



Measure Applications Partnership Hospital Workgroup In-Person Meeting December 14, 2017 9:00 am – 5:00 pm ET

Participant Instructions:

Materials for all MAP Workgroup meetings are available on the <u>NQF Public SharePoint Page</u> as well as the project web pages.

Participant Instructions:

Streaming Audio Playback http://nqf.commpartners.com/se/Meetings/Playback.aspx?meeting.id=171694

Meeting Objectives:

- Review and provide input on Measures Under Consideration for federal programs applicable to the hospital setting
- Discuss strategic issues related to hospital care

8:30 am Breakfast

- 9:00 am Welcome, Introductions, Disclosures of Interest, and Review of Meeting Objectives Cristie Upshaw Travis, MAP Hospital Workgroup Co-Chair Ronald Walters, MAP Hospital Workgroup Co-Chair Melissa Mariñelarena, Senior Director, NQF
- 9:15 am CMS Opening Remarks and Review of Meaningful Measures Framework *Pierre Yong, CMS*
- 9:45 am Overview of Pre-Rulemaking Approach Melissa Mariñelarena, Senior Director, NQF Kate McQueston, Project Manager, NQF Desmirra Quinnonez, Project Analyst, NQF
 - MAP will use a three step approach:
 - Provide program overview
 - o Review current measures
 - Evaluate Measures Under Consideration (MUC) for what they would add to the program measure set
 - Review of decision categories and guidance on refine and resubmit

PAGE 2

10:00 amOverview of the End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (ESRD QIP)Program and Opportunity for Public Comment on Measures Under Consideration

10:10 am Pre-Rulemaking Input for ESRD QIP

• MUC17-176: Medication Reconciliation for Patients Receiving Care at Dialysis Facilities

• Discussants:

- Anna Dopp, Pharmacy Quality Alliance
- Helen Haskell, Mothers Against Medical Error
- Paul Conway, American Association of Kidney Patients
- MUC17-241: Percentage of Prevalent Patients Waitlisted (PPPW)
 - Discussants:
 - Gregory Alexander, Individual Subject Matter Expert
 - Keith Bellovich, Kidney Care Partners
 - Martin Hatlie, Project Patient Care
- MUC17-245: Standardized First Kidney Transplant Waitlist Ratio for Incident Dialysis Patients (SWR)
 - Discussants:
 - Elizabeth Evans, Individual Subject Matter Expert
 - Mary Ellen Guinan, America's Essential Hospitals
 - Sarah Nolan, Service Employees International Union
- 10:55 am Break
- 11:10 am Overview of the Prospective Payment System (PPS)-Exempt Cancer Hospital Quality Reporting (PCHQR) Program and Opportunity for Public Comment on Measures Under Consideration
- 11:20 am Pre-Rulemaking Input for PPS-PCHQR
 - MUC17-178: 30-Day Unplanned Readmissions for Cancer Patients

 Discussants:
 - Lindsey Wisham, Individual Subject Matter Expert
 - R. Sean Morrison, Individual Subject Matter Expert
 - Wei Ying, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts
- 11:40 pm Overview of the Ambulatory Surgery Center Quality Reporting (ASCQR) Program and Opportunity for Public Comment on Measures Under Consideration
- 11:50 pm Pre-Rulemaking Input for ASCQR
 - MUC17-233: Hospital Visits following General Surgery Ambulatory Surgical Center Procedures
 - Discussants:

PAGE 3			
	Janis Orlowski, Association of American Medical Colleges		
	 Jeff Jacobs, The Society of Thoracic Surgeons 		
	 Kimberly Glassman, Nursing Alliance for Quality Care 		
12:20 pm	Overview of the Hospital Outpatient Quality Reporting Program (HOQR) and Opportunity for Public Comment on Measures Under Consideration		
12:30 pm	Pre-Rulemaking Input for HOQR		
	 MUC17-223: Lumbar Spine Imaging for Low Back Pain Discussants: Aisha Pittman, Premier, Inc. Ann Marie Sullivan, Individual Subject Matter Expert Joan Brennan, Geisinger Health System 		
1:00 pm	Lunch		
1:45 PM	Overview of the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (HIQR) Program and Medicare and Medicaid EHR Incentive Program for Hospitals and Critical Access Hospitals (CAHs) (Meaningful Use) and Opportunity for Public Comment on Measures Under Consideration		
1:55 pm	Pre-Rulemaking Input for HIQR		
	 MUC17-210: Hospital Harm Performance Measure: Opioid Related Adverse Respiratory Events Discussants: Brock Slabach, National Rural Health Association Jack Jordan, Individual Subject Matter Expert Lee Fleisher, Individual Subject Matter Expert 		
	 MUC17-195: Hospital-Wide All-Cause Risk Standardized Mortality Measure Discussants: Andrea Benin , Children's Hospital Association 		

- Karen Shehade, Medtronic-Minimally Invasive Therapy Group
- Marisa Valdes, Baylor Scott & White Health (BSWH)
- MUC17-196: Hybrid Hospital-Wide All-Cause Risk Standardized Mortality Measure

 Discussants:
 - Frank Ghinassi, National Association of Psychiatric Health Systems (NAPHS)
 - Marsha Manning, University of Michigan
 - Nancy Foster, American Hospital Association

PAGE 4

- 3:00 pm Overview of Hospital-Acquired Condition (HAC) Reduction Program and Discussion of Future Measures Reena Duseja, CMS Joseph Clift, CMS
- 3:30 pm Input on Measure Removal Criteria
- 4:10 pm Public Comment
- **4:20 pm MAP Rural Health Introduction and Presentation** *Karen Johnson, Senior Director, NQF*
 - Introduce and discuss the newly created MAP Rural Health Workgroup

4:40 pm Summary of Day and Next Steps Cristie Upshaw Travis, MAP Hospital Workgroup Co-Chair Ronald Walters, MAP Hospital Workgroup Co-Chair Desmirra Quinnonez, Project Analyst, NQF

