier for other people to come by afterwards and contribute to measurement in both food insecurity and housing instability. Next slide.

So this is just replay, I will not read this entire slide to you. But at NQF, we really do have a lot of different components. A lot of different activities that are going on and I wanted to say that the frameworks are really at the foundation of a lot of this. So we really hope the information from the framework will be able to inform the endorsement process down the road. We'll be able to inform MAP. We'll contribute to some of the things in our quality innovations section.

And really we'll take a good part of the measure maintenance, the measure science works. So everything we do here we expect to be really part of the entire NQF breed. And going forward, I think this framework will inform a lot of different component, so next slide.

So as I said, we have done quite a few of these framework projects. I certainly will not read this to you. They may be projects that you familiar with, but each one of these was one that we had gone through the same process. I'm going to tell you honestly that sometimes, it feels like a little bit of a slugfest, but we'll trust the process and in each of these cases it really had

turn out to be end deliverable but I think every single one of those committee was pleased with the framework and the final publication that they came up with at the end. Go ahead next slide.

So what are some of the key difference between framework project and other project? We talk about some of those. It does not have quite the scientific rigor. Again, we're trying to create a foundation so that we can add evidence to those fields. And again, some of that right now is in the form of the expertise in each one of your experiences.

So but – I like this slide because it shows a few things. One, if you've seen framework project you've sort of seen one framework project. Everyone has their own flavor. Everyone has their own uniqueness, but I do think when we apply our structure and our process too, they've all been able to come up with the – deliver both the end. It's been what they were looking for.

And I mentioned last time when I saw the slide, they are also a little sticky like the chocolate. They can get sticky, they can get hairy. At times that skills that I – we don't know what the scope is and we're trying to control something and boil the ocean. And I can only validate those feelings if they come through along the process because I think they will and let you know that very common on this framework projects. And we'll gradually hone it back down to something more granular and more granular so that we end up with a framework and I'm quite confidence that this group would be proud of at the end also. Next slide.

I'd really talk a bit a lot of these things but we're working more to conceptual level. We're not evaluating specific measures, not an endorsement process. These are not being picked for accountability programs. We're a level of more conceptual than that. Each one had different timelines. We relied more on our literature and environmental scans to try to (flicking) structure around the field.

And the likelihood of us having any traditional voting, if you've been on another NQF committee, is very low. Most of the time, this is just the process

that is discuss by the committee, but there's not a formal voting mechanisms throughout this process. And next slide. OK.

So we talk a lot about frameworks. But I wanted to spend sometime going over the structure of the framework and this process that I keep alluding to. So I will not read all the words on here but just try to step you through the high level. But again, throughout the process, we rely on your expertise that of our members to the public comment and having this transparent process where everything we do is visible to both yourselves, our members and the public.

We'll start off for the environmental scan. I won't spend a lot of time on that because Drew is going to go into some detail. And we really work with you to make sure we're doing the scan correctly, but we take on the responsibility of synthesizing that.

I also cannot say enough that this is an iterative approach. So we do not say, "Here is your environmental scan", hand it to you and walk away. That environmental scan may make people on the committee think, "Wait, we forgot this, or I know a really good article and why was that not captured." So it's an iterative approach on this.

But we'll get to that point where based on that environmental scan and committee discussion will come up with the draft conceptual framework and I will fill into more details of what that looks like. After we do that, once again, another opportunity for (revisement) and iterations and back and forth. And as we start applying different concepts to this framework, we can see if it works.

And finally as Vanessa mentioned, the final deliverable for this project will be conceptual framework, a paper that would be publish on our website and it contain all of the information that all the domains and subdomains and measure concept that I'm about to show you. So go ahead next slide.

So what is a measurement framework verbally and what is the definition of it. It is an organizing structure. And I'll repeat that is an organizing structure

because that's really important. We're not trying to come up here with the final measures. We're trying to come up with the way to categorize what cubby holes make sense in the topics that we have. That way we do that is the committee-based on the literature and your own expert opinion.

