

http://www.qualityforum.org

Perinatal and Women's Health, Fall 2019 Measure Review Cycle

Measure Evaluation Web Meeting

Matt Pickering, Senior Director Suzanne Theberge, Senior Project Manager Hannah Ingber, Project Analyst Robyn Nishimi, NQF Consultant

February 7, 2020

OUR MISSION The trusted voice driving measurable health improvements

OUR VISION

Every person experiences high value care and optimal health outcomes

OUR VALUES

Collaboration Leadership Passion Excellence Integrity

Welcome



NQF Staff

- Matthew Pickering, PharmD, Senior Director
- Suzanne Theberge, MPH, Senior Project Manager
- Hannah Ingber, MPH, Project Analyst
- Robyn Nishimi, PhD, NQF Senior Consultant



Agenda

- Welcome
- Introductions & Disclosure of Interest
- Overview of Evaluation Process
- Consideration of Candidate Measure
- NQF Member and Public Comment
- Next Steps
- Adjourn

Introductions and Disclosures of Interest



Standing Committee

- Kimberly Gregory, MD, MPH (Co-chair)
- Carol Sakala, PhD, MSPH (Co-chair)
- Jill Arnold
- J. Matthew Austin, PhD
- Jennifer Bailit, MD, MPH
- Amy Bell, DNP, RNC-OB, NEA-BC, CPHQ
- Martha Carter, DHSc, MBA, APRN, CNM
- Tasha Cooper, RN
- Tracy Flanagan, MD
- Ashley Hirai, PhD (inactive)
- Lisa Holtzclaw, RN, BS, MHA, MSN
- Mambarambath Jaleel, MD
- Diana Jolles, CNM, MS, PhD
- Deborah Kilday, MSN, RN

- Sarah McNeil, MD
- Jennifer Moore, PhD, RN
- Sarah Nathan, MSN, RN, FNP
- Kristi Nelson, MBA, BSN
- Sheila Owens-Collins, MD, MPH, MBA
- Diana E. Ramos, MD, MPH, FACOG
- Sindhu Srinivas, MD, MSCE
- Nan Strauss, JD
- Angeline Ti, MD, MPH
- Rajan Wadhawan, MD, MMM, CPE, FAAP

Measure Evaluation Process and Inputs to Date



Measures Submitted for Fall 2019

- 3543: Patient-Centered Contraceptive Counseling (PCCC)
 - New measure
 - Passed Scientific Methods Panel Review
- 3528: CDC and VON Late Onset Sepsis and Meningitis in Very Low Birthweight Neonates
 - New measure
 - Did not pass Scientific Methods Panel Review



Measure Evaluation Inputs to the Standing Committee





Measure Evaluation Process—Fall 2019

Developer Receives Feedback





NQF Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) Review

- The SMP consists of individuals with statistical expertise
 - Established to help ensure consistent evaluation of the scientific acceptability of complex measures
 - Evaluate measures for scientific acceptability (e.g., reliability, validity)
- The SMP assessment:
 - 3543: SMP voted high on reliability and high on validity
 - 3528: Did not pass due to insufficient reliability testing
 - » This measure *is not* eligible for re-vote by the Committee



Questions?

Committee Evaluation Process



Major Endorsement Criteria

- Importance to measure and report: Goal is to measure those aspects with greatest potential of driving improvements; if not important, the other criteria are less meaningful
 - Evidence (must pass)
 - Gap (must pass)
- Scientific acceptability of measure properties: Goal is to make valid conclusions about quality; if not reliable and valid, there is risk of improper interpretation
 - Reliability (must pass)
 - Validity (must pass)
- Feasibility: Goal is to, ideally, cause as little burden as possible; if not feasible, consider alternative approaches
- Usability and Use (must-pass for maintenance measures): Goal is to use for decisions related to accountability and improvement; if not useful, probably do not care if feasible
 - Use
 - Usability
- Comparison to related or competing measures



Voting Preparation

- Check your email for link to voting website
- Voting will be conducted during today's webinar
- Voting must be accessed and submitted on a computer; voting from a mobile device is not yet enabled



Ground Rules for Today's Meeting

During the discussions, Committee members should:

- Be prepared, having reviewed the measures beforehand
- Base evaluation and recommendations on the measure evaluation criteria and guidance
- Remain engaged in the discussion without distractions
- Keep comments concise and focused
- Avoid dominating a discussion and allow others to contribute
- Indicate agreement without repeating what has already been said



