- TO: NQF Members and public
- FR: NQF staff
- RE: Pre-voting review for National Voluntary Consensus Standards for Patient Safety Measures, First Report: A Consensus Report
- DA: October 8, 2010

This first report of the patient safety measures project presents the evaluation results of several healthcare-associated infections (HAI) measures. NQF launched this new project to address HAI, medication safety, and other patient safety-related areas. A Steering Committee of 21 individuals representing the range of stakeholder perspectives reviewed and considered for endorsement five HAI candidate standards. All five measures are recommended for endorsement as voluntary consensus standards.

The draft document, *National Voluntary Consensus Standards for Patient Safety Measures, First Report*, is also posted on the NQF website, <u>http://www.qualityforum.org/projects/patient\_safety\_measures.aspx</u>, along with the following additional information:

- measure evaluations; and
- additional technical information, if applicable.

Pursuant to section II.A of the Consensus Development Process v. 1.8, this draft document, along with the accompanying material, is being provided to you at this time for purposes of review and comment only—not voting. You may post your comments and view the comments of others on the NQF website.

# NQF Member comments must be submitted no later than 6:00 pm ET, November 8, 2010. Public comments must be submitted no later than 6:00 pm ET, November 1, 2010.

Thank you for your interest in the NQF's work. We look forward to your review and comments.

NATIONAL VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS FOR PATIENT SAFETY MEASURES, FIRST REPORT: A CONSENSUS REPORT

DRAFT REPORT FOR COMMENTING

### NATIONAL VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS FOR PATIENT SAFETY MEASURES, FIRST REPORT: A CONSENSUS REPORT

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Executive Summary   |
|---|
| Background  |
| Strategic Directions for NQF  |
| National Priorities Partnership   |
| NQF's Consensus Development Process   |
| Evaluating Potential Consensus Standards  |
| Recommendations for Endorsement   |
| Candidate Consensus Standards Recommended for Endorsement                                   |
| Additional Recommendations  |
| Notes   |
| Appendix A—Specifications for the National Voluntary Consensus Standards for Patient Safety |
| Measures, First Report: A Consensus Report A-1  |
| Appendix B—Steering Committee and NQF StaffB-1  |
| Appendix C— NQF-Endorsed <sup>®</sup> Measures as of April 2010C-1                          |

### NATIONAL VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS FOR PATIENT SAFETY MEASURES, FIRST REPORT: A CONSENSUS REPORT

### 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) remain a significant public health issue in the United 2 States. In hospitals alone, the incidence of HAIs is estimated at 1.7 million infections, with 3 99,000 associated deaths. Urinary tract infections (UTIs), surgical site infections (SSIs), 4 pneumonia, and bloodstream infections account for 83 percent of all HAIs. The estimated direct 5 cost of these infections to the healthcare system is nearly \$4.5 billion. In 2009, the American 6 Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) authorized \$50 million in funding for states to engage 7 in HAI planning and other activities in support of the Department of Health and Human Services 8 (HHS) Action Plan to Prevent Healthcare-Associated Infections. Preventing HAIs has become a 9 10 national priority for public health and patient safety. 11 The National Quality Forum (NOF) inventory of endorsed measures includes more than 100 12 measures related to patient safety. Several of these measures focus specifically on HAIs, 13 14 addressing UTIs, SSIs, pneumonia, and bloodstream infections. Similarly, the measures recommended for endorsement in this first report of patient safety measures include updated 15 16 versions of previously HAI endorsed measures. Ultimately, the endorsement of these national standards for HAI measurement will provide states and other organizations with valuable 17 18 resources for implementing comparable standards and will enable consumers to gain access to 19 uniformly reported data that are reliable and useful for decision making. 20 Under this initial phase of NQF's most recent Patient Safety Measures project, five HAI 21 22 measures are recommended for endorsement. These measures were submitted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the American College of Surgeons (ACS) and are 23

- 24 listed below:
- 25
- 26

### 27 <u>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENDORSEMENT</u>

- PSM-001-10: National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Central line-associated bloodstream infection (CLABSI) outcome measure (CDC)
   PSM-002-10: National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) surgical site infection (SSI) outcome measure (CDC)
   PSM-006-10: Risk adjusted surgical site infection outcome measure (ACS)
- PSM-003-10: National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) catheter-associated urinary
   tract infection (CAUTI) Outcome (CDC)
- PSM-007-10: Risk adjusted urinary tract infection outcome measure (ACS)

### NATIONAL VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS FOR PATIENT SAFETY, FIRST REPORT: A CONSENSUS REPORT

#### 36 BACKGROUND

Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) remain a significant public health issue in the United
States. In hospitals alone, the incidence of HAI is estimated at 1.7 million infections, with
99,000 associated deaths.<sup>1</sup> Urinary tract infections (UTIs), surgical site infections (SSIs),
pneumonia, and bloodstream infections account for 83 percent of HAIs<sup>1</sup>. In 1992, the estimated
direct cost of these infections on the healthcare system was \$4.5 billion in 1992 dollars; adjusting
for inflation, this cost rose to \$6.65 billion in 2007.<sup>2</sup>

43

Consumer, provider, purchaser, and regulatory and accreditation organizations are growing 44 increasingly interested in HAIs.<sup>3</sup> Many of the stakeholders in healthcare have focused increased 45 attention on both surveillance and public reporting of HAIs. From 1970 to the present, the 46 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) collected voluntary data on HAIs, clinical 47 48 practices known to prevent HAIs, as well as information about multidrug-resistant organisms and other adverse events. Twenty-seven states are now requiring public reporting of certain HAIs.<sup>4</sup> 49 50 Preventing HAIs has become a public health and patient safety priority issue. In 2009, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) authorized \$50 million in funding for states 51 52 to engage in HAI planning and other activities in support of the HHS Action Plan to Prevent Healthcare-Associated Infections.<sup>5</sup> In October 2008, Medicare reduced reimbursement to 53 54 facilities not collecting data on particular HAIs including catheter-associated urinary tract infection (CAUTI), central line-associated bloodstream infection (CLABSI), and SSI. The 55 56 Patient Protection Affordable Care Act (PPAC) will extend these payment reductions to Medicaid providers in 2011. Beginning in 2013, hospitals' annual Medicare payment updates 57 will be tied to submission of infection data, including CLABSIs and SSIs.<sup>6</sup> 58 59 Though HAI data have been collected for many years, use of the data for comparison of infection 60

rates between hospitals and other healthcare facilities requires uniform measurement standards.

62 Because methods for diagnosis and data collection on HAIs vary among institutions, the validity

NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

of data comparisons between facilities or across geographic areas is questionable. Endorsement

- of national standards for HAI measurement allows states and other organizations to gain a
- valuable resource for implementing nationally comparable standards rather than going forward
- 66 with separate, potentially discordant measurement efforts. Ultimately, consumers gain access to
- 67 standardized data that are reliable and useful for decision making.
- 68

### 69 STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS FOR NQF

- NQF's mission includes three parts: 1) setting national priorities and goals for performance
- improvement, 2) endorsing national consensus standards for measuring and publicly reporting on
- 72 performance, and 3) promoting the attainment of national goals through education and outreach

programs. As greater numbers of quality measures are developed and brought to NQF for

consideration of endorsement, it is incumbent on NQF to assist stakeholders to "measure what

makes a difference" and address what is important to achieve the best outcomes for patients and

76 populations. For more information see <u>www.qualityforum.org</u>.

77

78 Several strategic issues have been identified to guide consideration of candidate consensus

79 standards:

80 **DRIVE TOWARD HIGH PERFORMANCE.** Over time, the bar of performance expectations

should be raised to encourage the achievement of higher levels of system performance.

82 EMPHASIZE COMPOSITES. Composite measures provide much needed summary

83 information pertaining to multiple dimensions of performance and are more comprehensible to

84 patients and consumers.

85 MOVE TOWARD OUTCOME MEASUREMENT. Outcome measures provide information

of keen interest to consumers and purchasers, and when coupled with healthcare process

- 87 measures, they provide useful and actionable information to providers. Outcome measures also
- focus attention on much needed system-level improvements, because achieving the best patient
- 89 outcomes often requires carefully designed care processes, teamwork, and coordinated action on
- 90 the part of many providers.

| 91  | <b>CONSIDER DISPARITIES IN ALL THAT WE DO.</b> Some of the greatest performance gaps                            |
|-----|---|
| 92  | relate to care of minority populations. Particular attention should be focused on the most relevant             |
| 93  | race/ethnicity/language/socioeconomic strata to identify relevant measures for reporting.                       |
| 94  |   |
| 95  | NATIONAL PRIORITIES PARTNERSHIP   |
| 96  | NQF seeks to endorse measures that address the National Priorities and Goals of the National                    |
| 97  | Priorities Partnership. <sup>7</sup> The National Priorities Partnership represents those who receive, pay for, |
| 98  | provide, and evaluate healthcare. The National Priorities and Goals focus on these areas:                       |
| 99  | • patient and family engagement,  |
| 100 | • population health,  |
| 101 | • safety,   |
| 102 | • care coordination,  |
| 103 | • palliative and end-of-life care,  |
| 104 | • overuse,  |
| 105 | • equitable access, and   |
| 106 | • infrastructure support.   |
| 107 |   |
| 108 | NQF'S CONSENSUS DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (CDP)   |
| 109 | Patient Safety Measures Project <sup>8</sup>  |
| 110 | The National Quality Forum's National Voluntary Consensus Standards for Patient Safety                          |
| 111 | Measures project seeks to endorse patient safety-related measures that address healthcare-                      |
| 112 | associated infections (HAIs), medication safety, and other areas. Potential consensus standards                 |
| 113 | focus on a broad range of areas including but not limited to safety risk assessment and/or risk                 |
| 114 | identification, hospital standardized mortality rates, reporting and follow-up or critical test                 |
| 115 | results, and leadership and culture of safety. Additionally, the project will identify gaps in patient          |
| 116 | safety measures.  |
| 117 |   |
| 118 | This report does not represent the entire scope of NQF work relevant to patient safety. NQF has                 |
| 119 | endorsed over 100 measures related to patient safety through the National Voluntary Consensus                   |
| 120 | Standards for Medication Management project <sup>9</sup> , the National Voluntary Consensus Standards for       |
|     |   |

NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

the Reporting of Healthcare-Associated Infection Data<sup>10</sup> and other projects. In addition the Safe

Practices for Better Healthcare: 2010 Update<sup>11</sup> provides evidence based strategies to increase
patient safety.

The full constellation of consensus standards, along with those presented in this report, provide a growing number of NQF-endorsed<sup>®</sup> voluntary consensus standards that directly reflect the importance of measuring and improving the quality of care provided to patients. Organizations that adopt these consensus standards will promote the delivery of safer and higher-quality care for patients.

129

### 130 Evaluating Potential Consensus Standards

Candidate standards were solicited though an open "Call for Measures" in January 2010 and 131 132 were actively sought by NQF staff through literature reviews, a search of the National Quality Measures Clearinghouse, NQF Member websites, and an environmental scan. The measures 133 were evaluated using NQF's standard evaluation criteria<sup>12</sup>. The HAI Technical Advisory Panel 134 (TAP) rated the subcriteria for each candidate consensus standard and identified strengths and 135 136 weaknesses to assist the project Steering Committee (Committee) in making recommendations. For this first report, the 21-member, multi-stakeholder Committee provided final evaluations of 137 138 the four main criteria: importance to measure and report, scientific acceptability of the measure properties, usability, and feasibility. Measure developers participated in the TAP and Committee 139 discussions to respond to questions and clarify any issues or concerns. 140

141

### 142 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENDORSEMENT**

This first report of the Patient Safety Measures project presents the evaluation results of five HAI
measures considered under NQF's Consensus Development Process. All five measures are
recommended for endorsement as voluntary consensus standards suitable for public reporting
and quality improvement.

147

### 148 Candidate Consensus Standards Recommended for Endorsement

149

150 PSM-001-10: National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Central line-associated

151 bloodstream infection (CLABSI) outcome measure (CDC) This measure applies a

- standardized infection ratio (SIR) of healthcare-associated, central line-associated bloodstream
- 153 infections (CLABSI) among patients in intensive care units (ICUs) and neonatal intensive care
- units (NICUs).PSM-001-10 is intended as a replacement for NQF-endorsed measure #0139 -
- 155 Central line catheter-associated blood stream infection rate for ICU and high-risk nursery
- 156 (HRN) patients.
- 157 This measure was designed to capitalize on increased reporting to the National Healthcare Safety
- 158 Network (NHSN), a voluntary, nationwide HAI surveillance system managed by the Centers for
- 159 Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Hospitals and other healthcare providers use
- standardized definitions and protocols to report HAI data to the NHSN regularly, allowing the
- 161 CDC to estimate the prevalence of HAIs, recognize trends, and assist healthcare facilities in
- 162 quality improvement activities. The measure uses a standardized infection ratio (SIR) to compare
- a given healthcare facility's observed CLABSI rate to that facility's expected CLABSI rate. The
- 164 expected rate is based on standardized rates that account for length of stay, length of central line
- use, patient care location, and other factors.
- 166
- This measure addresses a high impact area; approximately 80,000 CLABSIs occur in intensive care units (ICUs) each year, resulting in up to 20,000 deaths and up to \$2 billion in additional costs.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, evidence-based interventions have shown significant reductions in CLABSI rates and improved health outcomes. For these reasons, the Committee agreed that this measure strongly meets the criteria of importance to measure and report.
- 172

While the Committee appreciated the detail within the measure specifications, members expressed concern about the absence of a risk adjustment model or specific exclusions that consider the variability of disease severity from unit to unit or within units. Committee members also requested clarification on the measure developer's unit type classifications. The developer explained that as part of the NHSN enrollment process, facilities must map internal location to pre-defined locations in the NHSN Patient Safety Manual. The criteria or unit designation are

NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

179 included in the Manual. Although the measure is based on unit experience and not patient-level data, there are mechanisms to stratify patients by risk. Units with increased risk related to disease 180 severity, are identified as "special care areas," separate from critical care units or intensive care 181 units (ICUs). The developer noted that patient-level analysis would add to the data collection and 182 manual calculation burden. The developer added that data could be stratified on several levels 183 including by hospital type (i.e. teaching versus non-teaching hospital). Ultimately, the 184 Committee and the developer acknowledged the inevitable variability from patient to patient that 185 might be missed with this type of unit-based analysis. 186

187

The Committee raised several questions about how data are reported within the NHSN-188

specifically, the level of granularity used to report organism types and the specific reporting time 189

period (i.e., whether reporting is cumulative, ongoing, annual, or quarterly). For public reporting, 190

bloodstream infections are grouped together regardless of pathogen type. The developer stated 191

192 that pathogen-specific data are captured on CLABSI events when available, and that appropriate

exclusionary rules are applied to those events. Although annual data are published in the 193

194 American Journal of Infection Control, the NHSN application also houses aggregate data, which

provides facilities an opportunity to compare their performance with the national aggregate over 195

196 specific time intervals. The developer acknowledged that they have not explored all potential

issues associated with quarterly public reporting. The Committee recommended that the 197

198 developer define a specific reporting timeframe, especially if the metric is adopted by a

regulatory agency that requires quarterly reporting. No clarification has been received from the 199

200 developer yet.