We'll come up with a group of domains. Typically, the domains are three or four, but on some big projects, they can get over 10, within each domain, their subdomains of measurements and we give example of this so you'll be able to see that a little bit more tangibly.

And lastly, the committee will work based again on the data that's out there in the literature as well as your own opinion and try to formulate some measure concepts. And I'll spend a little bit of time on that.

And I want to let you know that at the end of result, what we're trying to do is have the structure so you can organize what might be available, where the gaps are, and we often we even have the opportunity to do some prioritization of those concepts at the end of the project. Next slide, please.

This is just a graphical illustration. I'll go into the actual definitions of each one of this. But based on what this committee, what the literature brings, we're going to find ideas. Find measurement ideas. As we begin to look at what ideas are out there and which ideas should be out there, they're going to start to cluster in groups and this committee will be able to put those groups into domain. Some are large buckets.

From there, we'll break each one of those down into subdomains and then have the ability to add measure concepts which are a refinement of an idea, but short of actually getting the whole way through a performance measurements – excuse me, performance measures. And the next slide will give us some definitions on that. You can go ahead to the next one, Vanessa.

So this is an example from one of our previous frameworks. And one of the domains and this is one that had a large number of domains, but created one domain that was called person-centered planning and Coordination.

So their literature, they are experts. So this is a big bucket. This is a big area of need for measurements in home- and community-based services. Within that, there was a subdomain of assessment. And I'm not going to, again, to read that to you, but this was where the ability for the system providers support the person, identifying their goals, needs, preferences and values.

So what then – what ideas, what themes, what concepts fell underneath that? And here is an example of one. The percent responding yes to this question, do you believe that the result of your level of care assessment identifies with your needs. And that's a good measure concept.

As you can see it defines the population, someone who had this care and the question, but what it does not get into is the actual parts of that performance measurement at the bottom. We're not getting into exclusions and undergoing scientific testings. We will get into the point where we say this is an important concept to measure. So that's what we expect to be the end result of the measurement framework. Can we go to next slide? OK.

So that is the last slide. I want to stop because I know I went through that quickly, but I want to make sure that there are not any questions. And if there are not any right now, you may certainly come up with some over the days and weeks to come and we can certainly take them at that point too. But I will give this opportunity for anyone to speak up a few questions.

Traci Ferguson: This is Traci. And I know that we will, you know, be publishing the report to the Urban Institute and to CMS ultimately, but what are the thoughts of the – and stakeholder who would we be measuring in terms of the breadth of this process?

John Bernot: That's a great question and actually it's the exact question, the first question that came up on the other orientation that we did. And the answer to that is we are starting with a very wide breadth. This committee yourself included will probably start to fine tune up-down. And the way we will do the fine tuning is we'll take a look that Drew will talk about the literature searches that we've already began to conduct.

So the breadth could be anything from – let me back, it would not be just clinical in our opinion. We suspect the committee will end on something broader than that. I'm totally making this up but domains could be something along the lines of what happens at the community level, what happens at the clinical level or provider level, what happens to the patient level. It could be that broad that we're looking at them. Domains could be that we're looking at what are the interventions/best practices, as well as whether the metrics to measure in organization – sorry, not organization, a community and see where the pockets of disparities might be.

So I say that to say there is really – at this point, this go for the extremely broad, we'll provide some ideas and suggestions to the committee based on the literature, but then the committee will actually decide how narrow to find this. So I've punted a little bit on that but do that answer your question?

Traci Ferguson: Yes, it does. Thank you.

John Bernot: Any other questions? That's a really good question. OK.

Well, I turn it over to Drew again, we'll have time at the end, if you think of anything else and certainly time in the days and weeks to come going forward. And I suspect there will be times that we want to revisit this process and that's not a problem at all.

So, OK, go ahead, Drew, you're up.

