

Welcome and Housekeeping Reminders

- Please mute your audio when not speaking
- Please ensure your name is displayed correctly (right click on your picture and select "Rename" to edit)
- Please turn on video, especially during discussions
- Modify your display by toggling the view in upper-right corner
- Please use 'Raise Hand' if you wish to speak (click 'Participants' icon, then click 'Raise Hand' at the bottom of the participant list)
- Please use the chat feature to communicate with the NQF Host

If you are experiencing technical issues, please contact us at propmroadmap@qualityforum.org



Building a Roadmap from Patient-Reported Outcome Measures to Patient-Reported Outcome Performance Measures

Web Meeting #5

May 25, 2021

This project is funded by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services under contract HHSM-500-2017-00060I – 75FCMC20F0003 Building a Roadmap from Patient-Reported Outcome Measures to Patient-Reported Outcome-Performance Measures.

Welcome and Meeting Objectives



Agenda

Roll Call and Meeting Objectives

Web Meeting #4 Recap

Interim Report Version 2 Discussion

Outline of Initial Concepts for Technical Guidance

NQF Member and Public Comment

Next Steps



Meeting Objectives

- Review Web Meeting #4
- Discuss content and TEP feedback opportunity for Version 2 of the Interim Report
- Discuss and outline initial concepts for Technical Guidance in PRO-PM development, including:
 - Discuss a use case from the perspective of measure developers;
 - Recommended approaches to content; and
 - Options for document structure.

Roll Call



NQF Staff

NQF Staff Member

Chuck Amos, MBA, Director

Beijier Edwards, MBA, PMP, Project Manager

Teresa Brown, MHA, MA, CPHQ, CPPS, Senior Manager

Juanita Rogers, MS, CHES, Analyst

Jhamiel Prince, BS, Analyst



Technical Expert Panel (TEP) Members

TEP Member Name/Credentials	TEP Member Name/Credentials
Catherine MacLean, MD, PhD (co-chair)	Sam Simon, PhD (<i>co-chair</i>)
David Andrews, PhD	Christine Izui, MS
Katherine Ast, MSW, LCSW	Laura Jantos, LFHIMSS
Rachel Brodie, BA	Kirk Munsch
Zahid Butt, MD, FACG	Deborah Paone, DrPH, MHA
Collette Cole, BSN, RN, CPHQ	Brenna Rabel, MPH
Paula Farrell, BSN, RN, CPHQ, LSSGB	Nan Rothrock, PhD, MA
Mark Friedberg, MD, MPP	Mike Sacca, AS
Debbie Gipson, MD, MS	Rachel Sisodia, MD
Ben Hamlin, MPH	John Spertus, MD, MPH, FACC, FAHA
Janel Hanmer, MD, PhD	Ruth Wetta, PhD, MSN, MPH, RN
Helen Haskell, MA	Albert Wu, MD, MPH, FACP
Brian Hurley, MD, MBA, DFASAM	8



Federal Liaisons and Affiliation

Federal Liaison Name/Credentials	Federal Agency	
Girma Alemu, MD, MPH	HRSA	
Joel Andress	CMS/CCSQ	
David Au, MD, MS	VA	
LaWanda Green Burwell, ScD (COR)	CMS/CCSQ	
Kyle Cobb	DHHS/ONC/OTECH	
Janis Grady, RHIT, FAC-COR III	CMS/CCSQ-QMVIG/DQM	
Rhona Limcangco, PhD	AHRQ	
Meghan McHugh, PhD, MPH	SAMHSA/CBHSQ	
Sandra Mitchell, PhD, CRNP, FAAN	NIH/NCI	
Ashley Wilder Smith, PhD, MPH	NIH/NCI	
Clifford A. Smith, PhD, ABPP-Cn	VA	



Project Timeline (Base Year)



*WM = Web Meeting; OY = Option Year



Ground Rules



No rank in the room



Stay respectful and engaged





Refrain from political comments



Share your experiences



Learn from others



True North Statement

- There is currently a gap between hundreds of existing PROMs and only a few dozen PROM-based Patient-Reported Outcome-Performance Measures. This project will provide guidance to developing PROM-based PRO-PMs for use in CMS accountability programs by identifying key attributes of high-quality PROMs and creating step-by-step guidance on utilizing these PROMs to develop fully tested digital PRO-PMs.
- Today's primary goal: Discuss and develop an initial map of how the identification and selection of high-quality PROMs fit into the performance measure development process.