5:00 pm Adjourn



Measure Applications Partnership

Hospital Workgroup In-Person Meeting

December 14, 2017

Welcome, Introductions, Disclosures of Interest and Review of Meeting Objectives

Measure Applications Partnership convened by the National Quality Forum

MAP Hospital Workgroup Members

Workgroup Chairs (voting)				
Cristie Upshaw Travis, MSHHA				
Ronald S. Walters, MD, MBA, MHA, MS				
Organizational Members (voting)	Organizational Representative			
American Association of Kidney Patients*	Paul Conway			
American Hospital Association	Nancy Foster			
America's Essential Hospitals	Maryellen Guinan, J.D.			
Association of American Medical Colleges*	Janis Orlowski, MD MACP			
Baylor Scott & White Health	Marisa Valdes, RN, MSN			
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts	Wei Ying, MD, MS, MBA			
Children's Hospital Association	Andrea Benin, MD			
Geisinger Health System	Joan Brennan, DNP			
Kidney Care Partners	Keith Bellovich, MD			
Medtronic-Minimally Invasive Therapy Group	Karen Shehade, MBA			

*indicates new member organizations

MAP Hospital Workgroup Members

Organizational Members (con't)	Organizational Representative
Mothers Against Medical Error	Helen Haskell, MA
National Association of Psychiatric Health Systems	Frank Ghinassi, PhD, ABPP
National Rural Health Association	Brock Slabach, MPH, FACHE
Nursing Alliance for Quality Care	Kimberly Glassman, PhD, RN, NEA-BC, FAAN
Pharmacy Quality Alliance	Anna Dopp, PharmD
Premier, Inc.	Aisha Pittman, MPH
Project Patient Care	Martin Hatlie, JD
Service Employees International Union	Sarah Nolan
The Society of Thoracic Surgeons	Jeff Jacobs, MD
University of Michigan	Marsha Manning

MAP Hospital Workgroup Members

Individual Subject Matter Experts (voting)				
Nursing	Gregory Alexander, PhD, RN, FAAN			
Renal	Elizabeth Evans, DNP			
Measure Methodology	Lee Fleisher, MD			
Patient Safety	Jack Jordon			
Palliative Care	R. Sean Morrison, MD			
Mental Health	Ann Marie Sullivan, MD			
Health Informatics	Lindsey Wisham, BA, MPA			
Federal Government Liaisons (non-voting)				
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)	Pam Owens, PhD			
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)	Dan Pollock, MD			
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS)	Pierre Yong, MD, MPH			

MAP Hospital Workgroup Staff Support Team

- Melissa Mariñelarena: Senior Director
- Kate McQueston: Project Manager
- Desmirra Quinnonez: Project Analyst

Project Email: MAPHospital@qualityforum.org

Agenda (Morning):

- Welcome, Introductions, Disclosures of Interest, and Review of Meeting Objectives
- CMS Opening Remarks and Review of Meaningful Measures Framework
- Overview of Pre-Rulemaking Approach Pre-Rulemaking Input:
 - ESRD QIP
 - PPS-PCHQR
 - ASCQR
 - HOQR

Agenda (Afternoon):

- Lunch
- Pre-Rulemaking Input
 - □ HIQR
- Overview of Hospital-Acquired Condition (HAC) Reduction Program and Discussion of Future Measures
- Input on Measure Removal Criteria
- MAP Rural Health Introduction and Presentation
- Summary of Day and Next Steps

Meeting Objectives



CMS Opening Remarks and Review of Meaningful Measures Framework

Measure Applications Partnership convened by the National Quality forum





Meaningful Measures







December 14, 2017

Jean Moody-Williams, RN, MPP Pierre Yong, MD, MPH, MS Theodore G Long, MD, MHS

A New Approach to Meaningful Outcomes



Meaningful Measures Objectives

Meaningful Measures focus everyone's efforts on the same quality areas and lend specificity, which can help:

- Address high impact measure areas that safeguard public health
- Patient-centered and <u>meaningful to patients</u>
- Outcome-based where possible
- Relevant for and <u>meaningful to providers</u>
- Minimize level of <u>burden for providers</u>
 - Remove measures where performance is already very high and that are low value
- <u>Significant opportunity for improvement</u>
- Address measure needs for <u>population based payment through</u> alternative payment models
- <u>Align across programs and/or with other payers</u> (Medicaid, commercial payers)

Meaningful Measures Framework

Meaningful Measure Areas Achieve:

- <u>High quality</u> healthcare
- ✓ Meaningful outcomes for patients

Criteria meaningful for patients and actionable for providers

Draws on measure work by:

- Health Care Payment Learning and Action Network
- National Quality Forum *High Impact Outcomes*
- National Academies of Medicine *IOM Vital Signs Core Metrics*

Includes perspectives from experts and external stakeholders:

- Core Quality Measures Collaborative
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
- Many other external stakeholders

Quality Measures

Use Meaningful Measures to Achieve Goals, while Minimizing Burden



Measure Applications Partnership convened by the National Quality Forum

Meaningful Measures



Measure Applications Partnership convened by the National Quality forum

Make Care Safer by Reducing Harm Caused in the Delivery of Care



Strengthen Person & Family Engagement as Partners in their Care The Percent of Long-Term Care



Measure Applications Partnership convened by the National Quality forum

Promote Effective Communication & Coordination of Care



Medication Reconciliation

Promote Effective Prevention & Treatment of Chronic Disease

Influenza Immunization

Received for Current Flu

Timeliness of Prenatal Care



Work with Communities to Promote Best Practices of Healthy Living



Home Health Quality Reporting Program (HH QRP) Skilled Nursing Facility Quality Reporting Program (SNF QRP) Long-Term Care Hospital Quality Reporting Program (LTCH QRP) Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Quality Reporting Program (IRF QRP)

Make Care Affordable



Meaningful Measures Next Steps

- Get stakeholder input to further improve the Meaningful Measures framework
- Work across CMS components to implement the framework
- Evaluate current measure sets and inform measure development



Meaningful Measures Summary



Meaningful Measure Areas

Guiding CMS's efforts to achieve better health and healthcare for the patients and families we serve

Give us your feedback!

Pierre.Yong@cms.hhs.gov Theodore.Long@cms.hhs.gov



Meaningful Measures

Question & Answer

To ask a question, please dial:

1-877-388-2064



Measure Applications Partnership convened by the National Quality forum

MAP Pre-Rulemaking Approach Kate McQueston, Project Manager, NQF

Approach

The approach to the analysis and selection of measures is a three-step process:

- Provide program overview
- Review current measures
- Evaluate MUCs for what they would add to the program measure set

Evaluate Measures Under Consideration

- MAP Workgroups must reach a decision about every measure under consideration
 - Decision categories are standardized for consistency
 - Each decision should be accompanied by one or more statements of rationale that explains why each decision was reached

Preliminary Analysis of Measures Under Consideration

To facilitate MAP's consent calendar voting process, NQF staff will conduct a preliminary analysis of each measure under consideration.

