



**NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM**

Driving measurable health
improvements together

Prevention and Population Health, Spring 2021 Measure Review Cycle

Measure Evaluation Standing Committee Meeting

Nicole Williams, MPH, Director

Oroma Igwe, MPH, Manager

Isaac Sakyi, MSGH, Senior Analyst

Mike DiVecchia, MBA, PMP, Senior Project Manager

Sharon Hibay, DNP, BS, RN, Senior Consultant

July 15, 2021

Funded by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services under contract HHSM-500-2017-00060I Task Order HHSM-500-T0001.



Housekeeping Reminders

- This is a WebEx meeting with audio and video capabilities
 - <https://nqf.webex.com/nqf/j.php?MTID=m48d653325329c735f55052bfc57f9444>
 - Password: **QMEvent**
- Optional: Dial **1-844-621-3956**; Access code: **173 404 0646**
- Please place yourself on mute when you are not speaking
- We encourage you to use the following features
 - Chat box: To message NQF staff or the group
 - Raise hand: To be called upon to speak
 - Video: When you are speaking
- We will conduct a Committee roll call once the meeting begins

If you are experiencing technical issues, please contact the NQF project team at populationhealth@qualityforum.org

Welcome



Project Team — Prevention and Population Health

- Nicole Williams, MPH, Director
- Oroma Igwe, MPH, Manager
- Isaac Sakyi, MSGH, Senior Analyst
- Mike DiVecchia, MBA, PMP, Senior Project Manager
- Sharon Hibay, DNP, BS, RN, Senior Consultant



Agenda

- Introductions and Disclosures of Interest
- Overview of Evaluation Process and Voting Process
- Voting Test
- Measures Under Review
- Consideration of Candidate Measures
- Related and Competing Measures
- NQF Member and Public Comment
- Next Steps
- Adjourn

Introductions and Disclosures of Interest

Prevention and Population Health Standing Committee

- Amir Qaseem, MD, PhD, MHA
(Chair)
- Philip Alberti, PhD
- Ron Bialek, MPP, CQIA
- Jayaram Brindala, MD, MBA, MPH
- Gigi Chawla, MD, MHA
- Larry Curley, MPA
- Favio Freyre, MD
- Barry-Lewis Harris, II, MD
- Catherine Hill, DNP, APRN
- Amy Nguyen Howell, MD, MBA, FAAFP
- Julia Logan, MD, MPH
- Patricia McKane, DVM, MPH
- Lisa Nichols, MSW
- Patricia Quigley, PhD
- Anita Ravi, MD, MPH, MSHP, FAAFP
- Carol Siebert, OTD, OT/L, FAOTA
- Jason Spangler, MD, MPH, FACPM
- Rosalyn Stephens, RN, MSN, CCM
- Matt Stiefel, MPA, MS
- Michael Stoto, PhD
- Arjun Venkatesh, MD, MBS, MHS
- Ruth Wetta, RN, PhD, MPH, MSN
- Whitney Bowman-Zatzkin, MPA MSR

Overview of Evaluation and Voting Processes



Roles of the Standing Committee During the Evaluation Meeting

- Act as a proxy for the NQF multistakeholder membership
- Evaluate each measure against each criterion
 - ▣ Indicate the extent to which each criterion is met and rationale for the rating
- Respond to comments submitted during the public commenting period
- Make recommendations regarding endorsement to the NQF membership
- Oversee the portfolio of Prevention and Population Health measures

Meeting Ground Rules

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
- Attend the meeting at all times
- Keep comments concise and focused
- Allow others to contribute



Process for Measure Discussion and Voting

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

Endorsement Criteria

- **Importance to Measure and Report (Evidence and Performance Gap):** Extent to which the measure focus is evidence-based and important to making significant gains in healthcare quality where there is variation in or overall less-than-optimal performance (**must-pass**).
- **Scientific Acceptability (Reliability and Validity):** Extent to which the measure produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented (**must-pass**).
- **Feasibility:** Extent to which the specifications require data that are readily available or could be captured and implemented without undue burden
- **Usability and Use:** Extent to which the measure is being used for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare (**must-pass** for maintenance measures).
- **Comparison to related or competing measures:** If a measure meets the above criteria and there are endorsed or new related measures or competing measures, the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure.



