

Meeting Summary

Building a Roadmap from Patient-Reported Outcome Measures to Patient-Reported Outcome Performance Measures Web Meeting 7

The National Quality Forum (NQF) convened a public web meeting for the Building a Roadmap From Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) to Patient-Reported Outcome Performance Measures (PRO-PMs) Technical Expert Panel (TEP) on August 3, 2021.

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Web Meeting Objectives

Chuck Amos, NQF Director, welcomed TEP members and other participants to the web meeting. Co-Chairs Drs. Cathy MacLean and Sam Simon made brief opening remarks to welcome meeting participants. Mr. Amos reviewed the housekeeping reminders, introduced the NQF project team and reviewed the meeting agenda and provided a project update. Teresa Brown, NQF Senior Manager, conducted attendance of the TEP members and Federal Liaisons, as well as recognized members of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) in attendance.

Recap of Web Meeting 6

Teresa Brown, NQF Senior Manager, provided a brief recap of Web Meeting 6, held on June 24, 2021. During Web Meeting 6, the TEP reviewed public comments received on the Interim Report and discussed proposed TEP responses and Report updates based upon the public comments. The TEP identified improvement opportunities within the Interim Report, as well as discussed input on draft content of the Technical Guidance, with a focus on the specific steps that need to be addressed in the Roadmap.

Technical Guidance and Information to Consider for Roadmap

Mr. Amos provided a brief overview of the Technical Guidance. The report will be a step-by-step roadmap that details how to develop digital PRO-PMs from high quality PROMs that can meet NQF endorsement criteria and include elements that are easily understood by measure developers at all stages of their career. The content will build on the findings of the Environmental Scan Report and Interim Report and will leverage the experience and expertise of the TEP. The report will include best practices for developing PRO-PMs that are usable by alternative payment models (APMs), value-based purchasing (VBP) programs, and other innovative payment models at CMS; integrated into electronic health records (EHRs); applicable to public and private payers; and are developed with fair and accurate linkages between outcomes and healthcare provision.

The discussion addressed the sequencing of the steps presented within the report and the fact that different measure developers will approach the steps in a different order. The TEP discussed some options for presenting this information in the report. While not every TEP member agreed with the specific sequence in which the steps are presented, Mr. Amos clarified that the report will emphasize the flexibility of certain steps.

Mr. Amos emphasized that five steps within the PRO-PM development process would be emphasized for further discussion and exploration during the meeting:

- Field Testing of a PROM
- Data Collection Method or Evaluation Methodology
- Developing the Implementation Guide
- Field Testing of a PRO-PM
- Preparation for Endorsement Submission

Field Testing of the PROM

Dr. Simon stated that when thinking about field testing a PROM, implementers should consider how the PROM works in the real world, such as if there are particular skip patterns and preference for mode of administration. Dr. MacLean stated that additional surveys could be needed to check validity and whether the PROM is measuring what it intends to measure. In previous meetings, the TEP identified field testing of both the PROM and the PRO-PM as important steps, but as TEP members began discussing field testing of the PROM, conflicting ideas and opinions emerged. TEP members stated that measure developers tend to only field test the PRO-PM because often a PROM has already been validated for the outcomes and the population being used. However, there are instances where the PROM is being used on a different population, and the validation isn't available, so additional testing will be needed. The TEP discussed possible clarifications around definitions in the report, particularly of patient-reported outcomes (PROs). Further TEP discussion included stating that a PRO-PM is not only an assessment tool but can also be used to drive quality improvement, so performance measurement and clinical decision making should align. A validated reliable PROM must exist prior to the development of a PRO-PM. TEP members also agreed that one of the aims of field testing the PROM is ensuring that the psychometric properties are still relevant while others believed that field testing of a PROM should be removed or reframed, and measure developers should be urged to use a PROM that is both valid and reliable in the relevant clinical setting. The TEP also reiterated the importance of clearly defining terms such as “field testing.”

Data Collection Method or Evaluation Methodology

The TEP did not object to incorporating this topic into the description of field testing the PROM.

Developing the Implementation Guide

Although there were brief comments made in the discussion and chat noting that the creation of the implementation guide should be an iterative process that occurs both before testing and before implementation, this topic was not addressed in detail.

Field Testing of PRO-PM

Dr. MacLean shared that properly assessing the validity of a measure is an important step to consider when field testing a PRO-PM. Other variables to consider include whether the PRO-PM is usable, if it performs correctly, if patients fill it out, and if another measure has the same intent. The PRO-PM should also meet NQF's criteria for endorsement and reliability. The TEP discussed issues that can prevent a PRO-PM from being endorsed, which include not being reliable, and a lack of data for testing.

Preparation for Endorsement Submission

Beyond brief comments that preparation for endorsement begins in the earliest stages of measure development and should follow documented NQF guidance, this topic was not extensively discussed.

Proposed Structural Change to the Roadmap

Further TEP discussion included separating the roadmap into different regions, grouping similar areas, and outlining a standard format for achieving sections of the roadmap. Several proposed groupings were shared with the TEP, such as a conceptual model of why the PRO-PM should exist, what PROM(s) should be used for it, does it effectively measure what it is intended to measure, and how should it be used. Each step should address the importance of what needs to be accomplished and the challenges that exist. The TEP generally agreed with this approach and NQF committed to exploring this in the Technical Guidance Report. A proposal was also shared about using a standard business mapping tool such as BPM+ instead of a linear diagram. NQF requested volunteers for offline work to further build out each group and describe and define each step in the roadmap.

Public Comment

Mr. Amos opened the meeting for public comments. One comment was received from LaWanda Burwell of CMS. Dr. Burwell stated that a few the questions that were posed during the web meeting have complicated answers. However, starting with the end in mind by thinking about what the report is trying to accomplish could help determine how much detail is needed.

Next Steps

Ms. Brown shared that Web Meeting #8 will be held on Wednesday, September 29, 12:00 – 1:30 pm ET and the Final Interim Report will be posted publicly August 18.

Adjourn

Mr. Amos thanked the TEP, CMS, and NQF staff as the meeting adjourned.