201

202 On the issue of feasibility, the Committee voiced concerns about reporting a SIR rather than a rate, since several states already mandate the reporting of CLABSI rates. The Committee 203 questioned the usability outside NHSN participation and believed that a SIR may also lead to 204 increased manual data collection and entry. The measure developer stated that using the SIR 205 206 creates significant added value by enabling comparisons of observed HAIs to expected HAIs 207 based on nationally aggregated data.

# NQF REVIEW DRAFT-DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

This outcome measure replaces NQF-endorsed measure #0139 – Central line catheter-associated
blood stream infections rate for ICU and high-risk nursery (HRN) patients and addresses the
National Priority area of safety.

211

#### 212 PSM-002-10: National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) surgical site infection (SSI)

**outcome measure (CDC)** *Standardized infection ratio (SIR) of SSIs among patients who* 

214 *underwent any National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) surgical procedure corresponding* 

215 to the Surgical Care Improvement Program (SCIP) coronary artery bypass graft, other cardiac,

colon, hip or knee arthroplasty, abdominal and vaginal hysterectomy, or vascular procedures.

217 This measure is intended as a replacement for NQF-endorsed measure #0299 – Surgical site

218 *infection rate.* 

219

This measure captures deep incisional and organ/space surgical site infections and is currently 220 used in the NHSN surveillance system. The selected procedure categories closely correspond 221 with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS') SCIP quality reporting initiative 222 223 and were included in the NHSN because they focus on higher risk and higher volume procedures. Consideration was also given to procedures with strong evidence-based data on care 224 225 practices and related outcomes. The measure addresses a high impact area; each year, approximately 11 percent of all deaths in ICUs are associated with SSIs, resulting in up to 20,000 226 deaths and \$2 billion in additional costs.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, evidence-based interventions have shown 227 significant reductions in SSI rates and improved health outcomes. For these reasons, the Steering 228 229 Committee agreed that this measure strongly meets the criteria of importance to measure and report. 230

231

Similar to the CDC's CLABSI outcome measure, data for this measure are published in NHSN
reports as a standardized infection ratio (SIR). The SIR calculation considers the total number of
observed SSI events and the expected number using the national aggregate rates within the
NHSN system. Because several states mandate rate-based SSI reporting, TAP and Committee
members debated the feasibility of calculating a SIR for facilities not participating in the NHSN.
The measure developer acknowledged the concern, yet believed that the utility of a SIR as an

NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

- indirect standardization of cumulative SSI experiences across several stratified groups of data,
- specifically procedure categories, provides significant added value.
- 240
- 241 The Committee rated the measure favorably on the four major criteria and suggested broader
- application to ambulatory surgery centers in the future.
- 243 This outcome measure replaces NQF-endorsed measure #0299 Surgical Site Infection Rate and
- addresses the National Priority area of safety.
- 245
- 246 **PSM-006-10:** Risk adjusted surgical site infection outcome measure (ACS) *This is a*

247 hospital-based, risk-adjusted, case-mix-adjusted surgical site infection measure of adults 18

248 *years of age and over.* 

249

Similar to measure #PSM-002-10, this measure counts the number of SSIs associated with a 250 subset of procedures used in the American College of Surgeons (ACS) National Surgical Quality 251 Improvement Program (NSQIP). Although the TAP and Committee recognized the opportunity 252 253 for hospitals to benchmark against national aggregate data, both raised concerns about data collection and case load, which is estimated at 200-500 cases per facility annually, as well as 254 255 concerns about the exclusion of trauma and transplant patients. The developer explained that data on trauma and transplant patients are not collected as part of the NSQIP system and are included 256 257 in a separate database. At the TAP's recommendation, the measure developer modified the measure's specifications to include an explicit rationale for the exclusion of these patients, in 258 259 addition to the following:

- confirmation on whether the measure is applicable to any ACS NSQIP listed CPT
   surgical procedure; and
- 262

• a list of specific CPT codes as indicated on the measure submission form.

263 The Committee agreed that this measure meets the criteria for scientific acceptability.

264 Committee members posed several questions about the data collection burden associated with

this measure, especially related to patient follow-up 30 days post-procedure and the potential

NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

burden for non-NSQIP facilities. The developer confirmed that only a phone call or letter is

- 267 required post-procedure if no other follow-up is documented in the patient record. The developer
- 268 provided an overview of the implementation plan for non-NSQIP participants. Essentially, CPT
- codes are specified, along with specific risk adjusters that all hospitals must collect. The
- 270 developer assured the Committee that there would be no added analytical burden placed on non-
- 271 NSQIP participating hospitals.
- 272 This outcome measure addresses the National Priority area of safety.

### 273 Head-to-Head Comparison of SSI Measures (#PSM-002-10 and #PSM-006-10)

The Committee compared the two SSI measures, measure #PSM-002-10 and measure #PSM-274 006-10, to determine if one measure could be considered best-in-class. The Committee noted that 275 both measures capture similar information using different data sources. Steering Committee 276 members acknowledged that each measure may offer benefits for quality improvement because 277 they assess populations differently. Both measures are currently in use in the NSQIP and NHSN 278 279 surveillance systems; however, it was difficult for the Committee to compare these measures, where the advantages and disadvantages of one measure may be offset by those of a competing 280 measure without additional evidence from the field on their use. Committee members also 281 discussed the possibility of harmonization.<sup>14</sup> The developers are collaborating to harmonize both 282 measures in the very near future. Ultimately, the Committee recommended both measures for 283 endorsement, independently, with the following suggestions: 284

- Harmonization of both measures should be complete by the first maintenance review; and
- The developers should conduct focus groups with current NSQIP and NSHN
   participating facilities to assess how both surveillance programs are working, with regard
   to feasibility and usability.
- 289 PSM-003-10: National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) Catheter-associated urinary
- 290 tract Infection (CAUTI) outcome measure (CDC) This measure applies a standardized
- 291 infection ratio (SIR) of healthcare-associated, catheter-associated urinary tract infections
- 292 (CAUTI) among patients in intensive care units (ICUs), excluding patients in neonatal ICUs

NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

293 (NICUs). This measure is intended as a replacement for NQF-endorsed measure #0138 -

- 294 Urinary catheter-associated urinary tract infection for intensive care unit (ICU) patients.
- 295

Urinary tract infections are estimated to be the most frequently-occurring HAIs, accounting for
approximately 36 percent of HAIs in U.S. hospitals.<sup>15</sup> UTIs can cause significant increases in
morbidity, mortality, and costs. The Steering Committee agreed that this measure strongly meets
the criteria for importance to measure and report.

300

301 Similar to the CDC's CLABSI and SSI outcome measures, this measure uses a SIR to compare a

302 given healthcare facility's observed CAUTI rate to that facility's expected CAUTI rate. The

303 expected rate is based on standardized rates that account for length of stay, length of urinary

304 catheterization, patient care location, and other factors. As with previous discussions about the

305 CDC's CLABSI and SSI measures, the Committee questioned the usability outside NHSN

306 participation and believed that a SIR may also lead to increased manual data collection and entry.

307 The developer reiterated the benefits of utilizing an indirect standardization of cumulative SSI

- 308 experiences across several stratified groups of data.
- 309

310 Measure development in this topic area has generally focused on specific sites and/or settings

311 like nursing homes. The Committee discussed the benefits of developing more cross-cutting

312 measures and suggested broader application beyond the ICU (i.e., to long term care settings

across the whole continuum of care) in the future.

This outcome measure addresses replaces NQF-endorsed measure #0138 - Urinary catheter-

associated urinary tract infection for intensive care unit (ICU) patients and addresses the

316 National Priority area of safety.

### 317 **PSM-007-10: Risk Adjusted Urinary Tract Infection Outcome Measure (ACS)** *This is a risk*

adjusted, case mix adjusted urinary tract infection outcome measure of adults 18+ years after

- 319 *surgical procedure*.
- 320 This measure is currently used in the ACS NSQIP surveillance system. The developer reiterated
- that the measure assesses UTIs within 30 days of surgical procedure and it is not catheter-

#### NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

- 322 specific. Nonetheless, urinary catheterizations account for the vast majority of UTIs. In a recent
- study of 36,000 major surgery patients, 86 percent of the study cohort had perioperative urinary
- 324 catheters. Patients who had indwelling catheters for longer than two days postoperative, were
- twice as likely to develop a catheter associated urinary tract infection (CAUTI).<sup>16</sup> In monetary
- terms, UTIs contribute to approximately \$340-450 million in additional health care costs
- 327 annually.<sup>17</sup> For these reasons, the Steering Committee agreed that this measure strongly meets
- 328 the criteria for importance to measure and report.
- Both TAP and Committee members were concerned that reliability and validity testing have only
- been conducted through modeling. The developer noted that inter-rater reliability is tested
- regularly. The Committee observed that, based on the model's estimates, a minimum case load
- of approximately 300 patients is required to achieve adequate reliability. Some members were
- 333 concerned that the data collection associated with this requirement could impose a burden on
- 334 providers
- The 30-day patient follow-up, specifically the clinical expertise needed to identify and
- differentiate infections and all associated financial costs, were cited by TAP and Committee
- 337 members as a barrier to data collection and implementation.
- The Committee also discussed the benefits of developing more cross-cutting measures andsuggested broader application beyond the surgical population.
- 340 This outcome measure addresses the National Priority area of safety.
- 341

### 342 Head-to-Head Comparison of UTI measures (#PSM-003-10 and #PSM-007-10)

- 343 The Steering Committee evaluated the benefits of potential harmonization between proposed
- measures #PSM-003-10 and #PSM-007-10. Although both measures address UTIs, the
- 345 Committee noted that there are substantial differences between the targeted populations and data
- sources of the measures. Therefore, the Committee did not think that it was necessary to make a
- 347 determination on best-in-class or render a recommendation for harmonization.

### NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

348

349

### 350 Additional Recommendations

351

Steering Committee members presented the following recommendations for further research andmeasure development:

354

Increasing opportunities to harmonize would relieve some of the current reporting burden. In 355 some cases, harmonization would be prudent and useful. However, it is important to note that 356 harmonization may not be feasible in all circumstances. Therefore, clustering measures into 357 meaningful topic categories that creates a suite of tools might assist the healthcare industry with 358 evaluating measures at multiple levels. For example, in the case of urinary tract infections, a 359 cluster of measures could be identified that uses any one of the following: lab results, physician 360 diagnosis from empirical symptoms, a transfer diagnosis from hospital to long-term care, patient 361 qualitative report, device usage patterns, or physician antibiotic orders. Defining the numerators 362 and denominators would vary depending on the source and use of the data. The selection of the 363 right measure would depend on the users' intentions. 364

365

As clinical information technologies become fully deployed throughout the healthcare system, 366 367 antibiotics or lab result data may be useful from a surveillance perspective for public accountability, while clinical judgment and empirical symptoms may be more useful for 368 369 improved patient care. Further discussion about this issue is needed to more clearly define the usability characteristics of each measure in relationship to other similar measures. Only by 370 371 clustering the measures into groups can in-depth analysis of the similarities and the differences be obtained. From there, more thoughtful dialogue on the "value" of each measure can be 372 373 assessed.

374

| 375 | NOTE | S  |
|-----|------|--|
| 376 | 1.   | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Estimates of Healthcare-Associated     |
| 377 |      | Infections. CDC; 2010. Available at http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dhqp/hai.html. Last        |
| 378 |      | accessed October 2010.   |
| 379 | 2.   | Scott II, RD. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The Direct Medical       |
| 380 |      | Costs of Healthcare-Associated Infections in U.S. Hospitals and the Benefits of          |
| 381 |      | Prevention. CDC; 2010. Available at  |
| 382 |      | http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dhqp/pdf/Scott_CostPaper.pdf. Last accessed October 2010.      |
| 383 | 3.   | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). External Peer Review of the Division   |
| 384 |      | of Healthcare Quality Promotion Surveillance Branch Final Report of the External Peer    |
| 385 |      | Review. CDC; 2008. Available at  |
| 386 |      | $http://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/PDFs/SurveillanceBranchPeerReviewReprot\_Excerpts\_MAY2$        |
| 387 |      | 008.pdf. Last accessed October 2010.   |
| 388 | 4.   | National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). Lessons from the Pioneers Reporting    |
| 389 |      | Healthcare-Associated Infections. NCSL; 2010. Available at                               |
| 390 |      | http://www.ncsl.org/documents/health/haireport.pdf . Last accessed October 2010.         |
| 391 | 5.   | Ibid.  |
| 392 | 6.   | McKinney, M. The infection connection. Modern Healthcare, August 9, 2010:6-7, 16,        |
| 393 |      | p.6. Available at <u>http://www.modernhealthcare.com/assets/pdf/CH7067686.PDF</u> . Last |
| 394 |      | accessed October 2010.   |
| 395 | 7.   | National Quality Forum (NQF), National Priorities Partnership, Washington, DC: NQF.      |
| 396 |      | Available at www.nationalprioritiespartnership.org. Last accessed October 2010.          |
| 397 | 8.   | http://www.qualityforum.org/projects/patient_safety_measures.aspx. Last accessed         |
| 398 |      | October 2010.  |
| 399 | 9.   | http://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2010/05/National_Voluntary_Consensus_Stan       |
| 400 |      | dards_for_Medication_Management.aspx. Last accessed October 2010.                        |
| 401 | 10.  | http://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2008/03/National_Voluntary_Consensus_Stan       |
| 402 |      | dards for the Reporting of Healthcare-Associated Infection Data.aspx. Last accessed      |
| 403 |      | October 2010.  |

### NQF REVIEW DRAFT—DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE

| 404 | 11. http://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2010/04/Safe_Practices_for_Better_Healthcare     |
|-----|---|
| 405 | <u>– 2010 Update.aspx</u> . Last accessed September 2010.                                     |
| 406 | 12. NQF. Measure Evaluation Criteria. Washington, DC: NQF; 2008. Available at                 |
| 407 | http://www.qualityforum.org/docs/measure_evaluation_criteria.aspx. Last accessed              |
| 408 | October 2010.   |
| 409 | 13. Saint S, Savel RH, Matthay MA. "Enhancing the Safety of Critically Ill Patients by        |
| 410 | Reducing Urinary and Central Venous Catheter-related Infections." American Journal of         |
| 411 | Respiratory Critical Care Med. 2002;165:1475-1479.  |
| 412 | 14. Harmonization refers to the standardization of specifications for similar measures on the |
| 413 | same topic (e.g., influenza immunization of patients in hospitals or nursing homes), or       |
| 414 | related measures for the same target population (e.g., eye exam and HbA1c for patients        |
| 415 | with diabetes), or definitions applicable to many measures (e.g., age designation for         |
| 416 | children) so that they are uniform or compatible, unless differences are dictated by the      |
| 417 | evidence. The dimensions of harmonization can include numerator, denominator,                 |
| 418 | exclusions, and data source and collection instructions. The extent of harmonization          |
| 419 | depends on the relationship of the measures, the evidence for the specific measure focus,     |
| 420 | and differences in data sources.  |
| 421 | 15. Klevens RM, Edwards JR, Richards CL, Jr. "Estimating Health Care-Associated               |
| 422 | Infections and Deaths in U.S. Hospitals." Public Health Reports. March-April,                 |
| 423 | 2002;122:160-166.   |
| 424 | 16. Wald HL, Ma A, Bratzler DW, Kramer AM. "Indwelling urinary catheter use in the            |
| 425 | postoperative period: analysis of the national surgical infection prevention project data."   |
| 426 | Archives of Surgery. June 2008;143(6):551-557.  |
| 427 | 17. Stone PW, Braccia D, Larson E. "Systematic review of economic analyses of health care-    |
| 428 | associated infections." American Journal of Infection Control. November                       |
| 429 | 2005;33(9):501-509.   |

