

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

**Moderator: Health and Well-Being
April 2, 2015
10:00 a.m. ET**

OPERATOR: This is Conference #: 78731075.

Adeela Khan: Good morning everyone. This is Adeela Khan at NQF. Welcome to the Health and Well-Being Standing Committee Q&A webinar.

I will turn it over to Kaitlynn who will walk us through our welcome and introduction.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Hello everyone and thank you for calling in. We are going to start by introducing project staff and then we're going to do a quick roll call.

So the project staffs supporting this project include Elisa Munthali, Robyn Nishimi, Adeela Khan, and myself, Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector.

OK. So, I'm just going to quickly read through the committee names and then you can just call out if you're here.

So we have Tom McNerny. OK.

Thomas McNerny: Here.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: OK, great. Amir Qaseem? Chisara ...

(Off-mike)

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: OK.

Adeela Khan: Chisara, are you on the line?

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: John Auerbach? Michael Baer? We have Ron Bialek.

Ron Bialek: I'm here.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: We have Emilio Carrillo. Jane Chiang? Eric France? Caroline Rosenthal Gelman? Catherine Hill? Ron Inge?

Ron Inge: Here.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: David Krol? Margaret Luck?

Margaret Luck: I'm here.

(Off-mike)

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Great. Patricia McKane? Amy Minnich? Jacqueline Moline? Marcel Salive?

Marcel Salive: Hello.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Katie Sellers?

Katie Sellers: Here.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Jason Spangler? Oh, yes.

Mike Stoto?

Michael Stoto: Hello.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Robert Valdez? And Arjun Venkatesh?

Arjun Venkatesh: Pardon me?

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: We're just checking to see if you're here. Is this Arjun? OK.

So, this is the agenda for the call.

John Auerbach: Oh, hi. I'm sorry, this is John Auerbach. I wasn't able to say I was on the call earlier when you called my name.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Thank you.

Renee Frazier: Excuse me. This is Renee Frazier. I think I'm on this committee.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: You are. Yes, you are Renee. I'm sorry.

Michael Baer: And Mike Baer is on the call too.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Great. Thank you.

Arjun Venkatesh: Hi. It's Arjun. I just joined.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: So, we're going to just go over the agenda for the call. We've done welcome and introductions. We're going to have our brief project overview and background.

Male: Yes.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: And we'll update you on pneumococcal specifications. And then we'll go over on Q&A section for measure evaluation.

OK. So currently there are 63 measures in the Health and Well-Being portfolio. Measures in this portfolio are the following domains and sub-domains. Health-related behaviors such as smoking, and diet and practices promoting healthy living, community-level indicators of health and disease, primary prevention and/or screening, and modifiable social, economic, environmental determinants of health.

The first population Consensus Development Project took place in 2011. During this project, the committee evaluated NQF measure evaluation criteria. And found that the measure criteria could be extended to population level measurement. The committee's standardized terminology to aid in the comprehension of criteria for population (inaudible). And the committee also provided developers with the (inaudible).

NQF also commissioned a paper which included an environmental scan of existing measures, proposed an integrated measurement framework to include total population, determinants of health and improvement activities – guidance for measuring and assessing population health, determinants of health and improvement activities. And lastly, discuss alignment between clinical care systems and public health systems.

Phase I of the population health project now called Health and Well-Being focus on review and endorsement of 19 clinical preventative services and immunization measures. The committee recommendations included a desire for universal measures for influenza and pneumococcal immunizations. The committee recommended that the vaccination measures align with standard specification. The committee also calls for further analysis of harmonization of measures across the various care settings, and requested additional information on disparities and ask to let measure developers stratify for disparities.

So, last year, the standing committee began the consensus development process evaluating 15 measures. The seven being newly-submitted to NQF and eight measures undergoing maintenance review.

Measure 0280: Dehydration Admission Rate was differed to this current cycle of Health and Well-Being. After the committee measurement evaluation phase, 13 measures were recommended for endorsement were measure 2518, Care Continuity, Dental Services was designated as Consensus Not Reached.

During CSAC, 13 measures are recommended for endorsement. Measure 2518, was not recommended for endorsement because CSAC found that the evidence supporting this measure was based on expert opinion.

