NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Patient Experience and Function, Fall 2018 Measure Review Cycle

Standing Committee Measure Evaluation Meeting

Samuel Stolpe, PharmD, MPH, Senior Director
Suzanne Theberge, MPH, Senior Project Manager
Tara Rose Murphy, MPAP, Project Manager
Jordan Hirsch, MHA, Project Analyst

February 11, 2019

Welcome

Project Team

- Samuel Stolpe, PharmD, MPH, Senior Director
- Suzanne Theberge, MPH, Senior Project Manager
- Tara Rose Murphy, MPAP, Project Manager
- Jordan Hirsch, MHA, Project Analyst

Agenda for Today's Web Meeting
February 11, 2019

- Welcome
- Introductions and Disclosure of Interest
- Overview of Evaluation Process
- Review of Candidate Measures
- NQF Member and Public Comment
- Next Steps
- Adjourn

Introductions and Disclosures of Interest

Patient Experience and Function Committee Roster – Fall 2018 Cycle

Gerri Lamb, PhD, RN, FAAN (Co-Chair)
Lee Partridge (Co-Chair)
Chris Stille, MD, MPH, FAAP (Co-Chair)
Donald Casey, MD, MPH, MBA, FACP, FAHA, DFACMQ
Ryan Coller, MD, MPH
Sharon Cross, LISW-S
Christopher Dezii, MBA, RN, CPHQ
Shari Erickson, MPH
Barbara Gage, PhD, MPA
Dawn Hohl, RN, BSN, MS, PhD
Stephen Hoy
Sherrie Kaplan, PhD, MPH
Brenda Leath, MHSA, PMP
Russell Leftwich, MD
Brian Lindberg, BSW, MMHS
Lisa Morisse, MA
Charissa Pacella, MD
Lenard Parisi, RN, MA, CPHQ, FNAHQ
Debra Saliba, MD, MPH
Ellen Schultz, MS
Peter Thomas, JD

Portfolio Review

NQF Scientific Methods Panel Review

- The Scientific Methods Panel independently evaluated the Scientific Acceptability of these measures.
  - 3477 Discharge to Community – Post Acute Care Measure for Home Health Agencies (HHA) (CMS/Abt Associates)
  - 3479 Discharge to Community – Post Acute Care Measure for Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities (IRF) (CMS/RTI)
  - 3480 Discharge to Community- Post Acute Care Measure for Long-Term Care Hospitals (LTCH) (CMS/RTI)
  - 3481 Discharge to Community – Post Acute Care Measure for Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF) (CMS/RTI)
- The Panel, consisting of individuals with methodologic expertise, was established to help ensure a higher-level evaluation of the scientific acceptability of complex measures.

NQF Scientific Methods Panel Review

- 4 of 8 measures reviewed by the SMP did not pass the SMP Review
  - 3227 CollaboRATE
  - 3452 Access to Independence Promoting Services for Dual Eligible Beneficiaries
  - 3461 Functional Status Change for Patients with Neck Impairments
  - 3476/3300 Communication Climate Assessment Toolkit
- Scientific Acceptability is a must-pass criteria; because the Panel did not view these measures as methodologically sound for reliability and/or validity, the measures are removed from the current evaluation cycle and are not forwarded to the Standing Committee for evaluation.
- The Panel's comments and concerns are provided to developers to further clarify and update their measure submission form with the intent of strengthening their measures to be evaluated by the Standing Committee in a future submission.

