

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

**Moderator: N/A
September 25, 2019
7:44 pm CT**

Suzanne Theberge: Welcome to everyone who's connected. We'll be getting started in just a few minutes. Thank you.

Thanks everyone for joining. We'll be getting started in just a minute or two.

Sam Stolpe: Hello and welcome everyone. This is the Patient Experience and Function Standing Committee Post Comment Web Meeting. I'm Sam Stolpe and it is very much my pleasure to welcome you today to what will be our last meeting for this measurement cycle.

We have a fairly limited agenda today but check to make sure we have all of the people that we need to have around the table.

Do we have our co-chairs, (Lee) and Chris, on the line?

(Lee): I'm here.

Sam Stolpe: Very good. (Chris) Stille, do we have (Chris) Stille on the line?

Well perhaps he'll be joining shortly. In the meantime let's just go ahead and get started. I wanted to just issue a brief welcome from myself and the rest of the NQF team. So joining me on the call is Jordan Hirsch, our product - project panelist. We also have Suzanne Theberge on the line. And we also have (Aroma Igwei) joined us as well.

So my thanks to the team and my thanks to the co-chairs. So, (Lee), would you like to offer some words of welcome to the committee?

(Lee): I'm happy to welcome everybody back to our last meeting of this cycle. I'm sure Chris will plug in. He's - he always has to juggle patients around a bit to join us.

And if during the course of the call you hear some sirens in the background, forgive us. My husband and I live just north of the UN and this is the week when all of the heads of state are here and what you will be hearing is just the passing motorcade for Mr. (Hany) or whoever.

And so I think with that official welcome, we should proceed to roll call, Sam. Is that what you want? Are you sure we have a quorum?

Sam Stolpe: Yes, thanks very much. I'll pivot it over to (Aroma) to our roll call. Thank you.

(Aroma Igwei): Okay. So I'm just going to call your name if you could speak if you're here or not. Just indicate, "Here."

All right. (Beth Agrebak)?

(Don Casey)?

(Don Casey): Present.

(Aroma Igwei): (Ryan Collar)? (Sharon Cross)? (Christopher Desi)?

(Christopher Desi): Present.

(Aroma Igwei): (Sherry Erickson)? (Don Hole)? (Steven Hoyt)?

(Steven Hoyt): I'm here. Hey guys.

(Aroma Igwei): (Sherry Kaplan)? (Brenda List)?

(Brenda List): Present.

(Aroma Igwei): (Brian Limberg)?

(Brian Limberg): Here.

(Aroma Igwei): Here, (Brian)?

(Brian Limberg): Yes.

(Aroma Igwei): Great. (Linda Molilo)? (Anne Monroe)? (Lisa Maurice)?

(Lisa Maurice): Present.

(Aroma Igwei): (Derek O'Malley)? (Leonard Purisi)? (Debra Solibas)?

(Debra Solibas): Here.

(Aroma Igwei): (Ellen Schultz)? (Lisa Gail Suther)?

(Lisa Gail Suther): I'm here. Thank you.

(Aroma Igwei): And (Peter Thomas)? And I heard a couple of beeps. Are there any members who just joined? If you can state your name, that will be great.

Sam Stolpe: Okay. Well thank you very much everybody. We only have one item of business today to - which is to review and discuss the public comment that we received. So we'll go ahead and move forward to that portion of our agenda which is going to be led by Suzanne Theberge. Suzanne?

Suzanne Theberge: Great. Thanks, Sam. So just we will quickly review. We did receive 15 measures for review this cycle as you all recall and the committee did recommend them for endorsement. We have the caps measures, the functional change measures from both CMS and UDSMR and then we had our two new measures collaborate and the photo functional status change.

So that was the spring cycle. However despite the large number of measures we received, we only received one comment. We did not receive any expressions of support or non-support on any of the measures.

And that one comment that we received was on Measure 0258, the ICH cap for in-center hemodialysis, and we did get one comment that noted the importance of gathering patient experience reports on hemodialysis facilities but did raise some concerns about the burden of the (CAT) survey in this population and then that potentially causing some validity issues.