Voting on Endorsement Criteria

- Votes will be taken after the discussion of each criterion
- **Importance to Measure and Report**
 - ▣ Vote on Evidence (must pass)
 - ▣ Vote on Performance Gap (must pass)
 - ▣ Vote on Rationale - Composite measures only (must pass)
- **Scientific Acceptability Of Measure Properties**
 - ▣ Vote on Reliability (must pass)
 - ▣ Vote on Validity (must pass)
 - ▣ Vote on Quality Construct - Composite measures only (must pass)
- **Feasibility**
- **Usability and Use**
 - ▣ Use (must pass for maintenance measures)
 - ▣ Usability



Voting on Endorsement Criteria (continued)

- **Related and Competing Discussion**
- **Overall Suitability for Endorsement**
- **Procedural Notes**
 - ▣ 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 and Standing Committee discussion moves to the next measure.
 - ▣ If consensus is not reached, discussion continues with the next measure criterion.



Achieving Consensus

- Quorum: 66% of active Standing Committee members (**16 of 23 members**)

Vote	Outcome
Greater than 60% yes	Pass/Recommended
40% - 60% yes	Consensus Not Reached (CNR)
<40% yes	Does Not Pass/Not Recommended

- “Yes” votes are the total of high and moderate votes based on the number of active and voting-eligible Standing Committee members who participate in the voting activity.
- Measures with a CNR, in any must-pass criterion, will move forward to public and NQF-member comment. The Standing Committee will revote on the CNR criterion and overall suitability for endorsement during the post-comment web meeting.
- Measures that are not recommended will also move on to public and NQF-member comment, but the Standing Committee will not revote on the measures during the post comment meeting unless the Standing Committee decides to reconsider them based on submitted comments or a formal reconsideration request from the developer.



Standing Committee Quorum and Voting

- Please let staff know if you need to miss part of the meeting.
- Quorum must be maintained to vote. Discussions may occur without quorum.
- If we do not have quorum at any point during the meeting, live voting will stop, and NQF staff will send the Standing Committee a survey link to complete measure voting, which must be submitted by within 48 hours of receiving the survey link.
- If a Standing Committee member leaves the meeting and quorum is maintained, the Standing Committee will continue to vote on the measure(s). If quorum is maintained, Standing Committee members who leave the meeting will not have the opportunity to vote on measures evaluated by the Standing Committee during their absence.



Evaluation Process Questions?

Voting Test

Measure Under Review



Spring 2021 Cycle Measure

- **1 New Measure for Standing Committee Review**
 - ▣ 3620 Adult Immunization Status (National Committee for Quality Assurance)



NQF Scientific Methods Panel

- The Scientific Methods Panel (SMP), consisting of individuals with methodologic expertise, was established to help ensure consistent and high-level evaluations for the scientific acceptability of complex measures.
- The SMP's comments and concerns are provided to developers to further clarify and update their measure submission forms with the intent of strengthening their measures to be evaluated by the Standing Committee.
- Measures that do not pass the SMP's scientific acceptability must-pass ratings are not reviewed by the Standing Committee unless they are-pulled by a Standing Committee member for discussion and revote.



NQF Scientific Methods Panel Review

- No measures were reviewed by the SMP under the Spring 2021 review period

Consideration of Candidate Measure



3620 Adult Immunization Status

- **Measure Steward:** National Committee for Quality Assurance
 - ▣ New measure
- **Brief Description of Measure:**
 - ▣ The percentage of adults 19 years of age and older who are up-to-date on Advisory Committee on Immunization Practice (ACIP) recommended routine vaccines for influenza, tetanus and diphtheria (Td) or tetanus, diphtheria and acellular pertussis (Tdap), zoster and pneumococcal.