Process for Measure Discussion

- Brief introduction by measure developer (3-5 minutes)
- Lead discussants will begin Committee discussion <u>for each criterion</u>:
 - Briefly explaining information on the criterion provided by the developer
 - Providing a brief summary of the pre-meeting evaluation comments (from SMP or other Committee members)
 - Emphasizing areas of concern or differences of opinion
 - Noting, if needed, the preliminary rating by NQF staff
 - » This rating is intended to be used as a guide to facilitate the Committee's discussion and evaluation.
- Developers will be available to respond to questions at the discretion of the Committee
- Full Committee will discuss, then vote on the criterion, if needed, before moving on to the next criterion



Lead Discussants

Lead Discussants:

- Lead the discussion on their assigned criterion
- Begin the discussion of the measure evaluation including:
 - summarize the evaluation of each criterion based on all of the Standing Committee's pre-meeting evaluation comments
 - highlight areas of concern or difference of opinion and the issues or questions posed in the preliminary analysis
- Verbalize conclusions regarding how well the measure meets NQF's evaluation criteria
- Be fully conversant with the submitted measure information on their assigned measure criterion

Voting Process



Voting on Endorsement Criteria

- Importance to Measure and Report (must-pass):
 - » Discuss impact and opportunity for improvement and vote
- Scientific Acceptability (must-pass):
 - » Reliability: Committee may choose to re-adjudicate reliability OR accept the SMP votes
 - » Validity: Committee must discuss and vote on validity; the SMP did not reach consensus
- Feasibility:
 - » Discuss and vote on feasibility
- Usability and Use
 - » Discuss and vote on usability and use
- Overall Suitability for Endorsement

If a measure fails on one of the must-pass criteria, there is no further discussion or voting on the subsequent criteria for that measure; we move to the next measure.



Achieving Consensus

- Quorum: 66% of the Committee (16 people; 23 active members)
- Pass/Recommended: Greater than 60% "Yes" votes (high + moderate ratings) of the quorum
- Consensus not reached (CNR): 40-60% "Yes" votes (inclusive of 40% and 60%) of the quorum
 - Measure moves forward to public and NQF member comment and the Committee will revote
- Does not pass/Not Recommended: Less than 40% "Yes" votes of the quorum



Voting Test



Questions?

Consideration of Candidate Measure



Fall 2019 Cycle Measure Review

- 3543: Patient-Centered Contraceptive Counseling (PCCC)
- 3528 CDC and VON Late Onset Sepsis and Meningitis in Very Low Birthweight Neonates
 - Not eligible for full Committee evaluation



3543 Patient-Centered Contraceptive Counseling (PCCC)

- Measure Steward: University of California, San Francisco
- Brief Description of Measure: The PCCC is a four-item patient-reported outcome performance measure (PRO-PM) designed to assess the patientcenteredness of contraceptive counseling at the individual clinician/provider and facility levels of analysis.
- Numerator: The PCCC is a visit-specific measure of patient-centeredness in contraceptive counseling. It specifically measures how many patients report a top-box (i.e., the highest possible) score of patient experience in their contraceptive counseling interaction with a health care provider during their recent visit.
- Denominator: The target population for the PCCC is patients age 15-45, who were assigned female at birth, who are not currently pregnant, and who received contraceptive counseling as part of their recent visit.



3528 CDC and VON Late Onset Sepsis and Meningitis in Very Low Birthweight Neonates

- Measure Steward: CDC/VON
- Brief Description of Measure: Late onset sepsis (LOS) is one of the most common complications of extreme prematurity. This infection is usually serious, causing a prolongation of hospital stay, increased cost, and risk of morbidity and mortality.
- Numerator: The numerator for Crude Monthly Risk and Cumulative Admission Risk is the number of LOS and/or MEN events in eligible infants within an eligible location. The numerator for the survival probability measure is the number of eligible neonates without an LOS or MEN event within an eligible location.
- Denominator: The denominator for Crude Monthly Risk is the number of eligible neonates within an eligible location each month. The denominator for Cumulative Admission Risk is the number of eligible neonatal admissions to an eligible location. The denominator for survival probability is the total number of eligible neonates.



Questions?

NQF Member and Public Comment

Next Steps



Next Steps for Fall 2019 Cycle

- Draft Report Comment Period (30 days)
 - March 18 April 16, 2020
- Committee Post-Comment Web Meeting
 - May 8, 2020, 12-2 pm ET



Project Contact Info

- Email: <u>perinatal@qualityforum.org</u>
- NQF phone: 202-783-1300
- Project page: <u>http://www.qualityforum.org/ProjectDescription.aspx?projectID=86</u> <u>100</u>
- SharePoint site: <u>http://share.qualityforum.org/Projects/Perinatal%202015/SitePages</u> <u>/Home.aspx</u>



Questions?

Adjourn

THANK YOU.

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

http://www.qualityforum.org