The preliminary analysis is an algorithm that asks a series of questions about each measure under consideration. This algorithm was:

- Developed from the MAP Measure Selection Criteria, and approved by the MAP Coordinating Committee, to evaluate each measure
- Intended to provide MAP members with a succinct profile of each measure and to serve as a starting point for MAP discussions

MAP Measure Selection Criteria

1	NQF-endorsed measures are required for program measure sets, unless no relevant endorsed measures are available to achieve a critical program objective
2	Program measure set adequately addresses each of the National Quality Strategy's three aims
3	Program measure set is responsive to specific program goals and requirements
4	Program measure set includes an appropriate mix of measure types
5	Program measure set enables measurement of person- and family-centered care and services
6	Program measure set includes considerations for healthcare disparities and cultural competency
7	Program measure set promotes parsimony and alignment

MAP Decision Categories

Decision Category	Evaluation Criteria
Support for Rulemaking	The measure is fully developed and tested in the setting where it will be applied and meets assessments 1-6 of the MAP Preliminary Analysis Algorithm. If the measure is in current use, it also meets assessment 7.
Conditional Support for Rulemaking	The measure is fully developed and tested and meets assessments 1-6. MAP will provide a rationale that outlines the conditions (e.g., NQF endorsement) based on assessments 4-7 (reference Table 2 below) that should be met. Ideally the conditions specified by MAP would be met before the measure is proposed for use. However, the Secretary retains policy discretion to propose the measure. CMS may address the MAP-specified conditions without resubmitting the measure to MAP prior to rulemaking.
Refine and Resubmit for Rulemaking	The measure meets assessments 1-3, but needs modifications. A designation of this decision category assumes at least one assessment 4-7 is not met. MAP will provide a rationale that outlines each suggested refinement (e.g., measure is not fully developed and tested OR there are opportunities for improvement under evaluation). Ideally the modifications suggested by MAP would be made before the measure is proposed for use. However, the Secretary retains policy discretion to propose the measure. CMS may address the MAP-specified refinements without resubmitting the measure to the MAP prior to rulemaking. CMS may informally, without deliberations and voting, review these refinements via the "feedback loop" with the MAP. These updates may occur during the web meetings of the MAP workgroups scheduled annually in the fall.
Do Not Support for Rulemaking	The measure under consideration does not meet one or more of assessments 1-3.

Guidance on Refine and Resubmit

- Concerns were raised about this category during the fall web meetings
- The Coordinating Committee created this category with the thought that MUCs receiving this designation would be brought back to MAP before implementation.
- HHS Secretary has statutory authority to propose measures after considering MAP's recommendations.
- The feedback loop was implemented to provide MAP members updates on measures on prior MUC lists.
- The Coordinating Committee will review the decision categories at their January meeting.
Guidance on Refine and Resubmit

- The Coordinating Committee discussed the concerns raised by the Workgroups during its 11/30 meeting
 - Reiterated the intent of the decision was to support the concept of a measure but recognize a potentially significant issue that should be addressed before implementation
- The Committee suggested this category should be used judiciously
 - The Coordinating Committee recommended that the Workgroups use this decision when a measure needs a substantive change
 - The Committee also noted the need for Workgroups to clarify the suggested refinement to the measure

MAP Voting Instructions

Key Voting Principles

- MAP has established a consensus threshold of greater than 60 percent of participants.
 - Multiple stakeholder groups would need to agree to reach this threshold.
 - Abstentions do not count in the denominator.
- Every measure under consideration receives a decision, either individually or as part of a slate of measures.
 - All measures are voted on or accepted as parted of the consent calendar.
- Workgroups and will be expected to reach a decision on every measure under consideration. There will not be a category of "split decisions" that would mean the Coordinating Committee decides on that measure. However, the Coordinating Committee may decide to continue discussion on a particularly important matter of program policy or strategy.

Key Voting Principles

- After introductory presentations from staff and the chair to give context to each programmatic discussion, voting will begin.
- The in-person meeting Discussion Guide will organize content as follows:
 - Measures under consideration will be divided into a series of related groups for the purposes of discussion and voting. The groups are likely to be organized around programs (Hospital and PAC/LTC) or condition categories (Clinician/Medicaid).
- Each measure under consideration will have been subject to a preliminary staff analysis based on a decision algorithm approved by the Coordinating Committee.
 - The discussion guide will note the result of the preliminary analysis (i.e., support, do not support, or conditional support, refine and resubmit) and provide rationale to support how that conclusion was reached.

Voting Procedure

Step 1. Staff will review a Preliminary Analysis Consent Calendar

 Staff will present each group of measures as a consent calendar reflecting the result of the preliminary analysis using MAP selection criteria and programmatic objectives

Voting Procedure

Step 2. MUCs can be pulled from the Consent Calendar and become regular agenda items

- The co-chairs will ask the Workgroup members to identify any MUCs they would like to pull off the consent calendar. Any Workgroup member can ask that one or more MUCs on the consent calendar be removed for individual discussion. Workgroup members are asked to identify any MUCs to be pulled off for individual discussion prior to the in-person meeting, if possible.
- Workgroup members should clarify if they are pulling a measure for discussion only or if they disagree with the preliminary analysis and would like to vote on a new motion.
- Measures pulled for discussion will focus on resolving clarifying questions.
 - If during the course of discussion, a workgroup member determines the discussion has shown the need for a new vote a workgroup member can put forward a motion.
- Potential reasons members can pull measures:
 - Disagreement with the preliminary analysis
 - New information is available that would change the results of the algorithm
- Once all measures that the Workgroup would like to discuss are removed from the consent calendar, the co-chair will ask if there is any objection to accepting the preliminary analysis and recommendation of the MUCs remaining on the consent calendar
- If a measure is not removed from the consent calendar the associated recommendations will be accepted without discussion

Voting Procedure

Step 3. Discussion and Voting on Measures Identified for a New Motion

- Workgroup member(s) who identified the need for discussion describe their perspective on the use of the measure and how it differs from the preliminary recommendation in the discussion guide.
 - If a motion is for conditional support or refine and resubmit the member making the motion should clarify and announce the conditions or suggested refinements.
- Workgroup member(s) assigned as lead discussant(s) for the relevant group of measures will be asked to respond to the individual(s) who requested discussion. Lead discussant(s) should state their own point of view, whether or not it is in agreement with the preliminary recommendation or the divergent opinion.
- The co-chair will then open for discussion among the Workgroup. Other workgroup members should participate in the discussion to make their opinions known. However, one should refrain from repeating points already presented by others in the interest of time.
- After the discussion, the Workgroup member who made the motion has the option to withdraw the motion. Otherwise, the Workgroup will be asked to vote on the motion.
 - If the motion is for conditional support or refine and resubmit the chair can accept additional conditions or suggested refinement based on the Workgroup's discussion.
 - If the named conditions or refinements directly contradict each other, the chair should ask for a separate motion after the original motion has been subject to a vote.