We included the entire comment in the memo because we received only one. Typically we would summarize the comment but since it was only one, the full text of that comment is in your memo as well as the developers' initial response and - to that comment.

So what we would ask you to do now is to discuss this comment received. We'd like the committee to consider it, consider the issues raised and whether the committee have previously discussed them or whether there are more items to discuss on this measure and then whether the developers' response meet the issues raised in the comment and then we would ask you to discuss to consider whether or not you wish to revote or reconsider the measure or whether you're satisfied with your recommendation.

We do ask that - well the developer is on the line. So you should be able to ask them questions if you need to. And with that, I think we can pause. I've heard a few beeps since we got started. So just want to see if any other committee members have joined us. And just a reminder that you need to be on both the phone and the Web. So if you're on the Web, you need to dial in to the phone line to speak. But any committee members joined us since we've conducted roll call?

Chris Stille: Hi it's Chris Stille. Sorry I'm late.

Suzanne Theberge: Great. Thank you. Anybody else?

Okay. Well with that, welcome, Chris. I think we will turn it over to our fearless co-chairs, (Lee) and Chris, to kick off the committee discussion.

(Lee): Okay. I hope everybody has had a chance to read the comment. And I think from my perspective I'd like to hear first from the committee members if they

have any questions. And if not, I do have one. So let me open it up for committee members.

No?

(Don): Yes this is (Don). I...

(Lee): (Don), go ahead. Yes.

(Don): Yes. So I'm going to bring up an issue and apparently my cookie has an incorrect e-mail for you. So I got to bounce back. So sorry I didn't get a chance to give you a heads up on this. But on Page 6 of the memo from the 19th about the post comment Web meeting, you know, this last paragraph is a chronic issue with NQF if you go all the way to Page 6.

You know, throughout the 16-week continuous public commenting period, NQF members had the opportunity to express their support or do not support for each measure submitted for endorsement consideration to inform the committee's recommendations. Zero NQF members provided their expression of support. I assume that means zero also provided, you know, the "do not support" as well and I think this raises a fundamental question about the validity of acknowledging public comment because to me silence does not mean ascent or descent. It means other things. Maybe it's the difference between ignorance and apathy. I don't know and I don't care but the fact of the matter is it's not a good sign for a large membership organization with such high-stakes members - measures to have this result.

And again this is not specific to PEF. It's happened through the past years. It's been going on. So it raises an important point about whether this is even a necessary step or whether we're just checking a box and say, "We asked and

no one said anything.” But I just hear a lot of silence and echoing in this report here relative to making any assumptions about whether people even paid any attention to this.

So it’s not to say that we do anything different from the PEF standpoint in terms of validating our work which is important but it does really emphasize that this is a chronic problem that we haven’t addressed successfully in the realm of NQF and I think it creates serious credibility problems for everyone involved. So I’ll just leave it at that.

(Lee): Okay. Thank you, (Don). Member comments or questions on the one comment we did receive?

(Christopher Desi): (Chris Desi) here. (Don) raised a good point by going about it. Of course I’m impressed. (Unintelligible) to the actual page to find out what the rule is.

I think the comment, I mean, it’s (unintelligible) potential validity issues but this gets right to the heart if I thought of usability. Is that a correct assumption there or evaluation of the point? (Unintelligible). It’s the only comment I had.

(Lee): I’m sorry I’m having a little trouble hearing the last part of your sentence.

(Christopher Desi): No problem. No problem. I thought it’s after the heart of validity of usability and I just wanted to make the request to go back. I’m not sure how we voted or what we voted on in terms of the usability because from their comment, it sounds like its usability is quite a big problem.

(Lee): Suzanne or Sam, can you remind us what our vote was on the issue?

Suzanne Theberge: We can pull that up. Just give us a minute.

(Lee): While you're pulling that up, I think - I guess I'm echoing (Don). I think it's unfortunate that the comment that we got on this measure wasn't before when we were considering the measure. And I don't know how you - how we can be sure that affected parties really are aware that the issue is up for discussion and when and how. But it would have been nice to have it in front of us.