The following table presents the detailed specifications for the National Quality Forum (NQF)-endorsed<sup>®</sup> *National Voluntary Consensus Standards for Patient Safety*. All information presented has been derived directly from measure sources/developers without modifications or alteration (except when the measure developer agreed to such modifications during the NQF Consensus Development Process) and is current as of October 8, 2010. All NQF-endorsed voluntary consensus standards are open source, meaning they are fully accessible and disclosed. Measures were developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the American College of Surgeons.

| Measure    | Measure       | Measure     | Measure         | Numerator                    | Denominator             | Exclusions         | Data Source    | Level of    |
|------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Numbers    | Title         | Steward     | Description     |                              |                         |                    |                | Analysis    |
| PSM-001-10 | National      | Centers for | Standardized    | Total number of observed     | Total number of         | 1. Pacemaker       | Electronic     | Population: |
|            | Healthcare    | Disease     | Infection Ratio | healthcare-associated CLABSI | expected CLABSIs,       | wires and other    | clinical data; | states;     |
|            | Safety        | Control and | (SIR) of        | among patients in ICUs and   | calculated by           | nonlumened         | Electronic     | Facility/   |
|            | Network       | Prevention  | healthcare-     | NICUs                        | multiplying the         | devices inserted   | Health/        | Agency;     |
|            | (NHSN)        |             | associated,     |                              | number of central       | into central blood | Medical        | Population: |
|            | Central line- |             | central line-   |                              | line device days for    | vessels or the     | Record; Lab    | national    |
|            | associated    |             | associated      |                              | each location under     | heart are excluded | data; Paper    |             |
|            | Bloodstream   |             | bloodstream     |                              | surveillance for        | as central lines   | medical        |             |
|            | Infection     |             | infections      |                              | CLABSI during the       | 2. Peripheral      | record/ flow-  |             |
|            | (CLABSI)      |             | (CLABSI)        |                              | period by the CLABSI    | intravenous lines  | sheet; Special |             |
|            | Outcome       |             | among patients  |                              | rate for the same       | are excluded from  | or unique data |             |
|            | Measure       |             | in intensive    |                              | types of locations      | this measure       |                |             |
|            |               |             | care units      |                              | obtained from the       |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             | (ICUs) and      |                              | standard population.    |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             | Neonatal        |                              | Central line device-    |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             | Intensive Care  |                              | day denominator         |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             | Units (NICUs)   |                              | data that are collected |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             |                 |                              | differ according to     |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             |                 |                              | the location of the     |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             |                 |                              | patients being          |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             |                 |                              | monitored. See 2a.8.    |                    |                |             |
|            |               |             |                 |                              |                         |                    |                |             |

| Measure    | Measure Title   | Measure     | Measure          | Numerator                    | Denominator           | Exclusions | Data Source    | Level of    |
|------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| Numbers    |                 | Steward     | Description      |                              |                       |            |                | Analysis    |
| PSM-002-10 | National        | Centers for | Standardized     | Total number of observed     | Using multivariable   | None       | Electronic     | Facility/   |
|            | Healthcare      | Disease     | Infection Ratio  | deep incisional primary      | procedure-specific    |            | clinical data; | Agency;     |
|            | Safety          | Control and | (SIR) of deep    | (DIP) and organ/space SSIs   | logistic regression   |            | Electronic     | Population: |
|            | Network         | Prevention  | incisional and   | detected during admission    | models, the expected  |            | Health/        | national;   |
|            | (NHSN)          |             | organ/space      | or readmission among         | number of SSIs is     |            | Medical        | Population: |
|            | Surgical Site   |             | Surgical Site    | patients who have            | obtained. These       |            | Record; Lab    | states      |
|            | Infection (SSI) |             | Infections (SSI) | undergone the following      | expected numbers are  |            | data; Paper    |             |
|            | Outcome         |             | at the primary   | inpatient NHSN operative     | summed across strata  |            | medical        |             |
|            | Measure         |             | incision site    | procedure categories:        | (e.g., procedure      |            | record/ flow-  |             |
|            |                 |             | among patients   | 1. Abdominal Aortic          | categories, surgeons, |            | sheet; Special |             |
|            |                 |             | undergoing       | Aneurysm Repair (AAA)        | etc) and used as the  |            | or unique data |             |
|            |                 |             | selected         | 2. Coronary Artery Bypass    | denominator of this   |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             | inpatient        | Graft with both chest and    | measure (see also     |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             | operative        | donor site incisions (CBGB); | 2a.8).                |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             | procedure        | only SSI from the chest      |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             | categories.      | (primary site) are included  |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 3. Coronary Artery Bypass    |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | Graft with chest incision    |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | only (CBGC)                  |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 4. Colon surgery (COLO)      |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 5. Hip Arthroplasty (HPRO)   |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 6. Abdominal Hysterectomy    |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | (HYST)                       |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 7. Knee Arthroplasty         |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | (KPRO)                       |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 8. Peripheral Vascular       |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | Bypass surgery (PVBY)        |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 9. Rectal surgery (REC)      |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | 10. Vaginal Hysterectomy     |                       |            |                |             |
|            |                 |             |                  | (VHYS)                       |                       |            |                |             |

| Measure<br>Numbers | Measure Title   | Measure<br>Steward                 | Measure<br>Description   | Numerator  | Denominator   | Exclusions   | Data Source  | Level of<br>Analysis   |
|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| PSM-006-10         | Risk Adjusted<br>Surgical Site<br>Infection<br>Outcome<br>Measure | American<br>College of<br>Surgeons | This is a<br>hospital based,<br>risk adjusted,<br>case mix<br>adjusted<br>surgical site<br>infection<br>measure of<br>adults 18 years<br>of age and<br>over. | The outcome of interest is a<br>hospital-specific risk-<br>adjusted Deep Incisional<br>Surgical Site Infection (SSI)<br>or Organ/Space SSI as<br>defined by American<br>College of Surgeons<br>National Surgical Quality<br>Improvement Program (ACS<br>NSQIP), occurring within 30<br>days of any of the listed CPT<br>surgical procedures. The list<br>of eligible CPT codes is<br>attached. | Patients undergoing<br>any of the specified list<br>of eligible CPT<br>surgical procedure<br>codes. See separate<br>attached list of eligible<br>CPT codes. | Major trauma and<br>transplant<br>surgeries are<br>excluded as are<br>surgeries not on<br>the supplied CPT<br>list as eligible for<br>selection. Patients<br>who are ASA 6<br>(brain-death organ<br>donor) are not<br>eligible surgical<br>cases.<br>A patient who has<br>a second surgical<br>procedure<br>performed within<br>30 days after an<br>index procedure<br>cannot be accrued<br>into the measure<br>as a new (second)<br>index procedure<br>since the measure<br>is based on 30 day<br>outcomes. | Documentatio<br>n of original<br>self-<br>assessment;<br>Paper medical<br>record/ flow-<br>sheet;<br>Pharmacy<br>data;<br>Electronic<br>clinical data;<br>Electronic<br>Health/<br>Medical<br>Record; Lab<br>data;<br>Management<br>data | Analysis         Facility/         Agency;         Population:         national;         Population:         regional/         network;         Population:         states |

| Measure Meas<br>Numbers Title  | easure<br>le  | Measure<br>Steward                                  | Measure<br>Description  | Numerator   | Denominator   | Exclusions   | Data Source   | Level of<br>Analysis  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| PSM-003- National Nat | tional<br>althcare<br>ety<br>twork<br>HSN)<br>theter-<br>ociated<br>inary Tract<br>ection<br>AUTI)<br>tcome<br>easure | Centers for<br>Disease<br>Control and<br>Prevention | Standardized<br>Infection Ratio<br>(SIR) of<br>healthcare-<br>associated,<br>catheter-<br>associated<br>urinary tract<br>infections<br>(CAUTI)<br>among<br>patients in<br>intensive care<br>units (ICUs),<br>excluding<br>patients in<br>neonatal ICUs<br>(NICUs) | Total number of observed<br>healthcare-associated<br>CAUTI among patients in<br>ICUs (excluding patients in<br>NICUs) | Total number of<br>expected CAUTIs,<br>which is calculated<br>by multiplying the<br>number of urinary<br>catheter days for each<br>location under<br>surveillance for<br>CAUTI during the<br>period by the CAUTI<br>rate for the same<br>types of locations<br>obtained from the<br>standard population.<br>These expected<br>numbers are summed<br>across locations and<br>used as the<br>denominator of this<br>measure (see also<br>2a.8). | Non-indwelling<br>catheters by<br>NHSN<br>definitions:<br>1.Suprapubic<br>catheters<br>2.Condom<br>catheters<br>3."In and out"<br>catheterizations | Electronic<br>clinical data;<br>Electronic<br>Health/<br>Medical<br>Record; Lab<br>data; Paper<br>medical<br>record/ flow-<br>sheet; Special<br>or unique<br>data | Population:<br>states;<br>Population:<br>national;<br>Facility/<br>Agency |

| Measure    | Measure Title | Measure    | Measure        | Numerator                      | Denominator              | Exclusions           | Data Source       | Level of    |
|------------|---------------|------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Numbers    |               | Steward    | Description    |                                |                          |                      |                   | Analysis    |
| PSM-007-10 | Risk Adjusted | American   | Risk adjusted, | The outcome of interest is a   | Patients undergoing      | Major trauma and     | Documentation     | Facility/   |
|            | Urinary Tract | College of | case mix       | hospital-specific assessment   | any of the listed (CPT)  | transplant           | of original self- | Agency;     |
|            | Infection     | Surgeons   | adjusted       | of risk-adjusted Urinary       | surgical procedures-     | surgeries are        | assessment;       | Population: |
|            | Outcome       |            | urinary tract  | Tract Infection (UTI: as       | list is attached         | excluded as are      | Paper medical     | national;   |
|            | Measure After |            | infection      | defined by American            | separately. Specifically | surgeries not on     | record/ flow-     | Population: |
|            | Surgery       |            | outcome        | College of Surgeons            | excluded are certain     | the supplied CPT     | sheet;            | regional/   |
|            |               |            | measure of     | National Surgical Quality      | CPTs involving the       | list as eligible for | Pharmacy data;    | network;    |
|            |               |            | adults 18+     | Improvement Program (ACS       | urinary tract            | selection. Patients  | Electronic        | Population: |
|            |               |            | years after    | NSQIP)defined below)           | (excluded: 50220,        | who are ASA 6        | clinical data;    | states      |
|            |               |            | surgical       | within 30 days of any listed   | 50545, 50400, 50205,     | (brain-death organ   | Electronic        |             |
|            |               |            | procedure.     | (CPT) surgical procedure:      | 51040, 54640, 53852,     | donor) are not       | Health/           |             |
|            |               |            |                | the list of eligible CPT codes | 55866, 52450, 52234).    | eligible surgical    | Medical           |             |
|            |               |            |                | is attached separately.        | See attached             | cases.               | Record; Lab       |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                | submitted list of        | A patient who has    | data;             |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                | eligible CPT codes.      | a second surgical    | Management        |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | procedure            | data              |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | performed within     |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | 30 days after an     |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | index procedure      |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | cannot be accrued    |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | into the measure     |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | as a new (second)    |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | index procedure      |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | since the measure    |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | is based on 30 day   |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          | outcomes.            |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          |                      |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          |                      |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          |                      |                   |             |
|            |               |            |                |                                |                          |                      |                   |             |