Voting Procedure Step 4: Tallying the Votes

- If the motion put forward by the workgroup member receives greater than 60% of the votes, the motion will pass and the measure will receive that decision.
- If the motion does not receive greater than 60% of the votes, the co-Chairs will resume discussion to develop another motion. To start discussion, the co-chairs will ask for another motion. If that motion receives greater than 60% of the votes, the motion will pass. If not, discussion will resume.
- If a no motion put forward by the Workgroup achieves greater than 60% the preliminary analysis decision will stand.
- Abstentions are discouraged but will not count in the denominator

MAP Approach to Pre-Rulemaking: A look at what to expect



Pre-Rulemaking Input

MAP Hospital Workgroup Charge: Programs to be Discussed During Today's Meeting



End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (ESRD QIP)

End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (ESRD QIP)

Program Type:

Pay for performance and public reporting

Incentive Structure:

 As of 2012, payments to dialysis facilities are reduced if facilities do not meet or exceed the required total performance score.
 Payment reductions will be on a sliding scale, which could amount to a maximum of two percent per year.

Program Goals:

 Improve the quality of dialysis care and produce better outcomes for beneficiaries.

ESRD QIP: Current Program Measure Information



Туре	NQF ID	Measure Title	NQF Status
Process	0255	Serum Phosphorus Reporting Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	1454 Proportion of Patients with Hypercalcemia		Endorsed
Outcome	Based on NQF 1460	National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Bloodstream Infection in Hemodialysis Patients	Endorsed
Outcome	1463	Standardized Hospitalization Ratio (SHR) Clinical Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	2496	Standardized Readmission Ratio (SRR) for dialysis facilities	Endorsed
Outcome	2978 ★	Hemodialysis Vascular Access: Long Term Catheter Rate Clinical Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	2977 🔶	Hemodialysis Vascular Access: Standardized Fistula Rate Clinical Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	0258	CAHPS In-Center Hemodialysis Survey	Endorsed
Outcome	2979	Anemia of chronic kidney disease: Dialysis facility standardized transfusion ratio (STrR)	Endorsed
Process	Based on NQF 0431	NHSN Healthcare Personnel Influenza Vaccination Reporting Measure	Not Endorsed
Process	Based on NQF 0418	Clinical Depression Screening and Follow-Up Reporting Measure	Not Endorsed
Outcome	Based on NQF 0420	Kt/V Dialysis Adequacy Comprehensive Clinical Measure	Not Endorsed
Process	N/A	Pain Assessment and Follow-up Reporting Measure	Not Endorsed
Structural	N/A	National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Dialysis Event Reporting Measure	Not Endorsed
Process	N/A	Ultrafiltration Reporting Measure	Not Endorsed
Outcome	N/A	Anemia Management Reporting Measure	Not Endorsed

High Priority Domains for ESRD

CMS identified the following domains as high-priority for future measure consideration:



Source: Center for Clinical Standards and Quality. 2017 Measures under Consideration List. Program Specific Measure Priorities and Needs. Baltimore, MD: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS); 2017.

Public Comment

End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (ESRD QIP)

Consent Calendar 1:

- MUC17-176: Medication Reconciliation for Patients Receiving Care at Dialysis Facilities
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Support for Rulemaking
- MUC17-241: Percentage of Prevalent Patients Waitlisted (PPPW)
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Conditional Support for Rule Making
- MUC17-245: Standardized First Kidney Transplant Waitlist Ratio for Incident Dialysis Patients (SWR)
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Conditional Support for Rule Making

PPS-Exempt Cancer Hospital Quality Reporting Program (PCHQR)

PPS-Exempt Cancer Hospital Quality Reporting Program (PCHQR)

Program Type:

Quality Reporting Program

Incentive Structure:

 PCHQR is a voluntary quality reporting program. Data are published on Hospital Compare

Program Goals:

- Provide information about the quality of care in cancer hospitals, in particular the 11 cancer hospitals that are exempt from the Inpatient Prospective Payment System and the Inpatient Quality Reporting Program
- Encourage hospitals and clinicians to improve the quality of their care, to share information, and to learn from each other's experiences and best practices

PCHQR : Current Program Measure Information

Туре	NQF ID	Measure Title	NQF Status
Outcome	0166	66 HCAHPS - Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems Survey	
Outcome	0138	National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Catheter-Associated Urinary Tract Infection(CAUTI) Outcome Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	0139	National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Central line-associated Bloodstream Infection End (CLABSI) Outcome Measure	
Outcome	0753	American College of Surgeons – Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (ACS-CDC) Harmonized Procedure Specific Surgical Site Infection (SSI) Outcome Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	1717	National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Facility-wide Inpatient Hospital-onset Clostridium difficile Infection (CDI) Outcome Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	1716	National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Facility-Wide Inpatient Hospital-onset Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) Bacteremia Outcome Measure	Endorsed
Outcome	2936	Admissions and Emergency Department (ED) Visits for Patients Receiving Outpatient	Failed
		Chemotherapy1	Endorsement
Process	0384	Oncology: Medical and Radiation - Pain Intensity Quantified	Endorsed
Process	0383	Oncology: Plan of Care for Pain – Medical Oncology and Radiation Oncology	Endorsed
Process	0382	Oncology: Radiation Dose Limits to Normal Tissues2	Endorsed
Process	0390	Prostate Cancer: Adjuvant Hormonal Therapy for High Risk Prostate Cancer Patients	Endorsed
Process	0389	Prostate Cancer: Avoidance of Overuse of Bone Scan for Staging Low Risk Prostate Cancer Patients	Endorsed
Process	1822	External Beam Radiotherapy for Bone Metastases	Endorsed
Process	0431	Influenza Vaccination Coverage among Healthcare Personnel	Endorsed
Intermediate Outcome	0216	Proportion of Patients Who Died from Cancer Admitted to Hospice for Less Than Three Days	Endorsed