And let's assume if this were in front of us, are any of the - of my fellow members concerned either about the validity or - as I understand that one of the issues is not only what the measure's specifications are that is how easy it is to do the survey but part of the concern is that although there are supposed to be a minimum number of responses in order to have what I would call accountable score and here I turn to the CMS staff, the claim is - on the part of the commenter that CMS accepts scores from providers who have below the recommended 200 responses. Is that - I guess I would appreciate it if the CMS staff which is - tell us whether or not that claim is in fact best.

(Julie Azuko): Hi. This is (Julie Azuko). I'm the project officer for ICH caps. And in regards to the minimum number of responses needed to ensure validity, for public reporting, we do require 30 completed surveys over two semiannual periods. And just a background that our cycle metric now has determined that 30 completed surveys have interclass correlation and an interclass reliability that are close or above the critical cut-off of 0.7 for each of the three global ratings and two of the - and for two of the three composites with the third composite slightly below the cut-off at 0.65 and the proper days improved with more completed surveys.

(Lee): Thank you. Chris, do you have any questions?

Chris Stille: No, I guess - then I guess what that indicates is that the commenter doesn't necessarily agree with that. And that's fine. I mean, you know, that's their opinion.

Okay. So then (unintelligible) probably will only review this. We're working in all those hurdles we'll pass. So that helps me.

(Lee): All right. Any other reactions or comments?

Suzanne Theberge: (Lee), we have all the votes. Oh, sorry go ahead, (Lee).

(Lee): Yes. No, no. Give us the votes.

Suzanne Theberge: Was it - which ones would you like us to read?

(Lee): Validity.

Suzanne Theberge: Validity. Okay, let's see. Reliability this went to the Methods Panel. So the reliability votes from the Methods Panel were "High" two, "Moderate" three, "Low" zero and "Insufficient" one. The committee voted 15 to 0, 15 "Yes" votes to uphold the Methods Panel. And for validity Methods Panel voted "High" two, "Moderate" four, zero "Low," zero "Insufficient" and again the committee with a vote of 15 to 0 uphold the Methods Panel rating.

Chris Stille: All right.

Suzanne Theberge: Moderate for both reliability and validity.

Chris Stille: So...

(Lee): Thank you for that.

Chris Stille: Yes. Suzanne, how about usability?

Suzanne Theberge: Usability we had zero for “High,” 13 “Moderate,” “Low” two and one “Insufficient.”

Chris Stille: Okay. Thank you.

Suzanne Theberge: The overall recommendation is 16 to 0.

Chris Stille: Yes.

Suzanne Theberge: Or yes endorse in favor.

(Lee): So the question before us is whether or not anybody in the committee wishes to recommend we reconsider or revote. If not...

(Debra Solibas): We - this is (Deb). I - do you - would you also need a motion - would you also need a motion that we adhere to our prior recommendations or do we only need a motion to change?

(Lee): I do not believe we need a motion to adhere to our prior recommendation.

(Debra Solibas): Okay. Thank you very much.

(Lee): Suzanne, correct me if I’m wrong.

Sam Stolpe: No you’re spot on. Thank you.

(Lee): Okay.

Man: Would the - would a recommendation to not change it would it also include the claims to continue to address those issues as stated in the response?

(Lee): Are you talking about the way in which the survey is administered?

Man: Yes.

(Lee): Maybe it's easier.

Man: Yes.

(Lee): Yes.

Man: Okay.

(Lee): I mean, I think our developers already indicated they're working on that.

Man: Right.

(Lee): My guess is that most of us on the committee would say, "We think that's a good idea."

Man: Yes.

Sam Stolpe: So just a point of clarification, this is Sam from NQF. Since we don't have quorum, we're not in a position to actually vote for reconsideration. But if the committee feels very strongly, then we can put that on the table for discussion

next cycle to reevaluate the measure if the committee feels that that is the appropriate course of action.