Andrew Anderson: Great. So the environmental scan as Jean was mentioning is really mean to support you all in the development of the framework. It's to look at what measures currently exists. Look at their current state of the evidence. And get a sense of what's actually happening now, what's ongoing. And to provide you with that input to make your decisions around what the framework will look like.

So we will be documenting sample of the most commonly used measures and trying to, you know, capture measures that are used in both practice and research.

We'll also be looking at measure concepts through the literature trying to organize all of this release, all the research out there. So for example, housing instability has, you know, over crowding housing quality, homelessness, I'm really trying to figure out what the main concepts are and what's being measured.

From that, work will be identifying gaps and measurements, so we will look at what concepts are not being measured that are under measured or inadequately measured, and try to provide you with that context. And we'll also be looking to what are the effective interventions and what existing conceptual frameworks are there that we can build on because we don't want to be, you know, replicating any work that's been done so far and you want to be adding to the field and guiding stakeholders in this topic area.

So as I said, there – in order to support the environmental scan of measures, we will be conducting a literature review. So this literature review will be very broad. We'll be looking both at housing instability and food insecurity in all the concepts that are included in there. I'll share the definition that will be the operational definitions that we will be using in a moment.

But we will be looking in of course peer-reviewed journals and academic databases such as PubMed, academic search complete and premier using a defined set of parameters in term. So we've already, as Jean, mentioned begun this search and we have a work plan that we're building off up to conduct the search and making sure that it's done in a more systematic way.

Beyond the peer-reviewed literature, we'll be reviewing the Gray literature. So that includes government publications, federal or state agency reports, rules, regulations. You know, of course, looking at publications from relevant foundations and associations, specialty societies, even conference papers, abstract. So we are really taking a very broad approach to doing the literature review.

Another component of it is that we will be – we want to make sure that we identify the sources that are most relevant to this work and it will be most

helpful for your work. So we will be scoring each one of this abstracts based on criteria that we've develop internally.

Laura Gottlieb: May I ask a question?

Andrew Anderson: Yes.

Laura Gottlieb: Sorry, this is Laura. I just have a questions because as I look at this – some of the work that we've done on food insecurity screening, we see food insecurity measures being used, but actual validity of those measures, those different measures isn't kind of the front matter. That's not the – it's not the subject necessarily as the article on PubMed. But they may be being used and there are, you know, they may highlight key challenges. And what I don't see here is what kind of work has gone into – through the psychometric properties of the measure or is it really measuring what we think it's measuring.

And I think that sometimes it's an issue, maybe not as much in food and housing, but it potentially could be. And I'm just wondering where that fits into this research question.

Andrew Anderson: Thanks for that question. Yes. So, we are – we also have some criteria around the collection of the measures. So we have, of course, their performance measures which may have reliability and validity testing. There are instruments that are tools and skills, and even tool kit that surveys, so all of these types of measures have different types of testing.

And so, we do have categories of information that we're collecting on each one of these measures. And so, we are very much interested in collecting any testing information that we come across. And we will document that for the measures that – for they will document that information for – when we do come across it because I – we would prioritize measures that have undergone scientific testing. But we didn't want to. We wouldn't want to leave out measures that haven't but are promising.

So, I think it's just a matter of we didn't include that information on this slides. But we can share the fields that we are collecting for the measures, the information field. Does that answer your question?

Laura Gottlieb: It does. Thank you so much. That's really helpful.

Andrew Anderson: OK. So, as I mentioned we have a couple of operational definitions that we are starting with. This is really has aided our search so far. And I'll, you know, we're using the USDA definition of food insecurity, and the HHS definition of housing instability. One of the questions that – we've gotten is, you know, why are we, you know, choosing, you know, food and housing instability instead of housing insecurity.

So, based on the literature reviewed so far, a lot of – we find that the term housing instability has been used more often. Even though we are searching and using terms, using the terms housing insecurity. So, it's just a preference really. And then we have this definition from HHS. Next slide.