PCHQR : Current Program Measure Information



Туре	NQF ID	Measure Title	NQF Status
Intermediate		Proportion of Patients Who Died from Cancer Receiving Chemotherapy in	
Outcome	0210 🗡	the Last 14 Days of Life	Endorsed
Intermediate		Proportion of Patients Who Died from Cancer Admitted to the ICU in the	
Outcome	0213 🗡	Last 30 Days of Life	Endorsed
Intermediate			
Outcome	0215 🧡	Proportion of Patients Who Died from Cancer Not Admitted to Hospice	Endorsed
Intermediate		Proportion of patients who died from cancer admitted to hospice for less	
Outcome	0216 🗡	than 3 days	Endorsed
Process	0559	Combination chemotherapy is considered or administered within 4	Endorsed
	-	months (120 days) of diagnosis for women under 70 with AJCC T1cN0M0,	
		or Stage IB - III hormone receptor negative breast cancer	
Process	0220 ★	Adjuvant Hormonal Therapy	Endorsed
Process	0223	Adjuvant Chemotherapy is Considered or Administered Within 4 Months	Endorsed
		(120 days) of Diagnosis to Patients Under the Age of 80 with AJCC III	
		(lymph node positive) Colon Cancer	

High Priority Domains for Cancer Hospitals

CMS identified the following categories as high-priority for future measure consideration:



Hospital MAP 2016-2017 Identified Gaps:

Global
HarmInformed
Consent

Source: Center for Clinical Standards and Quality. 2016 Measures under Consideration List. Program Specific Measure Priorities and Needs. Baltimore, MD: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS); 2016.

Public Comment

PPS-Exempt Cancer Hospital Quality Reporting Program (PCHQR)

Consent Calendar 2:

- MUC17-178: 30-Day Unplanned Readmissions for Cancer Patients
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Support for Rulemaking

Ambulatory Surgical Center Quality Reporting Program (ASCQR)

Ambulatory Surgical Center Quality Reporting Program (ASCQR)

Program Type:

Pay for reporting and public reporting

Incentive Structure:

 Ambulatory surgical centers (ACSs) that do not participate or fail to meet program requirements receive 2.0 % reduction in annual payment update

Program Goals:

- Promote higher quality, more efficient health care for Medicare beneficiaries through measurement
- Allow consumers to find and compare the quality of care given at ASCs to inform decisions on where to get care

ASCQR :Current Measure Set



Туре	NQF #	Measure Title	NQF Status
Outcome	0263	ASC-1: Patient Burn	Endorsed
Process	0659	ASC-10: Endoscopy/Polyp Surveillance: Colonoscopy Interval for Patients with a Histor of Adenomatous Polyps – Avoidance of Inappropriate Use	y Endorsed
Outcome	1536	ASC-11: Cataracts: Improvement in Patient's Visual Function within 90 Days Following Cataract Surgery	Endorsed
Outcome	2539	ASC-12: Facility 7-Day Risk-Standardized Hospital Visit Rate after Outpatient Colonoscopy	Endorsed
Outcome	N/A	ASC-13: Normothermia Outcome.	Not Endorsed
Outcome	N/A	ASC-14: Unplanned Anterior Vitrectomy.	Not Endorsed
Outcome	0266	ASC-2: Patient Fall	Endorsed
Outcome	0267	ASC-3:Wrong Site, Wrong Side, Wrong Patient, Wrong Procedure, Wrong Implant	Endorsed
Structural	0265	ASC-4: All-Cause Hospital Transfer/ Admission	Endorsed
Process	0431	ASC-8: Influenza Vaccination Coverage Among Healthcare Personnel	Endorsed
Process	0658	ASC-9: Endoscopy/Polyp Surveillance: Appropriate Follow-Up Interval for Normal Colonoscopy in Average Risk Patients	Endorsed
Outcome	N/A 🌱	ASC-15: Outpatient and Ambulatory Surgery Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (OAS CAHPS) Survey-based Measures (ASC-15a-e)	Not Endorsed
Outcome	N/A 🌱	ASC-16: Toxic Anterior Segment Syndrome	Not Endorsed
Intermediat Outcome	e N/A 🌱	ASC-17: Hospital Visits after Orthopedic Ambulatory Surgical Center Procedures	Not Endorsed
Intermediat Outcome	e N/A 🌱	ASC-18: Hospital Visits after Urology Ambulatory Surgical Center Procedures	Not Endorsed
Process	0264 🌱	ASC-5: Prophylactic Intravenous (IV) Antibiotic Timing	Endorsement Removed
Process	N/A 🤟	Karana ASC-6: Safe Surgery Checklist Use	Not Endorsed
Structural	N/A 🍞	ASC-7: Facility Volume Data on Selected ASC Surgical Procedures	Not Endorsed

High Priority Domains for ASCQR

CMS High Priority Domains for Future Measure Consideration

Making Care Safer	• Infection rates
Person and Family Engagement	 Improve experience of care for patients, caregivers, and families Promote patient self-management
Best Practice of Healthy Living	 Increase appropriate use of screening and prevention services Improve the quality of care for patients with multiple chronic conditions Improve behavioral health access and quality of care
Effective Prevention and Treatment	Surgical outcome measures
Communication/Care Coordination	 Embed best practice to manage transitions across practice settings Enable effective health care system navigation Reduce unexpected hospital/emergency visits and admissions

Public Comment

Ambulatory Surgical Center Quality Reporting Program (ASCQR)

Consent Calendar 3:

- MUC17-233: Hospital Visits following General Surgery Ambulatory Surgical Center Procedures
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Conditional Support for Rule Making

Hospital Outpatient Quality Reporting Program (HOQR)

Hospital Outpatient Quality Reporting Program (HOQR)

Program Type:

Pay for reporting and public reporting

Incentive Structure:

 Hospitals that do not report data on required measures receive a 2.0% reduction in annual payment update

Program Goals:

- Provide consumers with quality of care information to make more informed decisions about heath care options
- Establish a system for collecting and providing quality data to hospitals providing outpatient services such as emergency department visits, outpatient surgery and radiology services