Overview of Evaluation Process

NQF's Major Endorsement Criteria

- Importance to measure and report (must-pass)
  - *Evidence*
  - *Opportunity for improvement*
- Scientific Acceptability (must-pass)
  - *Reliability*
  - *Validity*
- Feasibility
- Usability and Use
  - *Usability: Improvement and benefit vs. unintended negative consequences*
  - *Use: Specific use and feedback*
- Comparison to related or competing measures

Roles of the Standing Committee *During the Evaluation Meeting*

- Act as a proxy for the NQF multistakeholder membership
- Work with NQF staff to achieve the goals of the project
- Evaluate each measure against each criterion
  - *Indicate the extent to which each criterion is met and rationale for the rating*
- Make recommendations regarding endorsement to the NQF membership
- Oversee portfolio of Patient Experience and Function measures

Ground Rules for Today's Meeting

During the discussions, please do your best to:

- Attend the meeting at all times
  - *If you need to step away, please send a chat*
- Please keep your line muted during the call unless speaking to minimize background noise
- Raise your hand (on Web platform) to let us know if you'd like to speak
- Remain engaged and active in the discussion
- Announce your name prior to speaking
  - *This is really important on Web platform!*
- Keep comments focused on the discussion topic

Process for Measure Discussion

- Measure developer will introduce the measure (2-3 min.)
- Lead discussants will begin Committee discussion by:
  - *Providing a summary of the pre-meeting evaluation comments*
  - *Emphasizing areas of concern or differences of opinion*
- Developers will be available to respond to questions at the discretion of the Committee
- Committee will vote on the criteria/subcriteria

Quorum and Minimum Agreement

- Quorum: 66% of the Committee
- Pass/Recommended: Greater than 60% “Yes” votes of the quorum (this percent is the sum of high and moderate)
- Consensus not reached: 40-60% “Yes” votes (inclusive of 40 and 60%) of the quorum
- Does not pass/Not Recommended: Less than 40% “Yes” cotes of the quorum

Social Risk Overview

Background

- NQF conducted a two-year trial period from 2015-2017. During this time, adjustment of measures for social risk factors **was no longer prohibited**
- The NQF Board of Directors reviewed the results of the trial period and determined there was a need to launch a new social risk initiative
- As part of the Equity Program, NQF will continue to explore the need to adjust for social risk
- Each measure must be assessed individually to determine if SDS adjustment is appropriate (included as part of **validity** subcriterion)
- The Standing Committee will continue to evaluate the measure as a whole, including the appropriateness of the risk-adjustment approach used by the measure developer
- Efforts to implement SDS adjustment may be constrained by data limitations and data collection burden

Standing Committee Evaluation

The Standing Committee will be asked to consider the following questions:

- Is there a conceptual relationship between the SDS factor and the measure focus?
- What are the patient-level sociodemographic variables that were available and analyzed during measure development?
- Does empirical analysis (as provided by the measure developer) show that the SDS factor has a significant and unique effect on the outcome in question?
- Does the reliability and validity testing match the final measure specifications?

A More In-Depth Look: Conceptual Description

The Standing Committee should review the information provided by developers and consider the following questions:

- Is there a conceptual relationship between the SDS factor(s) and the measure focus?
- Is the SDS factor(s) present at the start of care?
- Is the SDS factor(s) caused by the care being evaluated?

A More In-Depth Look: Data and Variables

The Standing Committee should review the patient-level sociodemographic variables that were available and analyzed during measure development.

The Standing Committee should consider the following questions:

- How well do the SDS variables that were available and analyzed align with the conceptual description provided?
- Are these variables available and generally accessible for the measured patient population?

A More In-Depth Look: Empirical Analysis

The Standing Committee should examine the two sets of empirical analyses provided by the developer.

- First, review the analyses and interpretation of the importance of the SDS variables in their risk-adjustment model.
- Second, for the trial period, the measure developer must report and compare performance scores with and without SDS factors in the risk-adjustment model. Formal hypothesis testing is not required but there should be a discussion about whether the differences in the scores are substantial.