So, our research questions. So, the first two research questions here that are guiding the environmental scan in lit review are, of course, as I mentioned what are the most common concepts of these two areas, what measures address these two areas. But then, we also go a little bit beyond that. And dig a little deeper into the literature to see what are some of the key challenges with the measurements and this – in housing insecurity – in housing instability and food insecurity.

And then we also looking at opportunities for measurements. So anything that's more forward looking and, you know, recommendations for future research. So, really, we're being as comprehensive as we can be to, you know, support the recommendations that come out of this project and forming the framework.

So, as was mentioned a little earlier, we'll also be conducting key informant interviews. And so, of course, we have the expertise within this panel. But there are also other folks that we think that we can, you know, gather additional information to help inform your work. So, we'll be reaching out to a group. So far we have, I think, about six key informants that will be conducting some semi-structured interviewed with over the next few weeks. And to just get their input on, you know, their work with some of the

screening tools that we found getting at some of those challenges and opportunities.

And so, this is – gives us another input to the work. We are also open to suggestions from you all for other key informants. So we will be – hopefully we are try to wrap them up before we complete the environmental scan, but we'll – we're open to continuing these conversations as we move throughout the search process.

So, if you all do have any recommendations for key informants, please send it over to our project inbox which is foodandhousing@qualityforum.org at the end of the slide deck in case if you have any questions. And we'll also be following up after this e-mail. So you feel free to respond with anyone that you might have in mind.

And as Vanessa mentioned earlier in the call, we'll be documenting all the findings of the environmental scan and the literature review in a memo that will be sent to you prior to the in-person meeting on October 18th. And as Jean mentioned, of course, it's an iterative process. So, we expect that you will have potential additions or suggestions. And that the findings will also be documented in the draft report that – as I mentioned later on in the project. So, there are opportunities for additional input as we move through the process.

Are there any questions on the environmental scan before we move forward?

Laura Gottlieb: This is Laura again. I'm so sorry, I'm taking advantage of the fact that it is a small group, so please tell me to stop asking question when inappropriate.

Andrew Anderson: Oh, yes. Yes, please.

Laura Gottlieb: So, I think I'm struggling a little bit with one of the questions that one of the other people in the call asked about the domains, and whether these are measures that have been used in healthcare settings or could be – have been used in community setting, and some of the differences between tools that have been used in those different kinds of settings. Just in terms of the feasibility of implementation and the evidence that exist about, there maybe

amazing measures that have been used outside of healthcare settings that haven't been implemented in healthcare setting.

And I'm wondering how that gets incorporated into the literature review. Is that just sort of one of the, you know, one of the columns in a table or is that each domain has it for the separate set of literature that supports measure development or measure, kind of, validity testing. And are those are separate from one another? Does that make any sense?

Andrew Anderson: Yes, it makes sense. But I would just say that we are casting a very wide net. And I would probably be – what we are doing is identifying the setting based on the measure that we are collecting. And it depends, I think, really our process is to be what rises to the top. So – we anticipate that there will be probably be a lot more or a lot of measures that are more connected to healthcare setting. But, of course, we've also come across others that are not. So, it really is about prioritizing based on what we find.

And we are looking at what setting these tools or instruments would be administered in, and then also collecting whatever information that we can find on testing based on those settings. So, it's just a matter of categorization, and then allowing you all to prioritize. Does that make sense?

Traci Ferguson: It does. And this is Traci. I think it would also be helpful for us to see the types of keywords that you're using when you're doing your search and the databases you are looking at. I know you said the PubMed, but maybe looking at other ones that may not have made it PubMed, so that we can see that it really does incorporate not just the healthcare system.

But some of the, you know, community planning's that, you know, that happens to determine, you know, when commercial companies come into an area. So, I think, you know, trying to – when we talked about revitalizing some of the urban community with that type of research too.