HOQR: Current Program Measure Set

Туре	NQF #	Measure Title	NQF Status
Process	0498	Door to Diagnostic Evaluation by a Qualified Medical Professional	Endorsement Removed
Process	0662	Median Time to Pain Management for Long Bone Fracture Endorsed	
Process	0496	Median time from ED Arrival to ED Departure for Discharged ED Patients Endorsed	
Structural	0499	Left Without Being Seen Endorsement Remo	
Efficiency	0289	Median Time to ECG	Endorsement Removed
Process	0287	Median Time to Fibrinolysis	Endorsement Removed
Process	0288	Fibrinolytic Therapy Received Within 30 Minutes of ED Arrival	Endorsement Removed
Process	0290	Median Time to Transfer to Another Facility for Acute Coronary Intervention	Endorsed
Process	0286	Aspirin at Arrival	Endorsement Removed
		ED- Head CT or MRI Scan Results for Acute Ischemic Stroke or Hemorrhagic Stroke who	
Process	0661	Received Head CT or MRI Scan Interpretation Within 45 Minutes of Arrival	Endorsed
Efficiency	N/A	Mammography Follow-Up Rates	Not Endorsed
Efficiency	0513	Thorax CT- Use of Contrast Material	Endorsed
Efficiency	N/A	Abdomen CT - Use of Contrast Material	Not Endorsed
		Simultaneous Use of Brain Computed Tomography (CT) and Sinus Computed Tomography	
Efficiency	N/A	(CT)	Not Endorsed
Efficiency	0669	Cardiac Imaging for Preoperative Risk Assessment for Non-Cardiac Low-Risk Surgery	Endorsed
Outcome	0514	MRI Lumbar Spine for Low Back Pain	Endorsement Removed
Process	1822	External Beam Radiotherapy for Bone Metastases	Endorsed
Process	0658	Appropriate Follow-Up Interval for Normal Colonoscopy in Average Risk Patients	Endorsed
		Endoscopy/Polyp Surveillance: Colonoscopy Interval for Patients with a History of	
Process	0659	Adenomatous Polyps – Avoidance of Inappropriate Use	Endorsed
Outcome	2539	Facility 7-Day Risk-Standardized Hospital Visit Rate after Outpatient Colonoscopy	Endorsed
Structural	N/A	Safe Surgery Checklist Use	Not Endorsed
Structural	N/A	Hospital Outpatient Department Volume on Selected Outpatient Surgical Procedures	Not Endorsed
		Cataracts: Improvement in Patient's Visual Function within 90 Days Following Cataract	
Outcome	1536	Surgery	Endorsed
		The Ability for Providers with HIT to Receive Laboratory Data Electronically Directly into their	ſ
Structural	0489	ONC-Certified EHR System as Discrete Searchable Data Elements	Endorsement Removed
Structural	N/A	Tracking Clinical Results between Visits	Not Endorsed
Process	0431	Influenza Vaccination Coverage among Healthcare Personnel	Endorsed

High Priority Domains for HOQR

CMS High Priority Domains for Future Measure Consideration:

Making Care Safer	 Processes/outcomes designed to reduce risk in the delivery of health care (ED overcrowding/wait times)
Best Practices of Healthy Living	 Primary prevention of disease General screening for early detection of disease unrelated to a current or prior condition
Patient and Family Engagement	 Patient and family engagement in care Patient decision-making that reflects cultural sensitivity and patient preferences
Communication/Care Coordination	 Embed best practices to manage transitions across practice settings Enable effective health care system navigation Reduce unexpected hospital admissions and emergency room visits

Public Comment

Hospital Outpatient Quality Reporting Program (HOQR)

Consent Calendar 4:

- MUC17-223: Lumbar Spine Imaging for Low Back Pain
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Do Not Support for Rulemaking
Lunch

Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program (IQR) and Medicare and Medicaid EHR Incentive Program for Eligible Hospitals and Critical Access Hospitals (CAHs)

IQR - EHR Incentive Program

Program Type:

Pay for reporting and public reporting

Incentive Structure:

 Hospitals that do not participate or meet program requirements receive a ¼ reduction of the annual payment update

Program Goals:

- Progress towards paying providers based on the quality, rather than the quantity of care they give patients
- Interoperability between EHRs and CMS data collection
- To provide consumers information about hospital quality so they can make informed choices about their care

Type NQF #	Measure Title	NQF Status
Claims-based Outcome 0230	Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Acute Myocardial	Endorsed
	Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization	
Claims-based Outcome 2558	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Coronary Artery	Endorsed
	Bypass Graft (CABG) surgery	
Claims-based Outcome 1893	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Chronic Obstructive	Endorsed
	Pulmonary Disease (COPD) Hospitalization	
Claims-based Outcome 0229	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF)	Endorsed
	hospitalization.	
Claims-based Outcome 0468	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Pneumonia	Endorsed
	Hospitalization	
Claims-based Outcome N/A	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate Following Acute Ischemic Stroke	Not Endorsed
Claims-based Outcome 0505	Hospital 30-Day All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Acute Myocardial	Endorsed
	Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization	
Claims-based Outcome 2515	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Unplanned, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following	Endorsed
	Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG) Surgery	
Claims-based Outcome 1891	Hospital-Level, 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Chronic	Endorsed
	Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) Hospitalization	
Claims-based Outcome 0330	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Heart Failure (HF)	Endorsed
	Hospitalization.	
Claims-based Outcome 01789		Endorsed
Claims-based Outcome 0506	Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia	Endorsed
	Hospitalization.	
Claims-based Outcome N/A	30-Day Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate Following Stroke Hospitalization	Not Endorsed
laims-based Outcome 1551	Hospital-level 30 day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following elective primary	Endorsed
	total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)	
laims-based Outcome 2881	Excess Days in Acute Care after Hospitalization for Acute Myocardial Infarction	Endorsed
laims-based Outcome 2880	Excess Days in Acute Care after Hospitalization for Heart Failure	Endorsed
Claims-based Outcome 2882	Excess Days in Acute Care after Hospitalization for Pneumonia	Endorsed
laims-based Outcome 1550	Hospital-level risk-standardized complication rate (RSCR) following elective primary total hip	Endorsed
	arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA).	
Claims-based Outcome 0351	Death among Surgical Inpatients with Serious, Treatable Complications	Endorsed
Claims-based Outcome 0531	Patient Safety for Selected Indicators, Modified PSI 90 (Updated Title: Patient Safety and Adverse	Endorsed
	Events Composite)	

