

Patient Experience and Function Standing Committee— Post-Comment Web Meeting, Fall 2018 Cycle

The National Quality Forum (NQF) convened the Patient Experience and Function (PEF) Standing Committee for a post-comment web meeting on May 15, 2019.

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Meeting Objectives

Co-chairs Gerri Lamb, Lee Partridge, and Chris Stille welcomed the Standing Committee and participants to the post-comment web meeting. NQF staff reviewed the meeting objectives and conducted roll call.

Review Measures and Public Comments Received

During this review cycle, the PEF Standing Committee reviewed and recommended four new measures:

- 3455 Timely Follow-Up After Acute Exacerbations of Chronic Conditions
- 3477 Discharge to Community-Post Acute Care Measure for Home Health Agencies
- 3479 Discharge to Community-Post Acute Care Measure for Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities (IRF)
- 3481 Discharge to Community-Post Acute Care Measure for Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF)

The Committee did not reach consensus on one new measure:

 3480 Discharge to Community-Post Acute Care Measure for Long-Term Care Hospitals (LTCH)

The <u>draft report</u> for this measure cycle was posted on the project webpage for public and NQF member comment on March 18, 2019 for 30 days. This commenting period closed on April 16, 2019. NQF Senior Project Manager Suzanne Theberge provided a summary of the comments received during the public comment period; NQF received eight comments from two member organizations. One theme and one measure-specific comment were identified in the <u>comment</u> <u>memo</u> after the post-evaluation commenting period as follows:

- 1. Theme: Concerns with the risk-adjustment model
- 2. Measure specific: Not enough information on why the Committee did not reach consensus on measure 3480

Ms. Theberge explained that all eight comments submitted (two comments per measure for the four discharge-to-community measures) echoed one theme: a concern that the risk-adjustment models for the measures were not adequately tested and that people with dual eligible status were not included in the risk model due to a CMS policy decision, rather than empiric evidence. After this overview, she turned the call over to Co-chair Lee Partridge to facilitate the discussion.

At the request of the Committee, the developer provided a high-level review of their response, explaining that after the comment period they conducted additional analyses to address the

comments. In this analysis they stratified the measures and found that it did not make a difference in the outcomes. The Committee noted that the correlations were high and the interclass correlations were in the correct range. The Committee discussed how functional status impacts outcomes, and the developer noted that functional status is part of the case mix grouping. Next, a Committee member suggested there may be an interaction between functional status and dual eligibility status, but this was not seen in this review. After this discussion, the Committee elected to continue to recommend the measures for endorsement.

Next, the Committee turned to the measure that did not reach consensus at the measure evaluation meetings, 3480 *Discharge to Community-Post Acute Care Measure for Long-Term Care Hospitals (LTCH)*. NQF Senior Director Sam Stolpe reviewed the evidence requirements for outcome measures, noted that NQF's criteria require empirical data, but if such data are not available, wide variation in performance can be used as evidence, assuming the data are from a robust number of providers and results are not subject to systematic bias. He also briefly summarized the Committee's prior discussions and votes on the measure. Dr. Stolpe also explained that the measure had received one comment that suggested that the report did not adequately address why the Committee hadn't reached consensus. The staff had subsequently expanded that summary in the report to address the concern. Co-chair Gerri Lamb then took over facilitation of the call. While the Committee agreed that empirical evidence for this measure is limited, they agreed there are clear differences in care and a substantial performance gap.

A Committee member stated that from a patient perspective, there is a strong relationship between the outcome and a structure, process, intervention, or service provided by healthcare providers. The member added that discharge to the community is a key measure of how successfully a rehabilitation plan of care is designed and executed in any post-acute care setting; the entire goal of rehabilitation is to return the patient to his or her previous level of health, function, and independent living to the maximum extent possible. He said the discharge-tocommunity measure is an accurate surrogate for this process.

The Committee noted that the four discharge-to-community measures were very similar and used the same methodology, and that to be consistent, they should not approve some but not all. The Committee also agreed that the four measures assess a continuum of post-acute care and the measures are best kept together as a set. They encouraged the developer to include more evidence in their submission for the next review. The measure passed a vote on evidence, and the Committee then voted on an overall recommendation, voting to recommend for endorsement.

Standing Committee Votes

- Evidence: Yes-11; No-3
- Overall Recommendation for Endorsement: Yes-12; No-2

Public Comment

No public or NQF member comments were provided during the post-comment web meeting.

Next Steps

Ms. Theberge then reviewed next steps for the PEF Committee work.

Fall 2018 Cycle:

NQF will convene the CSAC web meeting on June 5-6, 2019 for review and approval of the two measures. Following the CSAC review, there will be an appeals period, tentatively scheduled for June 11 through July 10, 2019.

Spring 2019 Cycle:

For the spring 2019 cycle, there will be 15 measures for review. The Standing Committee will have a measure evaluation in-person meeting on June 20, 2019 at NQF offices in Washington, DC. The post-measure evaluation web meeting is scheduled for June 25, 2019.