#### Patient Safety Measures HAI TAP

#### Dr. Darrell A. Campbell, Jr., MD (Chair)

University of Michigan Hospitals & Health Centers, Ann Arbor, MI

#### Ms. Jan Allison, RN

Surgical Care Affiliates, Washington, OK

#### Ms. Sue Barnes, RN, BSN, CIC

Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, CA

#### Dr. Brian Fennerty, MD

Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR

#### Dr. Juan Sanchez, MD, MPA

Saint Mary's Health System, Waterbury, CT

#### Ms. Carolyn C. Scott, RN, MEd, MHA

Premier, Charlotte, NC

#### Dr. Kathleen Squires, MD

Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA

#### Dr. Patricia Stone, PhD, FAAN

Columbia University, New York, NY

#### **Patient Safety Measures Steering Committee**

#### William Conway, MD (Co-Chair)

Henry Ford Health System, Birmingham, MI

#### Lisa Thiemann, CRNA, MNA (Co-Chair)

American Association of Nurse Anesthetists, Park Ridge, IL

#### Jan Allison, RN

Surgical Care Affiliates, Washington, OK

#### Robert Bunting, MSA, CPHRM, CPHQ, MT

WellPoint, Columbus, GA

#### **Darrell Campbell, MD**

University of Michigan Hospitals & Health Centers, Ann Arbor, MI

#### Steven Clark, MD

Hospital Corporation of America, Nashville, TN

#### Cynthia de Luise, MPH, PhD

Pfizer, New York, NY

#### Ellis Diamond, MD

Tri-City Medical Center, Oceanside, CA

#### Donald Kennerly, MD, PhD

Baylor Health Care System, Dallas, TX

#### **Clifton Knight, MD**

Community Hospital of Indiana, Inc., Indianapolis, IN

#### Kris Kowdley, MD, FACP, FACG, FA

Virginia Mason Medical Center, Seattle, WA

#### Stephen Lawless, MD, MBA

Nemours Foundation, Wilmington, DE

#### Alan Levine

Consumers Advancing Patient Safety, Alexandria, VA

#### Stephen Muething, MD

Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, OH

#### Janet Nagamine, MD, RN

Society of Hospital Medicine, Aptos, CA

#### Paul Nagy, PhD

University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

#### David Nau, PhD, RPh, CPHQ

Pharmacy Quality Alliance, Lexington, KY

#### Paul Sierzenski, MD

Pharmacy Quality Alliance, Lexington, KY

#### Daniel Solomon, MD

Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

#### Iona Thraen, MSW

Utah Department of Health, Salt Lake City, Utah

#### David Turner, MD, PhD, MPH

Monsanto, Saint Louis, MO

#### NQF Staff

#### Peter Angood, MD

Senior Advisor

#### Andrew Lyzenga, MPP

Project Manager

### Elisa Munthali, MPH

Project Manager

#### Lindsey Tighe, MPH

**Research Analyst** 

#### Jessica Weber, MPH

**Research Analyst** 

## NQF-endorsed® Patient Safety Measures

### **Table of Contents**

| Measure# 0019: Documentation of medication list in the outpatient record  |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Measure# 0020: Documentation of allergies and adverse reactions in the outpatient record  | 3                   |
| Measure# 0021: Therapeutic monitoring: Annual monitoring for patients on persistent medications   | 3                   |
| Measure# 0022: Drugs to be avoided in the elderly: a. Patients who receive at least one drug to be avoided<br>Patients who receive at least two different drugs to be avoided | <b>, b.</b>         |
| Measure# 0035: Fall risk management in older adults: a. Discussing fall risk, b.Managing fall risk  | 4                   |
| Measure# 0101: Falls: Screening for Fall Risk   | 5                   |
| Measure# 0138: Urinary catheter-associated urinary tract infection for intensive care unit (ICU) patients   | 6                   |
| Measure# 0139: Central line catheter-associated blood stream infection rate for ICU and high-risk nursery   | <sup>,</sup> 6      |
| (HRN) patients  | 6                   |
| Measure# 0140: Ventilator-associated pneumonia for ICU and high-risk nursery (HRN) patients   | 6                   |
| Measure# 0141: Patient Fall Rate  | 7                   |
| Measure# 0184: Residents who have a catheter in the bladder at any time during the 14-day assessment pe<br>(risk adjusted)  | e <b>riod.</b><br>8 |
| Measure# 0187: Recently hospitalized residents with pressure ulcers (risk adjusted)   | 9                   |
| Measure# 0193: Residents who were physically restrained daily during the 7-day assessment period  | 10                  |
| Measure# 0196: Residents with a urinary tract infection   | 10                  |
| Measure# 0198: High-risk residents with pressure ulcers   | 11                  |
| Measure# 0199: Average-risk residents with pressure ulcers  | 11                  |
| Measure# 0201: Pressure ulcer prevalence  | 12                  |
| Measure# 0202: Falls with injury  | 13                  |
| Measure# 0203: Restraint prevalence (vest and limb only)  | 14                  |
| Measure# 0239: Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) Prophylaxis   | 15                  |
| Measure# 0263: Patient Burn   | 15                  |
| Measure# 0265: Hospital Transfer/Admission  | 15                  |
| Measure# 0266: Patient Fall   | 16                  |
| Measure# 0267: Wrong Site, Wrong Side, Wrong Patient, Wrong Procedure, Wrong Implant  | 16                  |
| Measure# 0298: Central Line Bundle Compliance   | 16                  |
| Measure# 0299: Surgical Site Infection Rate   | 17                  |
| Measure# 0301: Surgery patients with appropriate hair removal   | 18                  |
| Measure# 0302: Ventilator Bundle  | 19                  |
| Measure# 0337: Decubitus Ulcer (PDI 2)  | 19                  |
| Measure# 0345: Accidental Puncture or Laceration (PSI 15)   | 20                  |
| Measure# 0346: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)  | 20                  |
| Measure# 0347: Death in Low Mortality DRGs (PSI 2)  | 21                  |
| Measure# 0348: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax in Non-Neonates (PDI 5) (risk adjusted)  | 21                  |
| Measure# 0349: Transfusion Reaction (PSI 16)  | 22                  |

| Measure# 0350: Transfusion Reaction (PDI 13)                            | 22 |
|---|----|
| Measure# 0352: Failure to Rescue In-Hospital Mortality (risk adjusted)  |    |
| Measure# 0353: Failure to Rescue 30-Day Mortality (risk adjusted)       | 24 |
| Measure# 0362: Foreign Body left after procedure (PDI 3)                |    |
| Measure# 0363: Foreign Body Left in During Procedure (PSI 5)            | 25 |
| Measure# 0371: Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) Prophylaxis                 | 25 |
| Measure# 0589: Rheumatoid Arthritis New DMARD Baseline Serum Creatinine |    |

| Measure# 00        | 19: Documentation of medication list in the outpatient record  |
|--------------------|--|
| Steward            | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, National Committee for Quality Assurance   |
| Description        | Percentage of patients having a medication list in the medical record.   |
| Numerator          | Patients with a medication list in their medical record  |
| Denominator        | All patients who were continuously enrolled during the measurement year.   |
| Exclusions         |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Paper Medical Record   |
| Level              | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting            | Ambulatory Care (office/clinic)  |
| Measure# 002       | 20: Documentation of allergies and adverse reactions in the outpatient record  |
| Steward            | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, National Committee for Quality Assurance   |
| Description        | Percentage of patients having documentation of allergies and adverse reactions in the medical record.  |
| Numerator          | Patients with allergy and adverse reaction status present in medical record  |
| Denominator        | All patients who were continuously enrolled during the measurement year.   |
| Exclusions         |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Paper Medical Record   |
| Level              | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting            | Ambulatory Care (office/clinic)  |
| Measure# 002       | 21: Therapeutic monitoring: Annual monitoring for patients on persistent medications   |
| Steward            | National Committee for Quality Assurance   |
| Description        | Percentage of patients 18 years and older who received at least 180-day supply of medication therapy for the selected therapeutic agent and who received annual monitoring for the therapeutic agent. Percentage of patients on ACE inhibitors or ARBs with a  |
| Numerator          | a: The number of patients with at least one serum potassium and either a serum creatinine or a blood urea<br>nitrogen therapeutic monitoring test in the measurement year.<br>b: The number of patients with at least one serum potassium and either a serum creatinine or a blood urea<br>nitrogen therapeutic monitoring test in the measurement year.<br>c: The number of patients with at least one serum potassium and either a serum creatinine or a blood urea<br>nitrogen therapeutic monitoring test in the measurement year.<br>Note: The two tests do not need to occur on the same service date, only within the measurement year.<br>d: The number of patients with at least one drug serum concentration level monitoring test for the prescribed<br>drug in the measurement year. If a patient received only one type of anticonvulsant, the drug serum<br>concentration level test must be for the specific drug taken as a persistent medication. If a patient persistently<br>received multiple types of anticonvulsants, each anticonvulsant medication and drug monitoring test<br>combination is counted as a unique event (i.e., a patient on both phenytoin and valproic acid with at least a<br>180-days supply for each drug in the measurement year must separately show evidence of receiving drug<br>serum concentration tests for each drug to be considered numerator-compliant for each drug).<br>e: The number of patients with both an ALT and an AST liver enzyme test in the measurement year. A hepatic<br>function panel (which includes both a ALT and AST) also counts as numerator compliant.<br>F: Sum of the five numerators (a-e) |
| venominator        | a: The number of patients ages 18 years and older who received at least a 180-days supply of ACE inhibitors or<br>ARBs, including any combination products during the measurement year.<br>b: The number of patients ages 18 years and older who received at least a 180-days supply of digoxin,<br>including any combination products, during the measurement year.<br>c: The number of patients ages 18 years and older who received at least a 180-days supply of a diuretic,<br>including any combination products, during the measurement year.   |

| -                          |  |
|----------------------------|--|
|                            | d: The number of patients in the denominator who received at least a 180-days supply for any anticonvulsant for phenytoin, phenobarbital, valproic acid or carbamazepine during the measurement year. Each patient-  |
|                            | arug combination is considered a unique event.   |
|                            | CoA Reductase Inhibitors), including any combination product, during the measurement year.   |
|                            | F: Sum of the five denominators (a-e)  |
| Exclusions                 | a. Exclude patients from each rate denominator with a hospitalization in the measurement year. These patients  |
|                            | may have received a monitoring event during the hospitalization which may not be captured Hospitalizations<br>can be identified using either codes for inpatient discharges or non acute care or through the medical record.<br>B. Exclude patients from each rate denominator with a hospitalization in the measurement year. These<br>patients may have received a monitoring event during the hospitalization which may not be captured.<br>Hospitalizations can be identified using either codes for inpatient discharges or non acute care or through<br>medical records. |
|                            | C. Exclude patients from each rate denominator with a hospitalization in the measurement year. These patients may have received a monitoring event during the hospitalization which may not be captured. Hospitalizations can be identified using either codes for inpatient discharges or non acute care or medical   |
|                            | D. Exclude patients from each rate denominator with a hospitalization in the measurement year. These   |
|                            | patients may have received a monitoring event during the hospitalization which may not be captured.  |
|                            | Hospitalizations can be identified using either codes for inpatient discharges or non acute care.<br>E. Exclude patients from each rate denominator with a hospitalization in the measurement year. These<br>patients may have received a monitoring event during the hospitalization which may not be captured.<br>Hospitalizations can be identified using either codes for inpatient discharges or non acute care or medical<br>records.  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment         |  |
| Data Source                | Electronic Claims  |
| Level                      | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting                    | Ambulatory Care (office/clinic)  |
| Measure# 00<br>who receive | 22: Drugs to be avoided in the elderly: a. Patients who receive at least one drug to be avoided, b. Patients at least two different drugs to be avoided.   |
| Steward                    | National Committee for Quality Assurance   |
| Description                | Percentage of patients ages 65 years and older who received at least one drug to be avoided in the elderly in the measurement year.<br>Percentage of patients 65 years of age and older who received at least two different drugs to be avoided in the elderly in  |
| Numerator                  | a: at least one prescription for any drug to be avoided in the elderly in the measurement year.<br>b: At least two different drugs to be avoided in the elderly in the measurement year.   |
| Denominator                | All patients ages 65 years and older as of December 31 of the measurement year.  |
| Exclusions                 |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment         |  |
| Data Source                | Electronic Claims  |
| Level                      | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting                    | Ambulatory Care (office/clinic)  |
| Measure# 00                | 35: Fall risk management in older adults: a. Discussing fall risk, b.Managing fall risk  |
| Steward                    | National Committee for Quality Assurance   |
| Description                | Percentage of patients aged 75 and older who reported that their doctor or other health provider talked with them about falling or problems with balance or walking Percentage of patients aged 75 and older who reported that their doctor or other health pr   |
| Numerator                  | a- Discussing Fall Risk: The number of patients in the denominator a who responded "yes" to the question, "A   |
|                            | fall is when your body goes to the ground without being pushed. In the past 12 months, did your doctor or other health provider talk with you about falling or problems with balance or walking?   |

|                    | b- Managing Fall Risk: The number of patients in the denominatorb who responded "yes" to the question,<br>"Has your doctor or other health provider done these or anything else to help prevent falls or treat problems  |
|--------------------|--|
|                    | with balance or walking? "   |
| Denominator        | <ul> <li>a- Discussing Fall Risk: All patients 75 years and older as of December 31 of the measurement year, AND patients 65 years to 74 years as of December 31 of the measurement year who responded "yes" to either of the questions, "Did you fall in the past 12 months?" - Q2 OR "yes" to the question, "In the past 12 months, have you had problems with balance or walking?" - Q3 and who indicated they were seen by a provider during the measurement year.</li> <li>b- Managing Fall Risk: Patients 65 years and older as of December 31 of the measurement year who responded "yes" to either of the questions, "Did you fall in the past 12 months?" - Q3 and who indicated they were seen by a provider during the measurement year.</li> </ul> |
| Exclusions         |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Electronic Claims  |
| Level              | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting            | Ambulatory Care (office/clinic)  |
| Measure# 01        | 01: Falls: Screening for Fall Risk   |
| Steward            | American Geriatrics Society, American Medical Association, National Committee for Quality Assurance,<br>American Medical Association - Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement  |
| Description        | Percentage of patients aged 65 years and older who were screened for fall risk (2 or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year) at least once within 12 months  |
| Numerator          | Patients who were screened for future fall risk (patients are considered at risk for future falls if they have had 2 or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year) at least once within 12 months   |
|                    | Definition: A fall is defined as a sudden, unintentional change in position causing an individual to land at a<br>lower level, on an object, the floor, or the ground, other than as a consequence of sudden onset of paralysis,<br>epileptic seizure, or overwhelming external force (Tinetti).   |
| Denominator        | All patients aged 65 years and older   |
| Exclusions         | Documentation of medical reason(s) for not screening for future fall risk (e.g., patient is not ambulatory)  |
|                    | Exclude patients for whom patient was not an eligible candidate for fall risk screening by reason of medical exclusion.  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Electronic Claims  |
| Level              | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting            | Ambulatory Care (office/clinic)  |

| Measure# 0138: Urinary catheter-associated urinary tract infection for intensive care unit (ICU) patients |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Steward   | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  |  |
| Description   | Percentage of intensive care unit patients with urinary catheter-associated urinary tract infections  |  |
| Numerator   | Number of indwelling urinary catheter-associated UTIs (defined by CDC case definitions of symptomatic UTI or asymptomatic bacteriuria, excludes other infections of the urinary tract ) x 1,000   |  |
| Denominator   | Number of indwelling urinary catheter days for ICU patients<br>?Reported by type of ICU (coronary, cardiothoracic, medical, medical-surgical (major teaching and all others),<br>neurosurgical, pediatric, surgical, trauma, burn, and respiratory) |  |
| Exclusions  |   |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment  | Comparisons are made among ICUs of similar type: Coronary, Cardiothoracic, medical, medical-surgical (major teaching and all others), Neurosurgical, Pediatric, Surgical, Trauma, Burn and Respiratory  |  |
| Data Source   | Electronic Clinical Database  |  |
| Level   | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |  |
| Setting   | Hospital  |  |
| Measure# 013<br>(HRN) patier  | 39: Central line catheter-associated blood stream infection rate for ICU and high-risk nursery<br>nts   |  |
| Steward   | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  |  |
| Description   | Percentage of ICU and high-risk nursery patients, who over a certain amount of days acquired a central line catheter-associated blood stream infections over a specified amount of line-days  |  |
| Numerator   | Number of central line-associated blood stream infections (laboratory-confirmed bloodstream infection or clinical sepsis) x 1,000<br>Number of umbilical and central line-associated blood stream infections (laboratory-confirmed bloodstream      |  |
|   | infection or clinical sepsis) x 1,000   |  |
| Denominator   | Number of central line-days for ICU patients. Reported by type of ICU (coronary, cardiothoracic, medical, medical-surgical (major teaching and all others), neurosurgical, pediatric, surgical, trauma, burn, and respiratory)                      |  |
|   | Number of central-line days for HRN patients<br>?Reported for HRNs by birth weight category (<1,000, 1,001-1,500, 1,501-2,500, and >2,500g)   |  |
| Exclusions  |   |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment  | The measure is reported stratified by ICU-type, and the denominator as stated per 1,000 line days adjusts for the increased risk over time after a central line is inserted   |  |
| Data Source   | Electronic Clinical Database  |  |
| Level   | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |  |
| Setting   | Hospital  |  |
| Measure# 014  | 40: Ventilator-associated pneumonia for ICU and high-risk nursery (HRN) patients  |  |
| Steward   | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  |  |
| Description   | Percentage of ICU and HRN patients who over a certain amoint of days have ventilator-associated pneumonia   |  |
| Numerator   | Number of ventilator-associated pneumonias x 1,000  |  |
| Denominator   | Number of ventilator-days for ICU patients: Reported by type of ICU (coronary, cardiothoracic, medical, medical-surgical (major teaching and all others), neurosurgical, pediatric, surgical, trauma, burn, and                                     |  |
|   | Number of ventilator days for HRN patients:<br>Reported for HRNs by birth weight category (<1,000, 1,001-1,500, 1,501-2,500, and >2,500g)   |  |
| Exclusions  |   |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment  | Risk Adjustment: This measure of ventilator-associated pneumonias per ventilator days is adjusted for the major risk factor, which is use of catheters, as well as length of stay.  |  |
| Data Source   | Electronic Clinical Database  |  |
| Level   | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |  |
| Setting   | Hospital  |  |