Related and Competing Discussion

Related and Competing Measures

- If a measure is recommended for endorsement **and** other endorsed or new related (same measure focus **or** same target population) or competing (both the same measure focus **and** same target population) measures are identified, measures are compared for harmonization or selection of the best measure.

	Same concepts for measure focus-target process, condition, event, outcome	Different concepts for measure focus-target process, condition, event, outcome
Same target population	Competing measures-Select best measure from competing measures or justify endorsement of additional measure(s).	Related measures-Harmonize on target patient population or justify differences.
Different target patient population	Related measures-Combine into one measure with expanded target patient population or justify why different harmonized measures are needed.	Neither harmonization nor competing measure issue.



Related and Competing Measures (continued)

- Only measures recommended for endorsement will be discussed.
- Related and competing measures will be grouped and discussed after recommendations for all related and competing measures are determined.
- Standing Committee can discuss harmonization and make recommendations.
- Standing Committee will not be asked to select a best-in-class measure if all related and completing measures are not currently under review.
- Developers of each related and competing measure will be encouraged to attend any discussion.

Related Measure for #3620

- 0039: Flu Vaccinations for Adults Ages 18 and Older
- 0041: Preventive Care and Screening: Influenza Immunization
- 0043: Pneumococcal Vaccination Status for Older Adults (PNU)
- 0431: INFLUENZA VACCINATION COVERAGE AMONG HEALTHCARE PERSONNEL
- 0680: Percent of Residents Who Were Assessed and Appropriately Given the Seasonal Influenza Vaccine (Short Stay)
- 0681: Percent of Residents Assessed and Appropriately Given the Seasonal Influenza Vaccine (Long Stay)
- 0682: Percent of Residents or Patients Assessed and Appropriately Given the Pneumococcal Vaccine (Short-Stay)



Related Measure for #3620

- 0683: Percent of Residents Assessed and Appropriately Given the Pneumococcal Vaccine (Long-Stay)
- 1653: Pneumococcal Immunization
- 1659: Influenza Immunization

NQF Member and Public Comment

Next Steps



Measure Evaluation Process After the Measure Evaluation Meeting

- Staff will prepare a draft report detailing the Standing Committee's discussion and recommendations
- This report will be released for a 30-day public and member comment period
- Staff will compile all comments received into a comment table for developer responses (as requested) and Standing Committee review
- Post-comment call: The Standing Committee will reconvene for a post-comment call to discuss comments and responses submitted
- Staff will incorporate comments and responses to comments into the draft report in preparation for the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) meeting and endorse the measure
- Opportunity for public to appeal endorsement decision

Activities and Timeline – Spring 2021 Cycle

***All times ET**

Meeting	Date, Time
Draft Report Comment Period	August 27 – September 27, 2021
Standing Committee Post-Comment Web Meeting	October 28, 2021 – 2:00-4:00 pm
CSAC Review	November 30 – December 1, 2021
Appeals Period (30 days)	December 7, 2021 – January 5, 2022



Next Cycle – Fall 2021 Cycle Updates

- Intent to submit deadline is August 2, 2021
 - ▣ 5 maintenance measures are expected
- Topic areas
 - ▣ Dental services prevention, utilization, and evaluation
- Measure submission deadline is November 15, 2021



Project Contact Info

- Email: populationhealth@qualityforum.org
- NQF phone: 202-783-1300
- Project page:
[https://www.qualityforum.org/Prevention and Population Health.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Prevention_and_Population_Health.aspx)
- SharePoint site:
<https://share.qualityforum.org/portfolio/PreventionPopulationHealth/SitePages/Home.aspx>

Questions?

THANK YOU.

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

<http://www.qualityforum.org>