This is the complete list of the measures that were endorsed by the NQF Board of Directors' Executive Committee. During this phase, the Health and Well-Being Standing Committee discuss these overarching issues, the evaluation of performance measures for oral health, dental and oral health outcome measures, dental versus oral health services and accountability in population health management.

So this slide shows alignment between gaps identified by this committee and also MAP Population Health Task Force which recommend areas for future measurement development, CMS for possible future use in federal programs. So some of these gaps include social, economic, and environmental determinants of health, specific sub-populations such as people with disabilities or the elderly, and composite that assess population experience. OK. So these are the seven measures currently being evaluated during this phase now.

And we just wanted to ask if you all had any questions about anything at this point.

Female: Could you go back to the seven measures real quick please?

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Sure.

Female: Did you have ...

Female: Thanks. Thanks. Yes, thank you. I just wanted to refresh myself.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: Yes. No problem.

Adeela Khan: Thanks, Kaitlynn, for that background.

So, a second part of this project in addition to reviewing measures, we're actually going to be updating the (inaudible) specifications for pneumococcal vaccines. This is Adeela by the way.

Back in 2011, CMS has requested that NQF undertake some harmonization activities for pneumococcal and influenza vaccinations. The reason being is that there were a lot of different specifications out there. And CMS wanted to make sure that there was a standardized specification for both of those vaccines.

So in 2011, NQF recommended the standard set of specifications for both types of immunization. The specifications went through our usual review. They were actually voted on by NQF members. And they were based on the

CDC and (ACEP) recommendation of PPSV, the Pneumovax in adult age 65 and older and for certain immunocompromised populations.

And during this past few years, there's been new trials in (ACEP) and CDC and have actually updated their guidelines this past summer. The pneumococcal vaccination specifically which now recommend that Prevnar 13 be added to the vaccination schedule.

NQF has several measures that are part of the Health and Well-Being portfolio that involve pneumococcal vaccination. And currently these measures are largely in alignment with the 2011 standard specifications, which is why we're undertaking this activity to update our own standard specifications. At that time, once they've been updated, we'll share them with the developers of these five measures you see on the webinar here. And we'll be working with them to just make sure that they're now in alignment with the new specifications. So right now these measures only have – are specified for the PPSV23.

For the next slide, please.

Three sets of specifications were drafted by a small sub-committee that met on March 12. They were – they deferred in regards to the different time intervals for vaccine administration among different age group. And we actually had several conversations with CDC where they informed NQF that they're actually working to harmonize the six to 18 years and the 19 to 64 time intervals, in which case these are probably convinced the specifications into one or two measures depending on the outcome of the CDC integration.

And we did note that the – during the small workgroup that the specifications could have been written as one single composite measure, but there was some concern that it might be too complex and confusing, so we proposed three individual measures with that.

So for next step, the full committee is actually going to be reviewing the standard specifications during our April 22nd meeting. We have some material prepared for you that will be sending out to you sometime next week. This update will undergo number in public comment as well – and when the specifications will be published on the NQF website and shared us as well.

And Robyn, if you have anything to add, please feel free to jump in. We just wanted to (inaudible) that we've been doing. And, you know, hopefully we are looking forward to (inaudible) at the in-person meeting.

Does anyone have any questions?

Thomas McNerny: Yes. This is Tom. Has NQF ever disagreed with ACIP recommendations?

Elisa Munthali: That's a good question. This is Elisa. Actually, for that historical context, I would turn it over to Robyn who has been at NQF the longest. So, I can't recall if they have in my tenure at NQF. But Robyn, I don't know if you have done this in the past.

Robyn Nishimi: Yes. And I actually wasn't involved in that standardized project. I think it was even after I had left or certainly after I was involved in the (PDP) project. I cannot recall. It probably would have been noted in the report that they were just agreeing. And I don't recall that they made any such notation. But I'll take to look at that again before the meeting.

Thomas McNerny: Thanks very much.

Adeela Khan: Are there any other question?

Renee Frazier: So this is Renee. So, in terms of the process for the meeting that day, so we are going to through it, given that we have these recommendations which are the good point. Are we going to go through a different kind of process because these are being recommended by hopefully someone that typically we support their recommendation or we're going to go to pretty much the same process we went through last time which was kind of a broad-based presentation and then some detail and then a building process?