| Measure# 0141: Patient Fall Rate |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Steward                          | American Nurses Association   |  |
| Description                      | All documented falls, with or without injury, experienced by patients on an eligible unit in a calendar quarter.  |  |
| Numerator                        | Total number of patient falls (with or without injury to the patient and whether or not assisted by a staff member) by hospital Unit during the month X 1000.<br>Time window: Month<br>Fall Definition:   |  |
|                                  | A patient fall is an unplanned descent to the floor (or extension of the floor, e.g., trash can or other equipment) with or without injury to the patient, and occurs on an eligible reporting nursing unit. All types of falls are to be included whether they result from physiological reasons (fainting) or environmental reasons (slippery floor). Include assisted falls – when a staff member attempts to minimize the impact of the fall. |  |
|                                  | <ul> <li>Patient falls occurring while on an eligible reporting unit</li> <li>Assisted falls</li> </ul>   |  |
|                                  | • Repeat falls  |  |
|                                  | Excluded Populations:   |  |
|                                  | Falls by:   |  |
|                                  | • Visitors  |  |
|                                  | •Students   |  |
|                                  | • Staff members   |  |
|                                  | • Falls by patients from eligible reporting unit, however patient was not on unit at time of fall (e.g., patients   |  |
|                                  | • Falls on other unit types (e.g. pediatric psychiatric obstetrical rebab etc)  |  |
|                                  | Data Elements: Collected at a nationt level   |  |
|                                  | Month   |  |
|                                  | • Year  |  |
|                                  | • Age   |  |
|                                  | • Gender  |  |
|                                  | • Event Type (fall, assisted fall, repeat fall)   |  |
|                                  | • Type of Unit  |  |
|                                  | • Fall Kisk Assessment  |  |
|                                  | Fall Kisk     Fall Provention Protocol  |  |
| Donominator                      | Patient dere berkentigt Unit deren the selender menth   |  |
| Denominator                      | Fatient days by nospital Unit during the calendar month   |  |
|                                  | Included Populations:   |  |
|                                  | • Inpatients, short stay patients, observation patients and same day surgery patients who receive care on   |  |
|                                  | eligible in-patient units for all or part of a day.   |  |
|                                  | • Adult critical care, step-down, medical, surgical, medical-surgical combined units.   |  |
|                                  | • Any age patient on an eligible reporting unit is included in the patient day count.   |  |
|                                  | Four (4) Patient Days reporting methods are recognized:   |  |
|                                  | •Method 1-Midnight Census   |  |
|                                  | This is adequate for units that have all in-patient admissions. It is the least accurate method for units that have   |  |
|                                  | •Method 2-Midnight Census + Patient Days from Actual Hours for Short Stay Patients  |  |
|                                  | This is an accurate method for units that have both in-patients and short stay patients. The short stay "days"  |  |
|                                  | should be reported separately from midnight census and will be summed to obtain patient days. The total daily hours for short stay patients should be summed for the month and divided by 24  |  |
|                                  | • Method 3-from Average Hours for Short Stay Patients   |  |
|                                  | This method has been eliminated from the list of acceptable reporting methods   |  |
|                                  | • Method 4-Patient Days from Actual Hours   |  |
|                                  | This is the most accurate method. An increasing number of facilities have accounting systems that track the   |  |
|                                  | actual time spent in the facility by each patient. Sum actual hours for all patients, whether in-patient or short   |  |
|                                  | stay, and divide by 24.   |  |
|                                  | Method 5-Patient Days from Multiple Census Reports  |  |
|                                  | Some facilities collect censuses multiple times per day (e.g., every 4 hours or each shift). This method is more  |  |

|   | accurate than the Midnight Census, but not as accurate as Midnight Census + Actual Short Stay hours, or as<br>Actual Patient Hours. A sum of the daily average censuses can be calculated to determine patient days for the<br>month on the unit.<br>For all patient day reporting methods, it is recommended that hospitals consistently use the same method for a   |
|---|---|
|   | reporting unit over time. However, units with short stay patients should transition either to Method 2 or<br>Method 4 when it becomes feasible.<br>Data Elements:   |
|   | Month     Veer  |
|   | <ul> <li>Patient Days Reporting method which includes midnight census and short stay patient days</li> <li>Type of Unit</li> </ul>  |
| Exclusions  | Excluded Populations: Other unit types (e.g., pediatric, psychiatric, obstetrical, rehab, etc)  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment  | Stratification by facility size and unit; documentation of falls risk assessment on admission; fall protocol implementation; level of patient activity prior to fall  |
| Data Source   | Paper Medical Record, Electronic Health/Medical Record, Electronic source – Other, Other  |
| Level   | Group of clinicians (facility, dept/unit, group)  |
| Setting   | Hospital  |
| Measure# 01<br>adjusted)                                      | 84: Residents who have a catheter in the bladder at any time during the 14-day assessment period. (risk   |
| Steward   | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  |
| Description   | Percentage of residents with a valid target assessment who have a catheter in the bladder at any time during the 14-day assessment period.  |
| Numerator   | Indwelling catheter on target assessment (H3d=checked)  |
| <b>D</b>  |   |
| Denominator   | All residents with a valid target assessment.   |
| Denominator<br>Exclusions                                     | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:  |
| Denominator<br>Exclusions                                     | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1 The target assessment is an admission ( $\Delta A8a = 01$ )  |
| Exclusions  | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.   |
| Exclusions  | All residents with a valid target assessment.         Exclusions:         Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:         1.       The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).         2.       H3d is missing on the target assessment.         3.       The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no   |
| Denominator<br>Exclusions                                     | All residents with a valid target assessment.         Exclusions:         Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:         1.       The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).         2.       H3d is missing on the target assessment.         3.       The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).  |
| Exclusions  | <ul> <li>All residents with a valid target assessment.</li> <li>Exclusions:</li> <li>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions: <ol> <li>The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).</li> <li>H3d is missing on the target assessment.</li> <li>The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).</li> </ol> </li> </ul>  |
| Denominator<br>Exclusions                                     | All residents with a valid target assessment.         Exclusions:         Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:         1.       The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).         2.       H3d is missing on the target assessment.         3.       The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).         Covariates:       1.         Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:  |
| Denominator<br>Exclusions                                     | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if H1a =4.   |
| Exclusions  | <ul> <li>All residents with a valid target assessment.</li> <li>Exclusions:</li> <li>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions: <ol> <li>The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).</li> <li>H3d is missing on the target assessment.</li> <li>The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).</li> </ol> </li> <li>Covariates: <ol> <li>Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:</li> <li>Covariate =1 if H1a =4.</li> <li>Covariate =0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>  |
| Exclusions  | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if H1a =4.<br>Covariate =0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if M2a = 3 or 4.  |
| Denominator<br>Exclusions                                     | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate = 1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate = 1 if M2a = 3 or 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if M2a = 0  |
| Exclusions<br>Risk<br>Adjustment                              | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if M2a = 3 or 4.<br>Covariate =0 if M2a = 0.<br>Risk adjustment: For each of the five risk-adjusted QMs, a resident- level logistic regression was estimated.<br>Data came from the chronic or poet acute residents in the 20 percent random samples of all facilities for a one-   |
| Exclusions<br>Exclusions<br>Risk<br>Adjustment                | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate = 1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate = 1 if M2a = 3 or 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if M2a = 0.<br>Risk adjustment: For each of the five risk-adjusted QMs, a resident- level logistic regression was estimated.<br>Data came from the chronic or post acute residents in the 20 percent random samples of all facilities for a one-<br>year period, Quarter 4 of 2001 (Q4 2001) through Quarter 3 of 2002 (Q3 2002). The resident- level observed QM<br>score was the dependent variable. The predictor variables were one or more resident- level covariates.   |
| Exclusions<br>Exclusions<br>Risk<br>Adjustment                | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate =1 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =0 if M2a = 3 or 4.<br>Covariate =0 if M2a = 0.<br>Risk adjustment: For each of the five risk-adjusted QMs, a resident- level logistic regression was estimated.<br>Data came from the chronic or post acute residents in the 20 percent random samples of all facilities for a one-<br>year period, Quarter 4 of 2001 (Q4 2001) through Quarter 3 of 2002 (Q3 2002). The resident- level observed QM<br>score was the dependent variable. The predictor variables were one or more resident- level covariates<br>associated with the QM. More information is available here:   |
| Exclusions<br>Exclusions<br>Risk<br>Adjustment                | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate =0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =0 if M2a = 3 or 4.<br>Covariate =0 if M2a = 0.<br>Risk adjustment: For each of the five risk-adjusted QMs, a resident- level logistic regression was estimated.<br>Data came from the chronic or post acute residents in the 20 percent random samples of all facilities for a one-<br>year period, Quarter 4 of 2001 (Q4 2001) through Quarter 3 of 2002 (Q3 2002). The resident- level observed QM<br>score was the dependent variable. The predictor variables were one or more resident- level covariates<br>associated with the QM. More information is available here:<br>http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NursingHomeQualityInits/Downloads/NHQIQMUsersManual.pdf   |
| Exclusions<br>Exclusions<br>Risk<br>Adjustment<br>Data Source | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate = 1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate = 1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate = 0 if M2a = 3 or 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if M2a = 0.<br>Risk adjustment: For each of the five risk-adjusted QMs, a resident- level logistic regression was estimated.<br>Data came from the chronic or post acute residents in the 20 percent random samples of all facilities for a one-<br>year period, Quarter 4 of 2001 (Q4 2001) through Quarter 3 of 2002 (Q3 2002). The resident- level observed QM<br>score was the dependent variable. The predictor variables were one or more resident- level covariates<br>associated with the QM. More information is available here:<br>http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NursingHomeQualityInits/Downloads/NHQIQMUsersManual.pdf<br>Standardized clinical instrument            |
| Exclusions Exclusions Risk Adjustment Data Source Level       | All residents with a valid target assessment.<br>Exclusions:<br>Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:<br>1. The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01).<br>2. H3d is missing on the target assessment.<br>3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no<br>admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months).<br>Covariates:<br>1. Indicator of bowel incontinence on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =1 if H1a = 4.<br>Covariate =0 if H1a = 0,1,2, or 3.<br>2. Indicator of pressure ulcers on the prior assessment:<br>Covariate =0 if M2a = 3 or 4.<br>Covariate = 0 if M2a = 0.<br>Risk adjustment: For each of the five risk-adjusted QMs, a resident- level logistic regression was estimated.<br>Data came from the chronic or post acute residents in the 20 percent random samples of all facilities for a one-<br>year period, Quarter 4 of 2001 (Q4 2001) through Quarter 3 of 2002 (Q3 2002). The resident- level observed QM<br>score was the dependent variable. The predictor variables were one or more resident- level covariates<br>associated with the QM. More information is available here:<br>http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NursingHomeQualityInits/Downloads/NHQIQMUsersManual.pdf<br>Standardized clinical instrument<br>Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home) |

| Measure# 0187: Recently hospitalized residents with pressure ulcers (risk adjusted) |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Steward   | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services   |  |
| Description   | Recently hospitalized residents with pressure ulcers   |  |
| Numerator   | <ul> <li>SNF PPS Patients who satisfy either of the following conditions:</li> <li>1. On the SNF PPS 5-day assessment, the patient had no pressure ulcers (M2a[t-1]=0) AND, on the SNF PPS 14-day assessment, the patient has at least a stage 1 pressure ulcer (M2a[t]=1,2,3, or 4).</li> <li>2. On the SNF PPS 5-day assessment, the patient had a pressure ulcer (M2a[t-1] = 1,2,3, or 4) AND on the SNF PPS 14-day assessment, pressure ulcers worsened or failed to improve (M2a[t]&gt;=M2a[t-1]).</li> </ul>   |  |
| Denominator   | All patients with a valid SNF PPS 14-day assessment (AA8b=7) AND a valid preceding SNF PPS 5-day assessment (AA8b=1).  |  |
| Exclusions  | <ul> <li>Exclusions: Patients satisfying the following condition:</li> <li>1.M2a is missing on the 14-day assessment [t</li> <li>2. M2a is missing on the 5-day assessment [t-1] and M2a shows presence of pressure ulcers on the 14-day assessment (M2a=1,2,3, or 4.</li> <li>3. The Patient is in a facility with a Post Acute Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no SNF PPS 5-day assessments with AA8b =1 in the facility over the previous 12 months)</li> <li>Covariates: <ol> <li>Indicator of history of unresolved pressure ulcer on the SNF PPS 5-day assessment. Covariate =1 if M3 =1.</li> <li>Covariate =0 if M3 =0.</li> <li>Indicator of requiring limited or more assistance in bed mobility on the SNF PPS 5-day assessment:</li> <li>Covariate = 1 if G1a(A) = 2,3,4, or8.</li> <li>Covariate = 0 if G1a(A) =0 or 1.</li> <li>Indicator of bowel incontinence at least one/week on the SNF PPS 5-day assessment:</li> <li>Covariate =1 if H1a 2,3, or 4.</li> <li>Covariate =1 if H1a 2,3, or 4.</li> <li>Covariate =1 if H1a 2,3, or 4.</li> <li>Covariate =1 if H1a 0 or 1.</li> <li>Indicator of Low Body Mass Index (BMI) on the SNF PPS 5-day assessment:</li> <li>Covariate =1 if BMI &gt;=12 and &lt;=19.</li> <li>Covariate = 1 if BMI &gt;=12 and &lt;=19.</li> <li>Covariate = 0 if BMI &gt; 19 and &lt;= 40.</li> <li>Where: BMI = weight(kg)/height2 (m2) = ((K2b*0.45)/(((K2a)*.0254)^2))</li> </ol></li></ul> <li>(Note: An implausible BMI value &lt;12 or &gt;40 will be treated as a missing value on this covariate.</li> |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment  | Risk adjustment: For each of the five risk-adjusted QMs, a resident- level logistic regression was estimated.<br>Data came from the chronic or post acute residents in the 20 percent random samples of all facilities for a one-<br>year period, Quarter 4 of 2001 (Q4 2001) through Quarter 3 of 2002 (Q3 2002). The resident- level observed QM<br>score was the dependent variable. The predictor variables were one or more resident- level covariates<br>associated with the QM. More information is available here:<br>http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NursingHomeQualityInits/Downloads/NHQIQMUsersManual.pdf   |  |
| Data Source   | Standardized clinical instrument   |  |
| Level   | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |  |
| Setting   | Nursing home/ Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF)   |  |

| Measure# 0193: Residents who were physically restrained daily during the 7-day assessment period |   |
|--|---|
| Steward  | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  |
| Description  | Percentage of residents on most recent assessments who were physically restrained daily during the 7-day assessment period  |
| Numerator  | Residents who were physically restrained daily on most recent assessment.   |
| Denominator  | All residents on most recent assessments.   |
| Exclusions   |   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   |   |
| Data Source  | Standardized clinical instrument  |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting  | Nursing home/ Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF)  |
| Measure# 01  | 96: Residents with a urinary tract infection  |
| Steward  | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  |
| Description  | Percentage of residents on most recent assessment with a urinary tract infection  |
| Numerator  | Residents with urinary tract infection on target assessment. (I2j = checked)  |
| Denominator  | All residents with a valid target assessment.   |
| Exclusions   | Exclusions:Residents satisfying any of the following conditions:1.The target assessment is an admission (AA8a = 01) assessment.2.I2j is missing on the target assessment. |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   |   |
| Data Source  | Standardized clinical instrument  |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting  | Nursing home/ Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF)  |