(Lee): Sam, I suspect there isn't a sentiment to reconsider.

Sam Stolpe: I suspect so as well but...

(Lee): Okay.

Sam Stolpe: ...I wanted to make sure that has (unintelligible).

(Lee): Okay.

(Brian Limberg): This is (Brian). Just to clarify, Sam, if there's no motion, we're done. Is that correct?

Sam Stolpe: That's correct.

(Brian Limberg): We don't need to vote.

Sam Stolpe: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Sam Stolpe: ...voting will take place offline.

Man: We would need a quorum to have a motion to vote on those. So in that sense, the group could discuss this and submit their sentiment and then, you know, be up to the chairs and staff to take it from there in terms of how we would process that motion, how we would process that from the standpoint of a

formal vote as Sam just said. In other words, we can't make any decisions today without a quorum.

(Brian Limberg): Okay. I'm going to get off the line then. I think I'm comfortable with no motion. But thank you for...

Man: Yes.

(Brian Limberg): ...holding this call.

Chris Stille: And this is Chris Stille. Just to provide my 2 cents, my sense from the comment was more to create a strong recommendation moving forward rather than reconsider anything that we have talked about. So I also am in favor of not reconsidering at this point.

(Lee): Okay.

(Brenda List): This is (Brenda). I'm also not in favor of reconsidering any position on this. I recall, I think if I'm correct, that there were a number of issues that perhaps influence the response rate. And I think it's really important for us to have an opportunity to better understand the patient experience in this environment. So I, you know, personally am not interested in, you know, changing my position on this.

(Lee): Thank you, (Brenda). Anybody else?

(Don): Yes it's (Don). It's my opinion. I agree with (Brenda). I think this is a straw poll though. We need to get the full consensus.

Man: I'm not in favor of reconsidering.

(Debra Solibas): So I - this is (Deb) again. Another process question. So I think what I was hearing was that if there was consensus on the call today that we wanted to revote. We need a quorum to revote. But if there wasn't consensus on the call today, we would just do an offline - if the folks on the call today did not recommend a reconsideration of the measure, then we...

Man: Yes.

(Debra Solibas): ...just do an offline. I'm a little confused.

Sam Stolpe: Hi, this is Sam from NQF. And my apologies. I should have been a little bit more clear. If no one on the committee wants to put forward this idea that the committee should consider this option of re-voting, what we would do NQF staff would send out a poll to the entire committee to ask if the committee would like to reconsider the measure. If we have a more than 50% of the committee that says yes they would like to reconsider the measure, then we would reevaluate the measure in the fall. So it's the order of operations there.

(Debra Solibas): Got it. Thank you so much. That clarifies it.

Sam Stolpe: Yes. No one actually has to want to revote. It doesn't appear that that's the case.

(Debra Solibas): Got you. Thank you so much.

Man: Well but, Sam, you know, but that's a minority of the quorum. So I still think the rules were - I don't know what rules or what are you following but the rules were that I'm used to when problem into procedure does require a quorum to make any decision. So in that sense maybe this is the same

decision we're talking about. Maybe they're identical. But I just want to make that as a point of order relative to the fact that we don't have a quorum today.

(Debra Solibas): Yes I think what Sam...

Sam Stolpe: It is an important point but...

(Debra Solibas): ...is saying is that we have the option - can I - I think Sam is saying to us, "Do you all want to have more discussion today? Let us know if you do. Otherwise we're going to send out this poll to the full committee and so that that will achieve quorum and give everyone an opportunity at that point to say, 'We consider at our next meeting or proceed with prior recommendation.'"

Man: Right. And we can reflect our discussion in that message.

(Debra Solibas):: Yes.

Man: But we can't act as a deciding body...

(Debra Solibas): Yes that's what - I think that's what Sam said. Yes.

Suzanne Theberge: That is correct, (Deb). I think we're speaking - you did interpret that correctly. However we did hear a few beeps. Have any other committee members joined us who missed the roll call?

Chris Stille: I fell off and came back. So that was two beeps.