Туре	NQF #	Measure Title	NQF Status
		Hospital-level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for	
Cost/Resource Use	2431	Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)	Endorsed
		Hospital-level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care fo	r
Cost/Resource Use	2436	Heart Failure (HF)	Endorsed
		Hospital-level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode -of Care for	r
Cost/Resource Use	2579	Pneumonia	Endorsed
Cost/Resource Use	2158	Payment-Standardized Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB)	Endorsed
		Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 90-Day Episode -of Care	
Cost/Resource Use	N/A	for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)	Not Endorsed
Cost/Resource Use	N/A	Cellulitis Clinical Episode-Based Payment Measure	Not Endorsed
Cost/Resource Use	N/A	Gastrointestinal (GI) Hemorrhage Clinical Episode-Based Payment Measure	Not Endorsed
Cost/Resource Use	N/A	Kidney/Urinary Tract Infection Clinical Episode-Based Payment Measure	Not Endorsed
Cost/Resource Use	N/A	Aortic Aneurysm Procedure clinical episode-based payment (AA Payment) Measure	Not Endorsed
		Cholecystectomy and Common Duct Exploration Clinical Episode-Based Payment	
Cost/Resource Use	N/A	Measure	Not Endorsed
Cost/Resource Use	N/A	Spinal Fusion Clinical Episode-Based Payment Measure	Not Endorsed

*Both chart-abstracted and eCQM.

Туре	NQF #	Measure Title	NQF Status
eCQM Outcome	0495	Median Time from ED Arrival to ED Departure for Admitted ED Patients*	Endorsed
eCQM Process	0497	Admit Decision Time to ED Departure Time for Admitted Patients*	Endorsed
			Endorsement
eCQM Process	0163/3048	Primary PCI Received within 90 minutes of hospital arrival	Removed
			Endorsement
eCQM Process	0338	Home Management Plan of Care Document Given to Patient/Caregiver	Removed
eCQM Process	1354	Hearing screening before hospital discharge	Endorsed
eCQM Process	0469	Elective Delivery*	Endorsed
		Exclusive Breast Milk Feeding and the subset measure PC-05a Exclusive Breast	
eCQM Process	0480	Milk Feeding Considering Mother's Choice	Endorsed
eCQM Process	0435/3042	Discharged on Antithrombotic Therapy	Endorsed-Reserve
eCQM Process	0436/3043	Anticoagulation Therapy for Atrial Fibrillation/Flutter	Endorsed-Reserve
eCQM Process	0438/3045	Antithrombotic Therapy by the End of Hospital Day Two	Endorsed-Reserve
eCQM Process	0439	Discharged on Statin Medication	Endorsed
			Endorsement
eCQM Process	0440	Stroke Education	Removed
eCQM Process	0441	Assessed for Rehabilitation	Endorsed-Reserve
eCQM Process	0371	Venous Thromboembolism Prophylaxis	Endorsed
eCQM Process	0372/2933	Intensive Care Unit Venous Thromboembolism Prophylaxis	Endorsed

*Both chart-abstracted and eCQM.

Туре	NQF #	Ν	Measure Title	NQF Status
Chart-abstracted				
Composite	0500	S	Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock: Management Bundle (Composite Measure)	Endorsed
Chart-abstracted				
Outcome	0495	Ν	Median Time from ED Arrival to ED Departure for Admitted ED Patients*	Endorsed
Chart-abstracted				Endorsement
Outcome	0376	li	ncidence of Potentially Preventable Venous Thromboembolism	Removed
Chart-abstracted Process	0497	A	Admit Decision Time to ED Departure Time for Admitted Patients*	Endorsed
Chart-abstracted Process	1659	lı	nfluenza immunization	Endorsed
Chart-abstracted Process	0469	E	Elective Delivery	Endorsed
		۲ 🛧	Hybrid Hospital-Wide Readmission Measure with Claims and Electronic Health	
Outcome	2879	F	Record Data	Endorsed
		★ ト	HCAHPS - Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems	
Patient Survey	0166	S	Survey	Endorsed
Patient Survey	0228	3	3-Item Care Transitions Measure (CTM-3)	Endorsed
Process	0431	li	Influenza Vaccination Coverage Among Healthcare Personnel	Endorsed
Structural	N/A	F	Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture	Not Endorsed
Structural	N/A	S	Safe Surgery Checklist Use	Not Endorsed
NHSN Outcome	0138	Ν	NHSN Catheter-Associated Urinary Tract Infection (CAUTI) Outcome Measure	Endorsed
		Ν	NHSN Facility-wide Inpatient Hospital-onset Clostridium difficile Infection (CDI)	
NHSN Outcome	1717	C	Outcome Measure	Endorsed
NHSN Outcome	0139	Ν	NHSN Central line-associated Bloodstream Infection (CLABSI) Outcome Measure	Endorsed
		Α	ACS-CDC Harmonized Procedure Specific Surgical Site Infection (SSI) Outcome	
NHSN Outcome	0753	N	Measure	Endorsed
		Ν	NHSN Facility-Wide Inpatient Hospital-onset Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus	5
NHSN Outcome	1716	a	aureus (MRSA) Bacteremia Outcome Measure	Endorsed

Voluntary CY 2018

Adopting 3 measures pain communication beginning FY2020

High Priority Domains for IQR – EHR Incentive Program

Patient and Family Engagement

 Measures that foster the engagement of patients and families as partners in their care.

Best Practices of Healthy Living:

• Measures that promote best practices to enable healthy living.

Making Care Affordable: Measures that effectuate changes in efficiency and reward value over volume.