| Measure# 0198: High-risk residents with pressure ulcers |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Steward   | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  |  |
| Description   | Percentage of residents with a valid target assessment and one of the following inclusion criteria: 1.Impaired  |  |
|   | in mobility or transfer on the target assessment  |  |
|   | 2. Comatose on the target assessment  |  |
| Numerator   | 5. Surfer main utrition on the target assessment who  |  |
| Numerator   | Residents with pressure ulcers (Stage 1-4) on target assessment (M2a >0 OK 13a-3 = $707.0$ )  |  |
| Denominator   | All residents with a valid target assessment and any one of the following inclusion criteria $1.$ Impaired in mobility or transfer on the target assessment as indicated by G1a(A) = 3, 4, or 8 OR G1b(A) = 3, 4, |  |
|   | or 8.   |  |
|   | 2. Comatose on the target assessment as indicated by B1 = 1.  |  |
|   | 3. Suffer malnutrition on the target assessment as indicated by I3a through I3e = 260, 261, 262, 263.0, 263.1,  |  |
|   | 263.2, 263.8, or 263.9.   |  |
| Exclusions  | Exclusions for both measures:   |  |
|   | Residents satisfying any of the following conditions are excluded from all risk groups (high and low, high, and low), this is 1 with 1.2 and 2 holew being 1.1.1.2 and 1.2.                                       |  |
|   | 10  m = $113  is  1$ , with 1, 2, and 5 below being 1.1, 1.2, and 1.5.<br>The target assessment is an admission (A A8a = 01) assessment   |  |
|   | 2. The OM did not trigger (resident is not included in the OM numerator) AND the value of M2a is  |  |
|   | missing on the target assessment.   |  |
|   | 3. The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of 0 (i.e., there are no   |  |
|   | admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months.   |  |
|   | 4. The resident does not qualify as high-risk AND the value of G1a(A) or G1b(A) is missing on the target  |  |
|   | assessment.   |  |
| Diale   | 5. The resident does not quality as high-risk AND the value of bi is missing on the target assessment.  |  |
| Adjustment  | None.   |  |
| Data Source   | Standardized clinical instrument  |  |
| Level   | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |  |
| Setting   | Nursing home/ Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF)  |  |
| Measure# 01   | 99: Average-risk residents with pressure ulcers   |  |
| Steward   | Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  |  |
| Description   | Percetage of residents with a valid target assessment and not qualifying as high risk with pressure ulcers  |  |
| Numerator   | Residents with pressure ulcers (Stage 1-4) on target assessment (M2a >0 OR I3a-e =707.0)  |  |
| Denominator   | All residents with a valid target assessment and not qualifying as high risk.   |  |
| Exclusions  | Exclusions for both measures:   |  |
|   | Residents satisfying any of the following conditions are excluded from all risk groups (high and low, high, and   |  |
|   | low) – this is 1, with 1, 2, and 3 below being 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3:   |  |
|   | 1. The target assessment is an admission $(AA8a = 01)$ assessment.  |  |
|   | 2. The QM did not trigger (resident is not included in the QM numerator) AND the value of M2a is  |  |
|   | The resident is in a facility with a Chronic Care Admission Sample size of $0$ (i.e., there are no  |  |
|   | admission assessments with AA8a = 01 in the facility over the previous 12 months.   |  |
|   | 4. The resident does not qualify as high-risk AND the value of G1a(A) or G1b(A) is missing on the target  |  |
|   | assessment.   |  |
|   | 5. The resident does not qualify as high-risk AND the Value of B1 is missing on the target assessment.  |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustmont                                      | None.   |  |
| Data Source   | Standardized clinical instrument  |  |
| Level   | Facility (e.g. hospital nursing home)   |  |
| Sotting   | Nureing home / Skilled Nureing Facility (CNE)   |  |
| Setting   | indising nome/ skilled nursing racinty (SINF)   |  |

| Measure# 0201: Pressure ulcer prevalence |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Steward                                  | The Joint Commission, California Nursing Outcome Coalition   |  |
| Description                              | The total number of patients that have hospital-acquired (nosocomial) stage II or greater pressure ulcers on the day of the prevalence study.  |  |
| Numerator                                | Patients surveyed on an eligible reporting unit that have at least one stage II or greater [National Pressure<br>Ulcer Advisory Panel (NPUAP)] hospital-acquired pressure ulcer on the day of the prevalence study.<br>Time Window: Quarterly Prevalence Study Day   |  |
|  | Eligible reporting units are those units meeting the requirements as defined in the Type of Unit data element<br>and listed in the strata definitions provided under section number 10.<br>See study methodology in item #9 below.   |  |
|  | <ul> <li>Included Populations:</li> <li>Hospital-Acquired Pressure Ulcers – Pressure Ulcers of Stage II or greater AND the ulcer is discovered or documented after the first 24 hours from the time of inpatient admission.</li> </ul>   |  |
|  | Data Elements:<br>• Observed Pressure Ulcer<br>• Observed Pressure Ulcer – Hospital-Acquired<br>• Observed Pressure Ulcer – Stage  |  |
| Denominator                              | All patients on the selected unit at the time of the study who are surveyed for the study by Type of Unit and overall.<br>Time window: Quarterly Prevalence Study Day  |  |
|  | The current language "selected units" is not suggesting that hospitals "choose" units for survey. Rather, inherent in prevalence study method is that ALL eligible units are surveyed at the same point in time (note labor, delivery, post partum and psychiatry units are excluded). Hospitals do not choose units to be surveyed; units surveyed are standardized across institutions by those eligible reporting units as defined in the Type of Unit data element and listed in the strata definitions provided under section number 10. The word "selected" will be deleted for clarity. |  |
|  | Included Populations: Patients 18 years or older who are admitted to critical care, step-down, medical, surgical and medical-surgical combined units that are surveyed for the study.  |  |
|  | Data Elements:<br>• Admission Date<br>• Birthdate<br>• Sex<br>• Type of Unit<br>• Prevalence Study Date  |  |
| Exclusions                               | <ul> <li>Excluded Populations:</li> <li>Patients less than 18 years of age</li> <li>Patients who refuse to be assessed</li> <li>Patients who are off the unit at the time of the prevalence study, i.e., surgery, x-ray, physical therapy, etc.</li> <li>Patients who are medically unstable at the time of the study for whom assessment would be contraindicated at the time of the study, i.e., unstable blood pressure, uncontrolled pain, or fracture waiting repair.</li> <li>Patients who are actively dying and pressure ulcer prevention is no longer a treatment goal.</li> </ul>    |  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment                       | Stratified by hospital size.   |  |
| Data Source                              | Paper Medical Record, Electronic Health/Medical Record, Other  |  |
| Level                                    | Group of clinicians (facility, dept/unit, group), Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |  |
| Setting                                  | Hospital   |  |

| Measure# 02 | Measure# 0202: Falls with injury  |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| Steward     | American Nurses Association   |  |
| Description | All documented patient falls with an injury level of minor (2) or greater.  |  |
| Numerator   | Total number of patient falls of injury level minor or great (whether or not assisted by a staff member) by hospital unit during month x 1000.  |  |
|             | Included Populations:<br>• Falls with Fall Injury Level of 2 "minor" or greater, including assisted and repeat falls with an Injury level of<br>2 or greater  |  |
|             | <ul> <li>Patient injury falls occurring while on an eligible reporting unit</li> </ul>  |  |
|             | Excluded Populations:   |  |
|             | Falls by:   |  |
|             | • Visitors  |  |
|             | •Students   |  |
|             | • Staff members   |  |
|             | • Falls by patients from eligible reporting unit, however patient was not on unit at time of fall (e.g., patients falls in radiology department)  |  |
|             | • Falls on other unit types (e.g., pediatric, obstetrical, rehab, etc)  |  |
|             | • Falls with Fall Injury Level of 1 "none"  |  |
|             | Data Elements: Collected at a patient level   |  |
|             | • Month   |  |
|             | • Tear  |  |
|             | • Gender  |  |
|             | • Event Type (fall, assisted fall, or repeat fall)  |  |
|             | • Fall Injury Level   |  |
|             | • Type of Unit  |  |
|             | • Fall Risk Assessment  |  |
|             | • Fall Risk   |  |
|             | Fall Prevention Protocol  |  |
| Denominator | Denominator Statement: Patient days by Type of Unit during the calendar month.  |  |
|             | Time Window: Calendar Month   |  |
|             | Included Populations:   |  |
|             | • Inpatients, short stay patients, observation patients and same day surgery patients who receive care on in-<br>patient units for all or part of a day.  |  |
|             | • Adult critical care, step-down, medical, surgical, medical-surgical combined units  |  |
|             | Four (4) Patient Days reporting methods are recognized:   |  |
|             | Method 1-Midnight Census<br>This is adequate for units that have all in nationt admissions. It is the least accurate method for units that have   |  |
|             | both in-national and short stay patients. The daily number should be summed for every day in the month  |  |
|             | Method 2-Midnight Census + Patient Days from Actual Hours for Short Stay Patients   |  |
|             | This is an accurate method for units that have both in-patients and short stay patients. The short stay "days"  |  |
|             | should be reported separately from midnight census and will be summed to obtain patient days. The total   |  |
|             | daily hours for short stay patients should be summed for the month and divided by 24.   |  |
|             | Method 3-Midnight Census + Patient Days from Average Hours for Short Stay Patients  |  |
|             | This method has been eliminated from the list of acceptable reporting methods.  |  |
|             | Method 4-Patient Days from Actual Hours   |  |
|             | I his is the most accurate method. An increasing number of facilities have accounting systems that track the  |  |
|             | actual time spent in the facility by each patient. Sum actual nours for all patients, whether in-patient or short   |  |
|             | oray, and divide by 24.<br>Method 5-Patient Days from Multiple Census Reports   |  |
|             | Some facilities collect censuses multiple times per day (e.g., every 4 hours or each shift). This method is more  |  |
|             | accurate than the Midnight Census, but not as accurate as Midnight Census + Actual Short Stay hours, or as<br>Actual Patient Hours. A sum of the daily average censuses can be calculated to determine patient days for the |  |

|                    | month on the unit.   |
|--------------------|--|
|                    | It is recommended that data colectors consistently use the same method for reporting patient days. However,  |
|                    | units with short stay patients should transtion from MIdnight Census to Method 2 or Method 4 when it   |
|                    | becomes feasbile.  |
|                    | Data Elements:   |
|                    | • Month  |
|                    | <ul> <li>Tear</li> <li>Patient Days Reporting method which includes midnight census and short stay natient days</li> </ul>   |
|                    | Type of Unit   |
| Exclusions         | Excluded Populations: Other unit types (e.g., pediatric, psychiatric, obstetrical, rehab, etc.)  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment | Stratification by facility size and unit; documentation of falls risk assessment on admission; fall protocol implementation; level of patient activity prior to fall                                 |
| Data Source        | Paper Medical Record, Electronic Health/Medical Record, Electronic source – Other, Other   |
| Level              | Group of clinicians (facility, dept/unit, group)   |
| Setting            | Hospital   |
| Mooguro# 02        | 10: Destraint providence (yest and limb only)  |
| Stoward            | The List Completion California Numina Outcome Californ   |
| Stewaru            | The Joint Commission, California Nursing Outcome Coalition   |
| Description        | Total number of patients that have vest and/or limb restraint (upper or lower body or both) on the day of the prevalence study.  |
| Numerator          | Patients surveyed on the eligible reporting unit that have a vest restraint and/or limb restraint (upper or lower  |
|                    | or both) on the day of the prevalence study.   |
|                    | Time Window: Quarterly Prevalence Study Day  |
|                    | Excluded Populations:  |
|                    | • Restraints that are only associated with medical, denial, diagnostic, or surgical procedures and is based on standard practice for the procedure (comptimes referred to as "treatment restraints") |
|                    | • seclusion  |
|                    | • restraint uses that are forensic or correctional restrictions used for security purposes unrelated to clinical care  |
|                    | • devices used to meet the assessed needs of a patient who requires adaptive support or a medical protective   |
|                    | device   |
|                    | Data Elements:   |
|                    | Physical Restraint   |
|                    | Type of Restraint  |
| Denominator        | All patients on an eligible reporting unit at the time of the study and are surveyed for the study by Type of  |
|                    | Unit.  |
|                    | Time Window: Quarterly Prevalence Study Day  |
|                    | and listed in the strate definitions provided below section number 10 Stratification Details   |
|                    | Included Populations: Patients 18 years or older who are admitted to critical care, step-down, medical, surgical   |
|                    | and medical-surgical combined units that are surveyed for the study.   |
|                    | Data Elements:   |
|                    | Admission Date   |
|                    | • Birthdate  |
|                    | Prevalence Study Date  |
|                    | • Sex  |
|                    | • Type of Unit   |
| Exclusions         | Excluded Populations:  |
|                    | • Patients less than 18 years of age   |
|                    | • Patients who are off the unit at the time of the prevalence study, i.e. surgery, x-ray, physical therapy, etc.   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Paper Medical Record, Electronic Health/Medical Record   |
| Level              | Group of clinicians (facility, dept/unit, group), Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |
| Setting            | Hospital   |

| Measure# 0239: Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) Prophylaxis |   |
|---|---|
| Steward   | American College of Emergency Physicians, American Medical Association, National Committee for Quality<br>Assurance, American Medical Association - Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement  |
| Description   | Percentage of patients aged 18 years and older undergoing procedures for which VTE prophylaxis is indicated<br>in all patients, who had an order for Low Molecular Weight Heparin (LMWH), Low-Dose Unfractionated<br>Heparin (LDUH), adjusted-dose warfarin, fondapar   |
| Numerator   | Surgical patients, who had an order for VTE prophylaxis (low molecular weight heparin (LMWH), low-dose unfractionated heparin (LDUH), adjusted-dose warfarin, fondaparinux or mechanical prophylaxis) to be given within 24 hours prior to incision time or within 24 hours after surgery end time.                                       |
| Denominator   | All surgical patients aged 18 years and older undergoing procedures for which VTE prophylaxis is indicated in all patients.   |
| Exclusions  | Documentation of medical reason(s) for patient not receiving any accepted form of VTE prophylaxis (LMWH, LDUH, adjusted-dose warfarin, fondaparinux or mechanical prophylaxis) within 24 hours prior to incision time or 24 hours after surgery end time  |
|   | Exclude patients for whom VTE prophylaxis was not ordered by reason of appropriate denominator exclusion.<br>If using electronic data, exclude patients using the following code:<br>Append a modifier (1P) to the CPT Category II code to report patients with documented circumstances that<br>meet the denominator exclusion criteria. |
| Risk<br>Adjustment                                      |   |
| Data Source   | Electronic Claims   |
| Level   | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)   |
| Setting   | Hospital  |
| Measure# 020  | 63: Patient Burn  |
| Steward   | Ambulatory Surgical Centers Quality Collaborative   |
| Description   | Percentage of ASC admissions experiencing a burn prior to discharge   |
| Numerator   | Ambulatory surgical center (ASC) admissions experiencing a burn prior to discharge.   |
| Denominator   | All ASC admissions.   |
| Exclusions  | None  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment                                      | None.   |
| Data Source   | Paper Medical Record, Electronic Claims, Other  |
| Level   | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)   |
| Setting   | Hospital, Ambulatory Surgical Centers   |
| Measure# 02   | 65: Hospital Transfer/Admission   |
| Steward   | Ambulatory Surgical Centers Quality Collaborative   |
| Description   | Percentage of ASC admissions requiring a hospital transfer or hospital admission prior to being discharged from the ASC.  |
| Numerator   | ASC admissions requiring a hospital transfer or hospital admission prior to being discharged from the ASC.  |
| Denominator   | All ASC admissions  |
| Exclusions  | None.   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment                                      |   |
| Data Source   | Other   |
| Level   | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)   |
| Setting   | Hospital, Ambulatory Surgical Centers   |