Adeela Khan: So it won't be that we're voting on this new specification. What we have planned is that we have the red line versions of the old specification that have been updated by our full workgroup. We are hoping that we're going to be giving a small presentation on just some more background and some detail as

to how we landed on where we are. And then we're just going to have some discussions and hopefully we expect that the committee to just come to consensus that these are OK to go and ready to disseminate out.

Elisa Munthali: Yes. And this is Elisa. I just wanted to add to clarify – also Renee, I think you may be also talking about the measures that are under reviewed. So those will go to the same process. Those will be evaluated under the four major criteria, NQF major criteria. But with these specifications, we're bringing forward the red line changes that we agreed upon by the subgroup of the committee, to the full committee. And it would be a yes, no, we agree sort of thing. But it won't be – it's not against our criteria but for the measure, yes, you'll be evaluated there, the criteria.

(Renee Fisher): Great. OK. Thank you. That was the clarification I was trying to – thank you.

(Crosstalk)

(Renee Fisher): Very helpful. Perfect.

Elisa Munthali: No problem.

(Off-mike)

Female: Hey (inaudible), I had one question. I know we'd had that pre-call about the pneumococcal specifications. And I had – I think in general – (inaudible), but I'd raise a couple of questions just for clarification on a potential unintended consequences of the change or how whether or not there was evidence to support certain things. Will that be presented during the meeting? Where about to then?

Female: Yes ...

(Crosstalk)

Robyn Nishimi: Yes ...

Female: ... presentation but – Robyn, go ahead.

Robyn Nishimi: We did go to CDC with those questions and they didn't have any data related to either of them. So we'll cover that.

Male: OK.

Adeela Khan: Are there any other question? OK. At this time, I just wanted to turn it over to the committee if there is any questions about any of the measure evaluations you've been looking at. This is really a time for you to kind of ask us questions on the criteria. And if you're having any – if you have any questions at all, please – this project is a little bit different on last time and that we've actually done preliminary evaluations for all of the measures so this is something new that NQF is introducing into all of our projects. And so, if you have any questions on that, we're more than happy to talk through with that.

The remainder of the call is really for you guys to ask any questions, you know, walking through the algorithm or anything.

Elisa Munthali: So this is Elisa. Well, you may be thinking of questions to ask. So we just want to get from you your general feeling about our staff analysis that we had as Adeela said. This is the first time with this first round of project. So all of our consensus development project in which we've introduced this resource. It was based on recommendations that came from both a developer, a measure developer advisory panel and a steering committee advisory panel in which they (inaudible) to ask to help disseminate some of the – break down some of the information in the measure submission form.

So, we do hope it's valuable for you as we go through this process for this round of measure review, we will be asking you what you think, so we can assess, you know, where we can make some improvement. So any feedback you have on the announcing will be great.

Adeela Khan: So we aren't hearing any questions. I'm assuming them that there are none. And everyone ...

Female: We're saving everything for the 22nd. We don't want to – w want to create some excitement. You know what I mean? We got to create some excitement when we come to D.C. So don't get too comfortable today.

Elisa Munthali: Well, you can always call us in between now and the 22nd if you have any questions, if you need some clarity, if there's something about the algorithm you have a question on, or our criteria, we'll be happy to answer those questions.

Adeela Khan: Yes. And actually, as part of the slide deck, we did include some key points for our process measures and outcome measures. We'll be sure to send reply out to you so that you have it handy in there as well.

But if there are no questions, then I'll turn it over to Kaitlynn to walk us through our next step.

Jacqueline Moline: Can I – hi. Good morning everyone. It's (Jacky) Moline. Happy spring. You are going to send the slides out?

Adeela Khan: Yes. We'll be sending them out.

Jacqueline Moline: But to really – I mean, I'm (scrolling) up faster than I can read but that's cool. They're really wonderful in terms of what you want us to summarize, so I would love to have them.

Adeela Khan: Absolutely. We'll send them out right after this call.

Jacqueline Moline: Terrific. Thank you so much.

Adeela Khan: Yes. I mean, is there anything in particular you wanted to walk through or you just want ...

Jacqueline Moline: No, no, no. I just – you know, when you're going to the measures and you're trying to figure out what you're supposed to be putting into various sections, sometimes the nomenclature if it doesn't come naturally to us it helps to have what the slides seemed to be covering.