Testing and Specifications for Stratification

- The measure developer should provide updated reliability and validity testing of the measure as specified
- If a performance measure includes SDS variables in its risk-adjustment model, the measure developer must provide the information required to stratify a clinically-adjusted-only version of the measure results by the relevant SDS variables.
- For more information, please see the project webpage: http://www.qualityforum.org/Risk_Adjustment_SES.aspx

Voting Process

Consideration of Candidate Standards

Consideration of Candidate Measure 3477

Measure under Review

- NQF ID: 3477
- Title: Discharge to Community Post Acute Care Measure for Home Health Agencies
- Developer: Abt Associates
- Measure Type: Outcome
- Data Source: Claims, Enrollment Data, Other
- Level of Analysis: Facility
- Care Setting: Post-Acute Care
- Status: New Measure

NQF Member and Public Comment

Consideration of Candidate Measure 3479

Measure under Review

- NQF ID: 3479
- Title: Discharge to Community – Post Acute Care Measure for Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities
- Developer: RTI International
- Measure Type: Outcome
- Data Source: Assessment Data, Claims, Management Data
- Level of Analysis: Facility
- Care Setting: Post-Acute Care
- Status: New Measure

NQF Member and Public Comment

Next Steps

Project Timeline – Fall 2018 Cycle
*All times ET

Activity	Date/Time
Measure Evaluation Web Meeting 2	**February 13, 2019, 2:00-4:00pm ET**
Measure Evaluation Web Meeting 3	**February 15, 2019, 12:00-2:00pm ET**
Report Posted for Public Comment	March 18-April 16, 2019
Post Comment Web meeting	**May 15, 2019, 2:00-4:00pm ET**
CSAC Review Recommendations	May 30-June 19, 2019
Appeals Period	June 21-July 22, 2019
Final Report Posted	August 2019

Project Contact Info

- Email: PatientExperienceandFunction@qualityforum.org
- NQF phone: 202-783-1300
- Project page: http://www.qualityforum.org/Patient_Experience_and_Function.aspx
- SharePoint site: http://staff.qualityforum.org/Projects/Patient%20Experience%20and%20Function/SitePages/Home.aspx

Adjourn

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Patient Experience and Function, Fall 2018 Measure Review Cycle

Standing Committee Measure Evaluation Meeting

Samuel Stolpe, PharmD, MPH, Senior Director
Suzanne Theberge, MPH, Senior Project Manager
Tara Rose Murphy, MPAP, Project Manager
Jordan Hirsch, MHA, Project Analyst

February 13, 2019

Welcome and Recap of Day 1

Consideration of Candidate Measures

Consideration of Candidate Measure 3480

Measure under Review

- NQF ID: 3480
- Title: Discharge to Community – Post Acute Care Measure for Long-Term Care Hospitals
- Developer: RTI International
- Measure Type: Outcome
- Data Source: Assessment Data, Claims, Management Data
- Level of Analysis: Facility
- Care Setting: Post-Acute Care
- Status: New Measure

Consideration of Candidate Measure 3481

Measure under Review

- NQF ID: 3481
- Title: Discharge to Community – Post Acute Care Measure for Skilled Nursing Facilities
- Developer: RTI International
- Measure Type: Outcome
- Data Source: Assessment Data, Claims, Management Data
- Level of Analysis: Facility
- Care Setting: Skilled Nursing Facilities
- Status: New Measure

Consideration of Candidate Measure 3455

Measure under Review

- NQF ID: 3455
- Title: Timely Follow-Up After Acute Exacerbations of Chronic Conditions
- Developer: IMPAQ International
- Measure Type: Process
- Data Source: Claims
- Level of Analysis: Health Plan, Other
- Care Setting: Emergency Department and Services, Inpatient/Hospital
- Status: New measure

Public Comment

Next Steps

Patient Experience and Function, Fall 2018 Measure Review Cycle

Standing Committee Measure Evaluation Meeting

Samuel Stolpe, PharmD, MPH, Senior Director
Suzanne Theberge, MPH, Senior Project Manager
Tara Rose Murphy, MPAP, Project Manager
Jordan Hirsch, MHA, Project Analyst

February 15, 2019

Welcome and Recap of Days 1 & 2

Consideration of Candidate Measures

Public Comment

Next Steps

Next Steps for Fall 2018 Cycle

- Draft Report Comment Period (30 days)
  - *March 18-April 16, 2019 (tentative)*
- Committee Post-Comment Web Meeting
  - *May 15, 2019 2-4 pm EST*

Thank You