| Measure# 02        | 66: Patient Fall   |
|--------------------|--|
| Steward            | Ambulatory Surgical Centers Quality Collaborative  |
| Description        | Percentage of ASC admissions experiencing a fall in the ASC.   |
| Numerator          | ASC admissions experiencing a fall in the ASC.   |
| Denominator        | All ASC admissions.  |
| Exclusions         | ASC admissions experiencing a fall outside the ASC.  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment | None   |
| Data Source        | Other  |
| Level              | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting            | Hospital, Ambulatory Surgical Centers  |
| Measure# 02        | 67: Wrong Site, Wrong Side, Wrong Patient, Wrong Procedure, Wrong Implant  |
| Steward            | Ambulatory Surgical Centers Quality Collaborative  |
| Description        | Percentage of ASC admissions experiencing a wrong site, wrong side, wrong patient, wrong procedure, or wrong implant.  |
| Numerator          | ASC admissions experiencing a wrong site, wrong side, wrong patient, wrong procedure, or wrong implant.  |
| Denominator        | All ASC admissions.  |
| Exclusions         | None   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment | None.  |
| Data Source        | Other  |
| Level              | Individual clinician (physician, nurse)  |
| Setting            | Hospital, Ambulatory Surgical Centers  |
| Measure# 02        | 98: Central Line Bundle Compliance   |
| Steward            | Institute for Healthcare Improvement   |
| Description        | Percentage of intensive care patients with central lines for whom all elements of the central line bundle are<br>documented and in place.<br>The central line bundle elements include:<br>•Hand hygiene ,<br>•Maximal barrier precautions upon insertion<br>•Chlorhex  |
| Numerator          | <ul> <li>Number of intensive care patients with central lines for whom all elements of the central line bundle are documented and in place.</li> <li>The central line bundle elements include: <ul> <li>Hand hygiene ,</li> <li>Maximal barrier precautions upon insertion</li> <li>Chlorhexidine skin antisepsis</li> <li>Optimal catheter site selection, with subclavian vein as the preferred site for non-tunneled catheters in patients 18 years and older</li> <li>Daily review of line necessity with prompt removal of unnecessary lines</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| Denominator        | Total number of intensive care patients with central lines on day of week of sample.   |
| Exclusions         | Exclude patients less than 18 years of age at the date of ICU admission and patients outside the intensive care unit and patients whose lines were not placed in the intensive care unit   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Paper Medical Record   |
|                    | 1  |
| Level              | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |

| Measure# 0299: Surgical Site Infection Rate |   |
|---|---|
| Steward                                     | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  |
| Description                                 | Percentage of surgical site infections occurring within thirty days after the operative procedure if no implant is left in place or with one year if an implant is in place in patients who had an NHSN operative procedure performed during a specified time   |
| Numerator                                   | Number of surgical site infections occurring within thirty days after the operative procedure if no implant is left in place or with one year if an implant is in place in patients who had an NHSN operative procedure performed during a specified time period and the infection appears to be related to the operative procedure. Infections are identified on original admission or upon readmission to the facility of original operative procedure procedure within the relevant time frame (30 days for no implants; within 1 year for implants).  |
|   | <ul> <li>Two types of CDC-defined SSIs are included:</li> <li>(1) A deep incisional SSI must meet the following criteria:</li> <li>Infection occurs within 30 days after the operative procedure if no implant is left or within one year if implant is in place and the infection appears to be related to the operative procedure and</li> </ul>  |
|   | <ul> <li>involves deep soft tissues (e.g., fascial and muscle layers) of the incision<br/>and</li> <li>patient has at least one of the following:</li> <li>a) purulent drainage from the deep incision but not from the organ/space component of the surgical site</li> <li>b) a deep incision spontaneously dehisces or is deliberately opened by a surgeon and is culture-positive or not<br/>cultured when the patient has at least one of the following signs or symptoms: fever (&gt;38°C), or localized pain<br/>or tenderness. A culture-negative finding does not meet this criterion.</li> </ul> |
|   | <ul> <li>c) an abscess or other evidence of infection involving the deep incision is found on direct examination, during reoperation, or by histopathologic or radiologic examination</li> <li>d) diagnosis of a deep incisional SSI by a surgeon or attending physician.</li> <li>Note: There are two specific types of deep incisional SSIs:</li> <li>1) Deep Incisional Primary (DIP) – a deep incisional SSI that is identified in a primary incision in a patient that has bed an operation with one or more incisions (e.g., C section incision or short incision (or CABC))</li> </ul>             |
|   | <ul> <li>2) Deep Incisional Secondary (DIS) - a deep incisional SSI that is identified in the secondary incision in a patient that has had an operation with more than one incision (e.g., donor site [leg] incision for CBGB)</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul> <li>(2) An organ/space SSI must meet the following critieria:</li> <li>Infection occurs within 30 days after the operative procedure if no implant is left or within one year if implant is in place and the infection appears to be related to the operative procedure and</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul> <li>infection involves any part of the body, excluding the skin incision, fascia, or muscle layers, that is opened or manipulated during the operative procedure and</li> </ul>  |
|   | <ul> <li>patient has at least one of the following:</li> <li>a). purulent drainage from a drain that is placed through a stab wound into the organ/space</li> <li>b). organisms isolated from an aseptically obtained culture of fluid or tissue in the organ/space</li> <li>c). an abscess or other evidence of infection involving the organ/space that is found on direct</li> <li>examination, during reoperation, or by histopathologic or radiologic examination</li> <li>d) diagnosis of an organ/space SSI by a surgeon or attending physician.</li> </ul>  |
|   | Specific sites of an organ/space SSI may be identified11  |
| Denominator                                 | Number of NHSN operative procedures performed during a specified time period stratified by:   |
|   | <ul> <li>Type of NHSN operative procedure<br/>and</li> <li>NNIS SSI risk index:</li> <li>Every patient having the selected procedure is assigned one (1) risk point for each of the following three</li> </ul>  |
|   | factors:  |
|   | o Surgical would classification – clean contanimated of unity   |

|             | o American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) preoperative severity of illness score = 3, 4, or 5   |
|-------------|---|
|             | 0 Duration of operation >t bours where twaries by type of NHSN operative procedure and is the approximate 75th percentile of the                          |
|             | duration of the procedure rounded to the nearest whole number of hours.   |
|             |   |
|             | Note: For operative procedures performed using lapyroscopes and endoscopes the use of a lapyroscope is an additional factor that modifies the risk index. |
| Exclusions  | Exclude Procedures Not Included Under The Definition Of NHSN Operative Procedure And Excludes   |
| Dick        | Supericial 551.   |
| Adjustment  |   |
| Data Source | Paper Medical Record  |
| Level       | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting     | Hospital  |
| Measure# 03 | 01: Surgery patients with appropriate hair removal  |
| Steward     | The Joint Commission  |
| Description | Percentage of surgery patients with surgical hair site removal with clippers or depilatory or no surgical site<br>hair removal                            |
| Numerator   | Surgery patients with surgical hair site removal with clippers or depilatory or no surgical site hair removal   |
| Denominator | All selected surgery patients   |
|             | Include patients with an ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure code or ICD-9-CM Other Procedure Codes of selected surgeries.                                       |
| Exclusions  | Exclude the following patients:   |
|             | less than 18 years of age;  |
|             | <ul> <li>performed their own hair removal; and</li> <li>patients whose mode of hair removal could not be determined</li> </ul>                            |
| Pisk        | patients whose mode of nan removal could not be determined.   |
| Adjustment  |   |
| Data Source | Paper Medical Record, Electronic Claims   |
| Level       | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting     | Hospital  |

| Measure# 03        | 02: Ventilator Bundle  |
|--------------------|--|
| Steward            | Institute for Healthcare Improvement   |
| Description        | Percentage of intensive care unit patients on mechanical ventilation at time of survey for whom all four elements of the ventilator bundle are documented and in place. The ventilator bundle elements are:<br>• Head of bed (HOB) elevation 30 degrees or great   |
| Numerator          | <ul> <li>Number of intensive care unit patients on mechanical ventilation at time of survey for whom all four elements of the ventilator bundle are documented and in place. The ventilator bundle elements are: <ul> <li>Head of bed (HOB) elevation 30 degrees or greater (unless medically contraindicated); noted on 2 different shifts within a 24 hour period</li> <li>Daily ""sedation interruption" and daily assessment of readiness to extubate; process includes interrupting sedation until patient follow commands and patient is assessed for discontinuation of mechanical ventilation; Parameters of discontinuation include: resolution of reason for intubation; inspired oxygen content roughly 40%; assessment of patients ability to defend airway after extubation due to heavy sedation; minute ventilation less than equal to 15 liters/minute; and respiratory rate/tidal volume less than or equal to 105/min/L(RR/TV&lt;105)</li> <li>SUD (peptic ulcer disease) prophylaxis</li> <li>DVT (deep venous thrombosis) prophylaxis</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| Denominator        | Total number of intensive care unit patients on mechanical ventilation.  |
| Exclusions         | Patients less than 18 years of age at the date of ICU admission.   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Paper Medical Record   |
| Level              | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |
| Setting            | Hospital   |
| Measure# 03        | 37: Decubitus Ulcer (PDI 2)  |
| Steward            | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality   |
| Description        | Percent of surgical and medical discharges under 18 years with ICD-9-CM code for decubitus ulcer in secondary diagnosis field.   |
| Numerator          | All discharges, age under 18 years, with International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) codes denoting decubitus ulcer in any secondary diagnosis field  |
| Denominator        | All surgical and medical discharges age under 18 years defined by specific Surgical and Medical Diagnosis<br>Related Group (DRG), include only patients with a length of stay of 5 or more days  |
| Exclusions         | Exclude patients with an ICD-9-CM code of decubitus ulcer in the principal diagnosis field; with an ICD-9-CM procedure code for debridement or pedicle graft before or on the same day as a major operating room procedure (surgical cases only); with an ICD-9-CM procedure code for debridement or pedicle graft as the only major operating room procedure (surgical cases only); Major Diagnostic Category (MDC) 9 (Skin, Subcutaneous Tissue, and Breast) or MDC 14 (Pregnancy, Childbirth and the Puerperium); newborns less than 500 grams; Neonates (age < 28 days) and patients transferring in from long term care facility (ASOURCE = 3) or an acute care facility (ASOURCE = 2)  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment |  |
| Data Source        | Electronic Claims  |
| Level              | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |
| Setting            | Hospital   |

| Measure# 0345: Accidental Puncture or Laceration (PSI 15)  |  |
|--|--|
| Steward  | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality   |
| Description  | Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code denoting accidental cut,  |
| NI   | puncture, perforation, or laceration in any secondary diagnosis field.   |
| Numerator  | Medical and surgical discharges with ICD-9-CM code denoting accidental cut, puncture, perforation, or laceration in any secondary diagnosis field.   |
| Denominator  | Discharges, age 18 years and older, defined by specific DRGs   |
| Exclusions   | <ul> <li>with ICD-9-CM code denoting technical difficulty (e.g., accidental cut, puncture, perforation, or laceration) in the principal diagnosis field or secondary diagnosis present on admission, if known</li> <li>MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, and puerperium).</li> <li>with ICD-9-CM code for spine surgery</li> </ul>  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   | The predicted value for each case is computed using a hierarchical model (logistic regression with hospital random effect) and covariates for gender, age (in 5-year age groups), modified CMS DRG, and the AHRQ Comorbidity category. The reference population used in the regression is the universe of discharges for states that participate in the HCUP State Inpatient Data (SID) for the years 2002-2004 (combined), a database consisting of 37 states and approximately 90 million discharges. The expected rate is computed as the sum of the predicted value for each case divided by the number of cases for the unit of analysis of interest (i.e., hospital, state, and region). The risk adjusted rate is computed using indirect standardization as the observed rate divided by the expected rate, multiplied by the reference population rate. Required data elements: CMS Diagnosis Related Group (DRG); CMS Major Diagnostic Category (MDC); patient gender; age in years at admission; International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) principal and secondary diagnosis codes.  |
| Data Source  | Electronic Claims  |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |
| Sotting  | Hespital   |
| Jetting  | i iospitai   |
| Measure# 03  | 46: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)  |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward   | 46: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted) Agency for Healthcare Research and Ouality   |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward<br>Description  | 46: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)         Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic         pneumothorax in any secondary diamosic field   |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward<br>Description  | <b>46: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)</b> Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic         pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.         Discharges with ICD 0 CM as do a frictmannia group with the previous field.  |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward<br>Description<br>Numerator   | <b>46: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)</b> Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.         Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field         Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field  |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward<br>Description<br>Numerator<br>Denominator  | Hospital         46: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)         Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.         Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field         Discharges, age 18 years and older, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs  |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward<br>Description<br>Numerator<br>Denominator<br>Exclusions                                      | <b>46: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)</b> Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.         Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field         Discharges, age 18 years and older, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs         Patients in MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth and puerperium); with principal diagnosis (ICD-9-CM) code of iatrogenic pneumothorax (secondary diagnosis field if present on admission); with an ICD-9-CM diagnosis code of chest trauma or pleural effusion; with an ICD-9-CM procedure code of diaphragmatic surgery; and with an ICD-9-CM procedure code indicating thoracic surgery, lung or pleural biopsy, or assigned to cardiac surgery DRGs  |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward<br>Description<br>Numerator<br>Denominator<br>Exclusions<br>Risk<br>Adjustment                | <b>46:</b> Jatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)         Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.         Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field         Discharges, age 18 years and older, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs         Patients in MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth and puerperium); with principal diagnosis (ICD-9-CM) code of iatrogenic pneumothorax (secondary diagnosis field if present on admission); with an ICD-9-CM diagnosis code of chest trauma or pleural effusion; with an ICD-9-CM procedure code of diaphragmatic surgery; and with an ICD-9-CM procedure code indicating thoracic surgery, lung or pleural biopsy, or assigned to cardiac surgery DRGs         The predicted value for each case is computed using a hierarchical model (logistic regression with hospital random effect) and covariates for gender, age (in 5-year age groups), modified CMS DRG, and the AHRQ Comorbidity category. The reference population used in the regression is the universe of discharges for states that participate in the HCUP State Inpatient Data (SID) for the years 2002-2004 (combined), a database consisting of 37 states and approximately 90 million discharges. The expected rate is computed as the sum of the predicted value for each case divided by the number of cases for the unit of analysis of interest (i.e., hospital, state, and region). The risk adjusted rate is computed using indirect standardization as the observed rate divided by the expected rate, multiplied by the reference population rate.         Required data elements: CMS Diagnosis Related Group (DRG); CMS Major Diagnostic Category (MDC); pat |
| Measure# 03<br>Steward<br>Description<br>Numerator<br>Denominator<br>Exclusions<br>Risk<br>Adjustment<br>Data Source | <b>46:</b> Jatrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)         Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.         Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field         Discharges, age 18 years and older, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs         Patients in MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth and puerperium); with principal diagnosis (ICD-9-CM) code of iatrogenic pneumothorax (secondary diagnosis field if present on admission); with an ICD-9-CM procedure code of chest trauma or pleural effusion; with an ICD-9-CM procedure code indicating thoracic surgery, lung or pleural biopsy, or assigned to cardiac surgery DRGs         The predicted value for each case is computed using a hierarchical model (logistic regression with hospital random effect) and covariates for gender, age (in 5-year age groups), modified CMS DRG, and the AHRQ         Comorbidity category. The reference population used in the regression is the universe of discharges for states that participate in the HCUP State Inpatient Data (SID) for the years 2002-2004 (combined), a database consisting of 37 states and approximately 90 million discharges. The expected rate is computed as the sum of the predicted value for each case divided by the number of cases for the unit of analysis of interest (i.e., hospital, state, and region). The risk adjusted rate is computed using indirect standardization as the observed rate divided by the expected rate, multiplied by the reference population rate.         Required data elements: CMS Diagnosis Related Group (DRG); CMS Major Diagnostic Category (MDC); patient gender, age in years at                           |
| Measure# 03 Steward Description Numerator Denominator Exclusions Risk Adjustment Data Source Level                   | <b>10</b> : The prior is a secondary diagnosis field. <b>46</b> : Latrogenic Pneumothorax (PSI 6) (risk adjusted)         Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality         Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.         Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field         Discharges, age 18 years and older, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs         Patients in MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth and puerperium); with principal diagnosis (ICD-9-CM) code of iatrogenic pneumothorax (secondary diagnosis field if present on admission); with an ICD-9-CM diagnosis code of chest trauma or pleural effusion; with an ICD-9-CM procedure code of diaphragmatic surgery; and with an ICD-9-CM procedure code indicating thoracic surgery, lung or pleural biopsy, or assigned to cardiac surgery DRGs         The predicted value for each case is computed using a hierarchical model (logistic regression with hospital random effect) and covariates for gender, age (in 5-year age groups), modified CMS DRG, and the AHRQ Comorbidity category. The reference population used in the regression is the universe of discharges for states that participate in the HCUP State Inpatient Data (SID) for the years 2002-2004 (combined), a database consisting of 37 states and approximately 90 million discharges. The expected rate is computed as the sum of the predicted value for each case divided by the number of cases for the unit of analysis of interest (i.e., hospital, state, and region). The risk adjusted rate is computed using indirect standardization as the observed rate divided by the expected rate, multiplied by the reference population rate.         Required data ele                            |