Suzanne Theberge: Okay.

Man: Thanks, Chris.

Chris Stille: Okay. Sorry.

Suzanne Theberge: Thanks for letting us know. So yes, I think we can just sort of have some time for further discussion if anyone else on the committee has anything they like to say or any questions they would like to ask, you know, as we mentioned, the developer is on the line and is available to answer your questions or concerns. But we will have to follow up after this with the voting survey.

(Julia): Hi, this is (Julia) from CMS. Just a point of clarity, for those individuals who are not on this phone call today, can we provide them our response to the document from DaVita?

Suzanne Theberge: Yes. They would have...

Woman: We have it, (Julia). It went to the full committee before this call. But I assume that Suzanne and Sam will briefly summarize the discussion that we have had here today including your responses. Am I right, Suzanne?

Suzanne Theberge: Yes we - well we also - we would share the transcript and recording of this call. So they have...

Woman: Yes.

Suzanne Theberge: ...the verbatim discussion to hand and we ask them to review that before voting.

(Julia): Okay great. Thank you so much.

(Lee): Okay. Any further discussion on this issue? If not, I think we have the next is to open the lines for public report - public comments. Am I correct, Sam?

Suzanne Theberge: Yes.

Sam Stolpe: Sure. Let's go ahead to that portion of our agenda. So just a reminder, for members of the public and NQF members, you are free to give your comments verbally or if you'd like NQF staff to read your comments, you may submit it via chat. We'll all go ahead and open the line now for anyone who would like to submit a comment.

(Don): This is (Don). I have a point of clarification. Can we ask how many people are actually on the line just for documentation purposes?

Man: Given the members of the committee, we have ten the committee on the line now.

(Don): No I'm talking about people on the line for public comment.

Man: Traditionally we don't do that, (Don), but...

(Don): Well I think if zero are on, I think it's important to know that. If there are 100 that don't want to talk, then, you know, that's important too.

Man: There are 31 people dialed in to this call.

(Don): Great. Thirty-one excluding the committee members?

Man: No 31 total.

Man: So that includes measure developers, committee members, new members...

Man: Right.

(Don): How many for public comment? Do we know that?

Man: We do not know that.

Man: But somewhere on the order of five to ten, (Don).

(Don): You're guessing?

Man: Well with ten members of the committee and, you know, several measure developers on the line, I would say that's...

Man: But we don't know exactly. So it could be multiple people on the same team. So...

Man: Anyone in the public that wishes to identify themselves is welcome to.

(Lee): If there are no public comments...

Man: Yes. I'm not hearing any.

(Lee): All right. I suggest we move on to the last part of our agenda. Suzanne and Sam?

Suzanne Theberge: Okay. So we'll move on to next steps. October 21st through 22nd NQF will be holding a CSAC meeting. Following that will be the appeals period from November 6th to November 5th. And then we'll be rounding out with the final report on February 14th, 2020.

For the upcoming fall cycle, here are some dates to keep in mind. We'll be holding our orientation Web meeting on January 8th, 2020, the measure evaluation Web meeting on February 12th and the post comment Web meeting in May 6th. And just a reminder that we have two measures that we'll be evaluating. Those measures include 0291, emergency transfer communication measure from the University of Minnesota Rural Health Research Center and Measure 0425, a functional status change for patients with low back impairments measure. That's coming from photo.

Again a reminder your project contact information, any correspondence, questions, concerns, you can reach us at patientexperienceandfunction@qualityforum.org. Of course our number is listed there as well. And we have the project page online as well as our SharePoint site which is accessible to the committee members.

(Lee): Okay. Thank you for all of you who did dial in and participate in our discussion today. We will not officially reconvene until January the 8th. So I wish everybody a happy fall and what a big circle around January 8th for the important orientation to get us started on the next cycle.

Suzanne and Sam?

Man: Great. Thank you.

(Lee): Chris?

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you all.

Man: Thanks.

Man: Okay. Bye.

Suzanne Theberge: Thanks everyone for your time today.

END