



Measure Feedback Loop Committee Web Meeting #1

The National Quality Forum (NQF) convened a public web meeting for the Measure Feedback Loop Committee on January 22, 2019.

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Web Meeting Objectives

Madison Jung, NQF Project Manager, welcomed participants to the web meeting. NQF project staff, CMS colleagues, and members of the Committee introduced themselves. Following introductions, Ms. Jung reviewed the agenda and objectives of the web meeting. The goal of the meeting was to orient the Committee on the background, scope, key concepts, timeline, and objectives of the project and to discuss potential sources of information for measure feedback to inform the Environmental Scan Report.

Overview of NQF and Project Goals

Ms. Jung introduced NQF and the streams of NQF's work. Ms. Jung also explained the role of NQF project staff, Committee co-chairs, Committee members, and members of the public. Ms. Jung provided an overview of the project scope, timeline, and its deliverables.

Introduction and Discussion on Environmental Scan

Jean-Luc Tilly, Senior Manager, Data Analytics, introduced the scope and purpose of the environmental scan. NQF staff asked for the Committee's feedback on its current approach and current search criteria. Committee co-chairs, Rose Baez and Eddie Machado, facilitated the discussion.

Definition and Scope

The Committee overall supported the scope and definitions provided for the project. Committee members emphasized the importance of developing a measure feedback loop. It is necessary to identify which measures are having unintended consequences and implementation issues. Providers have high levels of performance measurement burden. The identification of measures that are causing unintended consequences will help to reduce this burden.

Committee members had several suggestions for NQF staff to consider throughout the project for the Committee's work:

- **Variation in data collection due to measure specifications and type.** Depending on the measure type (e.g., process, outcome) and data source (e.g., eCQM-based, chart-abstracted), there will be variation in the available data. The Committee should consider ways to assess this issue. In addition to the type of data, the Committee noted the quality of data collected should also be examined. It is important to have accurate data to ensure that results can be accurately compared.
- **Unintended consequences.** Committee members noted the difficulties involved in collecting the necessary information for a measure feedback loop. Members

acknowledged that measures typically focus on the intended consequences without fully accounting for the unintended consequences. If possible, staff should consider analyzing several measures with known unintended consequences for thematic issues.

- **Intended use.** NQF staff should also consider ways to assess if a measure is addressing its intended use and impact on patient care. For example, providers often utilized specialty-specific measures without consideration for the intent of measure that other providers may use. The specialty-specific measures can inadvertently contradict the intention of other specialty-specific measures. Without the alignment of intended effects, unintended consequences can occur. The Committee also noted that measures are often implemented by entities other than those for which the measure was developed.
- **Integration of measure feedback loop into processes of care.** The Committee should consider what incentives could motivate stakeholders to provide feedback. The measure feedback loop should also account for how often new feedback is generated and collected.

NQF staff clarified that it is looking for feedback at all levels of analysis and topical domains. The Committee emphasized that there will most likely be a lack of available articles and information related to measure feedback. NQF staff agrees with this concern and plans to address it in the gaps and challenges section of the environmental scan report.

Additional Sources

Search Terms

The Committee suggested several qualitative search terms for NQF staff to add to its search strategy. The terms are as follows:

- Consumer feedback
- Equity of care
- Patient education
- Patient experience
- Patient-reported outcomes
- Family education
- Validity
- Safety
- Reliability
- Unintended consequences
- Usability
- Use
- Utilization

NQF staff will add the terms to its search strategy.

Existing Efforts

The Committee highlighted several existing initiatives and efforts that are stewarded by other organizations and specialty societies. Several expert/advisory panels generate feedback on measures, such as:

- American Hospital Association Measures that Matter Collaborative
- American College of Physicians Performance Measurement Committee
- Measure developers' technical expert panels
- Patient Family Advisory Councils

Stakeholders to Consider for Key Informant Interviews

NQF asked the Committee for suggestions on additional stakeholder groups to contact for key informant interviews. Members of the Committee recommended that NQF staff speak with electronic health record (EHR) vendors and implementation vendors. These vendors are responsible for building into the EHR the necessary data elements for measures. EHR vendors are an important, but frequently underutilized resource in measure development.

Public Comment

Navya Kumar, NQF Project Analyst, opened the web meeting to allow for public comment. No public comments were offered.

Next Steps

Following the web meeting, NQF will finalize the key informant interview guide. NQF will schedule key informant interviews and will collect feedback to include in the draft environmental scan report. NQF will host web meeting #2 on February 19, 2019. During the next webinar, the Committee will review the progress to date on the scan and will continue its discussion on potential sources of information on measure feedback.