| Measure# 0347: Death in Low Mortality DRGs (PSI 2)                             |   |
|--|---|
| Steward  | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality  |
| Description  | Percent of in-hospital deaths, age 18 years and older, in DRGs with less than 0.5% mortality rate.  |
| Numerator  | Number of in-hospital deaths  |
| Denominator  | Discharges, age 18 years and older, in DRGs with less than 0.5% mortality rate. If a DRG is divided into "without/with complications," both DRGs must qualify as low mortality for inclusion  |
| Exclusions   | Patients with any ICD-9-CM code for trauma, immunocompromised state or cancer   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   | None.   |
| Data Source  | Electronic Claims   |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting  | Hospital  |
| Measure# 0348: Iatrogenic Pneumothorax in Non-Neonates (PDI 5) (risk adjusted) |   |
| Steward  | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality  |
| Description  | Percent of medical and surgical discharges, age under 18 years, with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field.   |
| Numerator  | Discharges with ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in any secondary diagnosis field   |
| Denominator  | Discharges, age under 18 years, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs   |
| Exclusions   | Neonates (birth weight less than 2500 grams); patients with an ICD-9-CM code of iatrogenic pneumothorax in neonates in the principal diagnosis field (secondary diagnosis field if present on admission); with an ICD-9-CM code of thoracic surgery, lung or pleural biopsy or diaphragmatic surgery repair or assigned to a cardiac surgery DRG; with a diagnosis code of chest trauma or pleural effusion; MDC of 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, puerperium) normal newborn and newborns less than 500 grams  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   | The predicted value for each case is computed using a hierarchical model (logistic regression with hospital random effect) and covariates for gender, birthweight (500g groups), age in days (29-60, 61-90, 91+), age in years (in 5-year age groups), modified CMS DRG and AHRQ CCS comorbities. The reference population used in the regression is the universe of discharges for states that participate in the HCUP State Inpatient Data (SID) for the years 2002-2004 (combined), a database consisting of 37 states and approximately 20 million pediatric discharges. The expected rate is computed as the sum of the predicted value for each case divided by the number of cases for the unit of analysis of interest (i.e., hospital, state, and region). The risk adjusted rate is computed using indirect standardization as the observed rate divided by the expected rate, multiplied by the reference population rate. |
|  | Modification (ICD-9-CM) principal and secondary diagnosis codes.  |
| Data Source  | Electronic Claims   |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting  | Hospital  |

| Measure# 0349: Transfusion Reaction (PSI 16) |  |
|--|--|
| Steward                                      | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality   |
| Description                                  | Percent of medical and surgical discharges, 18 years and older, with ICD-9-CM code for transfucsion reaction in any secondary diagnosis field.   |
| Numerator                                    | Discharges with an ICD-9-CM code for transfusion reaction in any secondary diagnosis field   |
| Denominator                                  | Discharges, age 18 years and older, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs  |
| Exclusions                                   | Patients with an ICD-9-CM code for transfusion reaction in the principal diagnosis field (secondary diagnosis field if present on admission)   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment                           | None.  |
| Data Source                                  | Electronic Claims  |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |
| Setting                                      | Hospital   |
| Measure# 0350: Transfusion Reaction (PDI 13) |  |
| Steward                                      | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality   |
| Description                                  | Percent of medical and surgical discharges, under 18 years of age, with an ICD-9-CM code for transfusion reaction in any secondary diagnosis field.  |
| Numerator                                    | Discharges with an ICD-9-CM code for transfusion reaction in any secondary diagnosis field   |
| Denominator                                  | Discharges, age under 18 years, defined by specific surgical and medical DRGs  |
| Exclusions                                   | Patients with MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, pueperium); with an ICD-9-CM code for transfusion reaction in the principal diagnosis field (secondary diagnosis field if present on admission); and neonates less than 500 grams |
| Risk   |  |
| Adjustment                                   |  |
| Data Source                                  | Electronic Claims  |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)  |
| Setting                                      | Hospital   |

| Measure# 0352: Failure to Rescue In-Hospital Mortality (risk adjusted) |   |
|--|---|
| Steward  | Children's Hospital of Philadelphia   |
| Description  | Percentage of patients who died with a complications in the hospital.   |
| Numerator  | Patients who died with a complication plus patients who died without documented complications. Death is defined as death in the hospital.   |
|  | All patients in an FTR analysis have developed a complication (by definition).  |
|  | Complicated patient has at least one of the complications defined in Appendix B. Complications are defined using the secondary ICD9 diagnosis and procedure codes and the DRG code of the current admission.  |
|  | Comorbidities are defined in Appendix C using secondary ICD9 diagnosis codes of the current admission and primary or secondary ICD9 diagnosis codes of previous admission within 90 days of the admission date of the current admission.  |
|  | *When physician part B is available, the definition of complications and comorbidities are augmented to include CPT codes.  |
| Denominator  | General Surgery, Orthopedic and Vascular patients in specific DRGs with complications plus patients who died in the hospital without complications.   |
|  | Inclusions: adult patients admitted for one of the procedures in the General Surgery, Orthopedic or Vascular DRGs (see appendix A)  |
| Exclusions   | Patients over age 90, under age 18.   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   | Risk Adjustment: Model was developed using logistic regression analysis.  |
| -  | Associated data elements: age in years, sex, race, comorbidities, DRGs (combined with and without complications) and procedure codes within DRGs, transfer status.  |
|  | Failure to rescue is adjusted using a logistic regression model where y is a failure and the total N is composed of patients who develop a complication and patients who died without a complication.   |
|  | According to developer: The model adjustment variables can vary. We have found that FTR results are fairly stable, even with little adjustment, since all patients in an FTR analysis have developed a complication (by definition), they are a more homogenous group of patients than the entire population. Hence severity adjustment plays somewhat less of a role than in other outcome measures. |
| Data Source  | Electronic Claims   |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting  | Hospital  |

| Measure# 0353: Failure to Rescue 30-Day Mortality (risk adjusted) |   |
|---|---|
| Steward   | Children's Hospital of Philadelphia   |
| Description   | Percentage of patients who died with a complication within 30 days from admission.  |
| Numerator   | Patients who died with a complication plus patients who died without documented complications. Death is defined as death within 30 days from admission.   |
|   | Complicated patient has at least one of the complications defined in Appendix B. Complications are defined using the secondary ICD9 diagnosis and procedure codes and the DRG code of the current admission.  |
|   | Comorbidities are defined in Appendix C using secondary ICD9 diagnosis codes of the current admission and primary or secondary ICD9 diagnosis codes of previous admission within 90 days of the admission date of the current admission.  |
|   | *When physician part B is available, the definition of complications and comorbidities are augmented to include CPT codes.  |
| Denominator   | General Surgery, Orthopedic and Vascular patients in specific DRGs with complications plus patients who died without complications within 30 days of admission.   |
|   | Inclusions: adult patients admitted for one of the procedures in the General Surgery, Orthopedic or Vascular DRGs (see appendix A)  |
| Exclusions  | Patients over age 90, under age 18.   |
| Risk  | Risk Adjustment: Model was developed using logistic regression analysis.  |
| Adjustment  | Associated data elements: age in years, sex, race, comorbidities, DRGs (combined with and without complications) and procedure codes within DRGs, transfer status.  |
|   | Failure to rescue is adjusted using a logistic regression model where y is a failure and the total N is composed of patients who develop a complication and patients who died without a complication.   |
|   | According to developer: The model adjustment variables can vary. We have found that FTR results are fairly stable, even with little adjustment, since all patients in an FTR analysis have developed a complication (by definition), they are a more homogenous group of patients than the entire population. Hence severity adjustment plays somewhat less of a role than in other outcome measures. |
| Data Source   | Electronic Claims   |
| Level   | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting   | Hospital  |
| Measure# 03   | 52: Foreign Body left after procedure (PDI 3)   |
| Steward   | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality  |
| Description   | Discharges with foreign body accidentally left in during procedure per 1,000 discharges   |
| Numerator   | All discharges, age under 18 years, with International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) codes for foreign body left in during a procedure in any secondary diagnosis field  |
| Denominator   | All surgical and medical discharges age under 18 years defined by specific Surgical and Medical Diagnosis<br>Related Group (DRG)  |
| Exclusions  | Exclude patients with an ICD-9-CM code of foreign body left in during a procedure in the principal diagnosis field, Major Diagnostic Category (MDC) 14 (Pregnancy, Childbirth and the Puerperium), newborns less than 500 grams and neonates (age < 28 days)  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment  | None.   |
| Data Source   | Electronic Claims   |
| Level   | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting   | Hospital  |

| Measure# 0363: Foreign Body Left in During Procedure (PSI 5) |   |
|--|---|
| Steward  | Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality  |
| Description  | Discharges with foreign body accidentally left in during procedure per 1,000 discharges   |
| Numerator  | Number of discharges, age 18 years and older, with an International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision,<br>Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) code for foreign body in any secondary diagnosis field  |
| Denominator  | All surgical and medical discharges age 18 years and older defined by specific Surgical and Medical Diagnosis<br>Related Group (DRG)<br>Include patients in MDC 14  |
| Exclusions   | Exclude patients with principal diagnosis (ICD-9-CM) code of foreign body   |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   | None.   |
| Data Source  | Electronic Claims   |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting  | Hospital  |
| Measure# 03  | 71: Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) Prophylaxis  |
| Steward  | The Joint Commission  |
| Description  | This measure assesses the number of patients who received VTE prophylaxis or<br>have documentation why no VTE prophylaxis was given the day of or the day after hospital<br>admission or surgery end date for surgeries that start the day of or the day after hosp   |
| Numerator  | Patients who received VTE prophylaxis or have documentation why no<br>VTE prophylaxis was given:<br>? the day of or the day after hospital admission<br>? the day of or the day after surgery end date for surgeries that start the day of or the day after<br>hospital admission   |
| Denominator  | All patients<br>Inclusions: Not applicable  |
| Exclusions   | Patients:<br>? Patients less than 18 years of age<br>? Patients who have a length of stay (LOS) < two days and > 120 days<br>? Patients with Comfort Measures Only documented<br>? Patients enrolled in clinical trials<br>? Patients who are direct admits to intensive care unit (ICU), or transferred to ICU the<br>day of or the day after hospital admission with ICU LOS = one day<br>? Patients with ICD-9-CM Principal Diagnosis Code of Mental Disorders or Stroke as<br>defined in Appendix A, Table 7.01, 8.1 or 8.2<br>? Patients with ICD-9-CM Principal or Other Diagnosis Codes of Obstetrics or VTE as<br>defined in Appendix A, Table 7.02, 7.03 or 7.04<br>? Patients with ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure Code of Surgical Care Improvement<br>Project (SCIP) VTE selected surgeries as defined in Appendix A, Tables 5.17, 5.19,<br>5.20, 5.21, 5.22, 5.23, 5.24 |
| Risk<br>Adjustment   |   |
| Data Source  | Paper Medical Record, Electronic Claims, Electronic Health/Medical Record   |
| Level  | Facility (e.g., hospital, nursing home)   |
| Setting  | Hospital  |

| Measure# 0589: Rheumatoid Arthritis New DMARD Baseline Serum Creatinine |   |
|---|---|
| Steward   | Resolution Health, Inc.   |
| Description   | This measure identifies adult patients with a diagnosis of rheumatoid arthritis who received appropriate baseline serum creatinine testing within 90 days before to 14 days after the new start of methotrexate, leflunomide, azathioprine, D-Penicillamine, i  |
| Numerator   | Patients in the denominator who received serum creatinine testing within 90 days before to 14 days after the new start of methotrexate, leflunomide, azathioprine, D-Penicillamine, intramuscular gold, cyclosporine, or cyclophosphamide during the measurement year.  |
| Denominator   | Patients >=18 years old with a history of rheumatoid arthritis and a new start of methotrexate, leflunomide, azathioprine, D-Penicillamine, intramuscular gold, cyclosporine, or cyclophosphamide anytime from the beginning of the measurement year to 14 days prior to the end of the measurement year. (This list of DMARDs will hereafter be referred to as 'DMARD needing baseline SCr') |
| Exclusions  | The measure excludes patients who have had an inpatient hospitalization during the measurement year because UB04 claims do not document individual lab tests ordered during an inpatient stay.  |
| Risk<br>Adjustment  | no  |
| Data Source   | Electronic Claims, Electronic Pharmacy Data, Other  |
| Level   | Individual clinician (physician, nurse), Community/Population, Health Plan, Group of clinicians (facility, dept/unit, group), Integrated delivery system  |
| Setting   | Ambulatory Care (office/clinic), Community Healthcare, Health Plan  |