Public Comment

IQR - EHR Incentive Program

Consent Calendar 5:

- MUC17-195: Hospital-Wide All-Cause Risk Standardized Mortality Measure
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Conditional Support for Rulemaking
- MUC17-196: Hybrid Hospital-Wide All-Cause Risk Standardized Mortality Measure
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Conditional Support for Rulemaking
- MUC17-210: Hospital Harm Performance Measure: Opioid Related Adverse Respiratory Events
 - » Preliminary analysis result: Revise and Resubmit

Overview of Hospital-Acquired Condition (HAC) Reduction Program and Discussion of Future Measures

Future Measure Considerations for the Hospital-Acquired Condition Reduction Program

Measure Applications Partnership Hospital Workgroup In-Person Meeting December 14, 2017

Reena Duseja, MD, MS; Director, Division of Quality Measurement

Joseph Clift, EdD, MPH, MS, PMP; Healthcare Analyst & HAC Reduction Program Measures Lead

Brief Overview of Hospital-Acquired Condition (HAC) Reduction Program

- The HAC Reduction Program is a pay-for-performance program established under Section 3008 of the Affordable Care Act (ACA).
- CMS adjusts Medicare payments for hospitals that rank in the worst-performing 25 percent of all subsection (d) hospitals on key quality measures.
- Payment adjustments started with Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 discharges (i.e., beginning on October 1, 2014).
 CMS reduces these hospitals' payments by 1 percent.
- Section 1886(p)(6)(B) of the ACA requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure eligible hospitals can review, and submit corrections for, their HAC-related data before public reporting.

HAC Reduction Program Measures

- Currently six measures in the program across two domains
- Domain 1 Recalibrated PSI-90
 - Updated in 2015 and re-endorsed by NQF.
 - Includes three additional indicators and removed catheter-related blood stream infection because of overlap with National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) measure.
 - Includes harm-based weighting in addition to risk adjustment.
- Domain 2 Healthcare-Associated Infection Measures
 - Five CDC NHSN measures: CLABSI, CAUTI, MRSA, C. diff., and SSI (colon and abdominal hysterectomy).
 - Recently re-baselined using 2015 data.

Measures for Future Consideration

- CMS is moving toward meaningful outcome measures for its programs including the HAC Reduction Program.
 - e.g., measures that address high impact areas, outcome-based, meaningful to patients and providers, low burden
- CMS has sought comment in past rules for potential measure topics including falls with injury, glycemic events, adverse drug events (ADEs), and ventilator associated events (VAEs).

MAP Discussion

- Are there other measures that you think are meaningful and should be considered for HAC Reduction Program?
 - Measures that are low burden and address gaps in quality?
 - Potential use of the eCQM opioid harm measure in the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program?
 - » What are your thoughts about this type of measure in the HAC Reduction Program?

Input on Measure Removal Criteria

What criteria should CMS consider as it reviews the measure sets for its quality reporting and value-based purchasing programs?

Considerations for Measure Removals

- Meaningful to patients and providers
 - Patient-centered high priority quality measures current with clinical guidelines. May also need to meet specific statutory requirements.

Measure Type

Outcome measures are preferred.

Variation in performance

• Measure should demonstrate variation in performance.

Peformance trend

• Should consider trends in performance.

CMS Criteria for Measure Removals

<u>Burden</u>

• Consider amount of burden associated with the measure.

Unintended consequences

• Consider unintended consequences from use of the measure.

Operational issues

• Consider operational issues that may impact the measure.

Alignment

• Consider alignment of similar measures with private payers, and across and within CMS programs while minimizing unnecessary duplication of measures and measure concepts.

Public Comment

MAP Rural Health Introduction and Presentation

2015 Rural Project: Purpose and Objectives

- To provide multistakeholder information and guidance on performance measurement issues and challenges for rural providers
 - Make recommendations regarding measures appropriate for use in CMS pay-for-performance programs for rural hospitals and clinicians
 - Make recommendations to help mitigate measurement challenges for rural providers, including the low-case volume challenge
 - Identify measurement gaps for rural hospitals and clinicians

Key Issues Regarding Measurement of Rural Providers

- Geographic isolation
- Small practice size
- Heterogeneity
- Low case-volume

Previous Rural Work: Overarching Recommendation

 Make participation in CMS quality measurement and quality improvement programs mandatory for all rural providers, but allow a phased approach for full participation across program types and explicitly address low-case volume

Previous Rural Work: Supporting Recommendations for Measure selection

- Use guiding principles for selecting quality measures that are relevant for rural providers
- Use a core set of measures, along with a menu of optional measures, for rural providers
- Consider measures that are used in Patient-Centered Medical Home models
- Create a Measures Applications Partnership (MAP) workgroup to advise CMS on the selection of ruralrelevant measures

Objectives for 2017-2018 MAP Rural Health Workgroup

- Advise MAP on selecting performance measures that address the unique challenges, issues, health care needs and other factors that impact of rural residents
 - Develop a set of criteria for selecting measures and measure concepts
 - Identify a core set(s) of the best available (i.e., "rural relevant") measures to address the needs of the rural population
 - Identify rural-relevant gaps in measurement
 - Provide recommendations regarding alignment and coordination of measurements efforts across programs, care settings, specialties, and sectors (both public and private)
 - Address a measurement topic relevant to vulnerable individuals in rural areas

Interaction With Other MAP Workgroups and Coordinating Committee

- NQF staff will introduce the Rural Workgroup and represent rural perspective at Nov-Dec 2017 Workgroup and Coordinating Committee meetings
- The MAP Coordinating Committee will consider input from the MAP Rural Health Workgroup during prerulemaking activities
- MAP Coordinating Committee will review and approve the Rural Health Workgroup's recommendations before finalizing (August 2018)

Progress to date

- Seated the Workgroup
 - [•] 18 organizational members
 - 7 subject matter experts
 - 3 federal liaisons
- Convened orientation meeting on November 29
- Obtained initial guidance on criteria for identifying core set measures
 - NQF endorsement
 - Addresses low case volume
 - Cross-cutting
 - Several "must-have" topic areas/conditions

Discussion Questions: Your Advice to the Rural Health MAP Workgroup

- What are the key issues measurement for hospital programs that you want to RH WG to keep in mind?
- Does the initial guidance from the RH WG concerning core measures (e.g., cross-cutting, etc.) ring true? Any concerns? Any additions?
- Going forward, what information/guidance/input from the RH WG be helpful to your work on MAP?
- What advice can you give this new WG vis-à-vis serving on a MAP Workgroup?

Summary of Day and Next Steps

MAP Approach to Pre-Rulemaking A look at what to expect



Next Steps: Upcoming Activities

In-Person Meetings

- Clinician Workgroup December 12
- PAC/LTC Workgroup December 13
- Hospital Workgroup December 14
- Coordinating Committee January 25-26

Public Comment Period #2: December 21st 2016—January 11th, 2017

Adjourn