Andrew Anderson: Sure. Yes, I think it would be helpful. We can provide you a copy of our work plan that include the search terms just to make sure – and the key databases that we're looking in.

Traci Ferguson: OK.

Laura Gottlieb: Yes. I think I really like the wide net. You know, some of the works that we have done as – has looked at, like, the amount of time that it takes to conduct screening in clinical settings or the provider acceptability of certain tools in places where that's been tested. And I think it will be great to see search terms. But I also wonder if just – and, maybe this is what we will do in November, is to sort of look at the different kind of columns of the table or sort of the rubric that you – that might be used to assess the different measures across such a broad range of setting. And because it's hard when you cast such a wide net to know what goes in those columns.

Andrew Anderson: Yes. And we have found in our experience that, you know, for some measure that we have a ton of information and we can completely, you know, do a one to one match based on the fields that we're looking for. And then, there are others that, you know, we have just enough information to, you know, see who the measure is targeting in the setting. But we'll be bringing all of that to you all.

Laura Gottlieb: Terrific. Thank you.

Andrew Anderson: Any other questions on the environmental scan or on the project? Any other thoughts on our approach? OK.

And so, we're going to take a moment to open it up for a public comment. We have a few folks on the line. So, I wanted to give them an opportunity to find and provide some input as well if there are any questions. Operator?

Operator: At this time, if you would like to make a public comment please press star one on your telephone keypad.

And there are no public comments at this time.

Andrew Anderson: OK. Thank you.

Vanessa Moy: Thank you. So thank you everyone for your input and comments, and questions, keep them coming if you have them towards the end.

And so, I'll just give a brief overview about SharePoint before I begin talking more about it. All of you should have – probably yesterday or in the upcoming days received an e-mail from (Connie), with the login and access information to the SharePoint site.

So, on the site, you'll be able to retrieve and see all the webinar, documents uploaded on the site as well as in-person meetings. They'll be posted prior to all the meetings. And you'll be able to download and also look them up into your computer. And also – and through out the project we'll be posting the materials such the draft measurement same work report which we like to – which we would like you to comment on throughout this process and the project.

And so, the next step for this project is, I'll just go over the project timeline. As Drew mentioned, the next thing that we will be doing is conducting key informant interviews last week of September, and creating a memo on October 11th. And then, the next most important upcoming event that we'll have with you or as a panelist is the in-person meeting at (D.C) here. And during this meeting you should pull off, be talking more about the measurement framework such as domains, the subdomains and measure concepts.

Also, this month you'll be receiving an e-mail with additional information from our meetings department on how book the flight and lodging to the in-person meeting, all of the expenses will be reimbursed by NQF. And the next step is, if you have any suggestions or questions for key informant interviews, we can e-mail us at e-mail address for the project which is foodandhousing@qualityform.org or you can also contact us by phone, as listed here on the slide.

And as Jean-Luc mentioned, we value transparency throughout this project. So, we'll posting slides, transcripts and also the framework report on the project page.

And lastly, is also the SharePoint site which I mentioned site which I mentioned and gave a brief overview of that. You can just click on this link

and they will direct you to that SharePoint site for all of you. And I'll just briefly pause for a second, if you guys have any additional questions or comments or suggestions for us.

Andrew Anderson: OK. So, we just wanted to say that we're really excited to get started with this project. And with that expert panel, we are really, you know, pleased with that group that we have assembled in. And, you know, we think that this is going to be – it's extremely important work especially right now.

So, if you do have any other questions as we move throughout the process over the next few days as Jean mentioned, please feel free to send them over or give us a call, if you have any concerns. So if there aren't any other questions, then we can go ahead and end the call and give you back sometime for today.

Vanessa Moy: OK.

Andrew Anderson: All right. Well, thank you, everyone.

Vanessa Moy: Thank you.

Female: Thank you.

Female: Thanks, everybody. Bye.

Female: Thank you.

Operator: That concludes today's call. You may now disconnect.

END