Background: Terminology

Concept	Definition	Example
Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO)	Any information on the outcomes of healthcare obtained directly from patients without modification by clinicians or other healthcare professionals. ¹	Symptom: depression
Patient-Reported Outcome Measure (PROM)	Any standardized or structured questionnaire regarding the status of a patient's health condition, health behavior, or experience with health care that comes directly from the patient (i.e., a PRO). The use of a structured, standardized tool such as a PROM will yield quantitative data that enables comparison of patient groups or providers. ¹	Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (<u>PHQ-</u> <u>9</u>) [©] , a standardized tool to assess depression
PRO-Based Performance Measure (PRO-PM)	A performance measure that is based on patient- reported outcomes assessed through data often collected through a PROM and then aggregated for an accountable healthcare entity. ¹	Percentage of patients with diagnosis of major depression or dysthymia and initial PHQ-9 score >9 with a follow-up PHQ- 9 score <5 at 6 months (NQF #0711) 13

Web Meeting #4 Recap



Web Meeting #4 Review

- Clarified scope of Interim Report
- Reviewed changes made to the PRO-PM version of the Attribute Grid (based on the grid from the PRO Best Practices report) and finalized revisions to support performance measurement
- Pressure tested the Attribute Grid against a widely used PROM (the PHQ-9) to:
 - Determine if the attributes listed were inclusive and complete when reviewing a high quality PROM for use in a performance measure;
 - Identify any attributes that might be missing; and
 - Provide an example of pressure testing the Attribute Grid for inclusion in the Interim Report.

Interim Report Discussion



Interim Report Scope

- Report Description: to discuss attributes of high quality PROMs for use in Performance Measures (PMs), including those in CMS Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) programs, Alternative Payment Models (APMs), or coverage determination
- Goal: to provide examples to users or developers of PRO-PMs of the essential attributes of high quality PROMs that could increase success for the PRO-PMs built upon them

Key Content:

- Updated Attribute Grid with descriptions
- Use case of PROMs for PMs assessed against the Attribute Grid (PHQ-9)
- Planning to be shared with the TEP June 1 for review and feedback

Discuss and Outline Initial Concepts for Technical Guidance



Technical Guidance Scope

- Report Description: A step-by-step roadmap that details how to develop digital PRO-PMs from PROMs.
- Goal: To provide a step-by-step approach for using PROMs to develop digital PRO-PMs that meet NQF endorsement criteria and include elements that are easily understood by measure developers at all stages of their career.

Key Content:

- Will build on the findings of the Environmental Scan Report and Interim Report and will leverage the experience and expertise of the TEP.
- Best practices for developing PRO-PMs that are usable by APMs, VBP programs, and other innovative payment models at CMS; integrated into EHRs; applicable to public and private payers; and are developed with fair and accurate linkages between outcomes and healthcare provision



Draft Process Mapping for PRO-PM Development





Discussion Questions

- What are the logical considerations when mapping a highquality PROM to a digital PRO-PM?
- What are the technical considerations in mapping a high-quality PROM to a digital PRO-PM?
- Does a similar PRO-PM already exist?
- What are some common issues that might prevent a PRO-PM from satisfying the four major endorsement criteria?

NQF Member and Public Comment

Next Steps



Upcoming Web Meeting and Public Comment

- Web Meeting #6: Thursday, June 24, 1:00 2:30 pm ET
- Final Environmental Scan Report is now posted publicly
- Interim Report will be shared with the TEP for feedback on June 1
 Written feedback due back to the team COB June 11
 - This same version will be posted for public comment in early June



Project Contact Information

Project page:



Email: propmroadmap@qualityforum.org



NQF phone: (202)783-1300

B

Building a Roadmap from Patient-ReportedOutcome Measures to Patient-ReportedOutcome Performance Measures



SharePoint site: PRO-PM Roadmap SharePoint Home Page

THANK YOU.

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

http://www.qualityforum.org