Adeela Khan: Yes, no problem. We'll send them out. I'll turn it over to Kaitlynn.

Kaitlynn Robinson-Ector: OK. So I'll just speak in over important upcoming days for the project. So, committee preliminary evaluations are due April 10th. You all – will be receiving meeting materials for the in-person by April 14th. And the in-person meeting is taking place April 22nd. And if we need – so we already have scheduled the in-person meeting follow up for April 30th.

The post meeting commenting period will be taking place May 29th through June 29th. And the post comment calls for that comment period will be taking place on July 16th.

The NQF member voting period takes place July 29th to August 12th. CSAC will be taking place on September 8th. The measures will go to the Executive Committee on October 1st. And the appeals period will take place between October 12th and November 10th.

And so, we also just wanted to remind you all that for the in-person meeting, please register with (Steven). And if you all need that e-mail again with that information, we can get that out to you. And then also we just wanted to make sure that you all have the in-person meetings, the follow up meeting call, the post comment call on your calendars. And if you don't, we can send out an Outlook invitation again.

Adeela Khan: The last thing I actually wanted to share you as an upcoming event for NQF members. Our membership department is actually holding a webinar on Quality Measurement 101: The Basics. That will be held April 16th, from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. This is just a quick overview of what that webinar is going to be covering and we have a link for you below, where you can actually go ahead and register for that event.

But if you have any questions, feel free to e-mail me and I'll get you in touch with our membership team. And, you know, I think it'll be a really good session for anyone who's really looking to get some more information on quality measurement and the use of quality measurement in healthcare.

- Female: Just a quick question, is this – is the link available on your website as well, because clicking it now it won't (roll up)?
- Adeela Khan: Right. I will – I can send it via e-mail. It's not available on the website but – it is available on the website but I don't think you're able to find it on our website. So I can send you an e-mail with the information. So I'll send the slide deck and a link to this webinar.
- Female: Fantastic.

(Crosstalk)
- Adeela Khan: Yes.
- Renee Frazier: This is Renee. You said you'd send out a follow up meeting, calendar invite for the 30th?
- Adeela Khan: Yes. And so you should have it on your calendar. If not, we'll be happy to send that again.
- Renee Frazier: Yes. And I know I have a conflict, I'm in a (inaudible) meeting actually in D.C., so I may have declined it, because that's on my calendar but send it again because if there's anyway I can in, I'll try to call in.
- Adeela Khan: Sure. And that meeting is really – it's only if necessary. It's usually we schedule it ahead of time in case we don't get through everything at the in-person meeting.
- Renee Frazier: That's right.
- Adeela Khan: So, we don't have a packed agenda for our in-person meeting, so we think it will be fine but we do have it scheduled. So we will most likely be canceling that call.
- Renee Frazier: So if I vaguely remember the last – the process that was done before. I want to make sure I don't missing things that they're – that you have – for measure which is what Elisa was making, clarifying for me. Typically, you guys create

small work teams then we have homework before the meeting. Do we have homework before the 22nd?

Adeela Khan: Yes. So we are asking that you complete preliminary evaluation by April 10th. And we sent out ...

Renee Frazier: OK.

Adeela Khan: ... workgroup assignment I believe a week ago, maybe ...

Renee Frazier: Yes. Something – I vaguely remember it, but it thought I put in the file to look at later.

Adeela Khan: Sure. And ...

Renee Frazier: So we have some homework and we have work assignments. We have a group assignments.

Adeela Khan: Yes.

Renee Frazier: OK. I need to look. OK.

Adeela Khan: Are there any other questions?

Thomas McInerney: This is Tom again. It may be worthwhile to send out those work assignments once more just to remind people and remind on that evaluation to do by April 10th.

Renee Frazier: I think, yes.

Male: I think that's a good idea.

Renee Frazier: Yes. Some people (inaudible) trying to do their taxes.

Adeela Khan: Yes. It's the tax season. It's spring break. All right. If there aren't anymore questions then we can give you back an hour and a half of your time.

Renee Frazier: Good. Great.

(Crosstalk)

Adeela Khan: All right. Thank you so much.

Renee Frazier: Thank you.

Male: Thank you.

Male: Thank you.

Female: Thanks.

END