



### Prevention and Population Health Standing Committee – Measure Evaluation Web Meeting

---

The National Quality Forum (NQF) convened the Prevention and Population Health Standing Committee for a web meeting on July 15, 2021, to evaluate one measure.

#### Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Meeting Objectives

NQF welcomed the Standing Committee and participants to the web meeting. NQF staff reviewed the meeting objectives. The Standing Committee members each introduced themselves and disclosed any conflicts of interest. No conflicts of interest were disclosed.

Some Standing Committee members were unable to attend the entire meeting due to early departures and late arrivals. The vote totals reflect members present and eligible to vote. Quorum was met and maintained for the entirety of the meeting.

#### Topic Area Introduction and Overview of Evaluation Process

NQF staff provided an overview of the topic area and the current NQF portfolio of endorsed measures. There are currently 23 endorsed measures in the Prevention and Population Health portfolio. Additionally, NQF reviewed the Consensus Development Process (CDP) and the measure evaluation criteria.

#### Measure Evaluation

During the meeting, the Prevention and Population Health Standing Committee evaluated one new measure for endorsement consideration. A summary of the Standing Committee's deliberations will be compiled and provided in the draft technical report. NQF will post the draft technical report on August 27, 2021, for public comment on the NQF website. The draft technical report will be posted for 30 calendar days.

**Rating Scale:** H – High; M – Medium; L – Low; I – Insufficient; NA – Not Applicable

#### #3620 Adult Immunization Status (National Committee for Quality Assurance [NCQA])

##### *Measure Steward/Developer Representatives at the Meeting*

Mary Barton, MD, MPP

##### *Standing Committee Votes*

- Evidence: H-1; M-15; L-0; I-0 (Pass – 16/16)
- Performance Gap: H-7; M-8; L-0; I-0 (Pass – 15/15)
- Reliability: H-0; M-13; L-2; I-1 (Pass – 13/16)
- Validity: H-1; M-12; L-3; I-0 (Pass – 13/16)
- Feasibility: H-5; M-11; L-0; I-0 (Pass – 16/16)
- Use: Pass-16; No Pass-0 (Pass – 16/16)
- Usability: H-2; M-11; L-1; I-1 (Pass – 13/15)

*Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Yes-13; No-2 (Pass – 13/15)*

The Standing Committee recommended the measure for initial endorsement.

This measure was reviewed during the fall 2019 cycle as a composite measure. However, the Standing Committee did not reach consensus on the composite quality construct. For this cycle, the measure was submitted with four individual vaccine component rates focused on 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. The developer modified the conceptual framework from the previously submitted composite #3483. This measure aims to improve the primary prevention of these vaccine-related diseases.

During the discussion, the developer provided a general overview and description of the measure and noted that ACIP continuously updates its guidelines, which will be reflected in future versions of the measure. The lead discussant commended the developer for updating the measure since the previous review but expressed concerns about the complexity of having separate evidence for each of the four vaccine component rates. The Standing Committee sought clarification on the process, specifically as to why four measures were being reviewed as one. NQF staff shared that although four measures are being reviewed, measure #3620, which includes four separate performance rates, was submitted as one measure. This was an option provided to the developer by NQF. The Standing Committee did not express any significant concerns regarding the measure's evidence and passed the measure on the evidence criterion. The developer noted a significant gap in care in this area, which is supported by data from the National Health Interview survey; the data from this survey indicated that most adults remain unprotected against vaccine-preventable diseases. Multiple Standing Committee members expressed their desire to see the measure performance stratified by race, ethnicity, geography, payer, and other available data. In addition, the developer expressed their anticipation in reporting this information for the maintenance evaluation review. The Standing Committee agreed that a substantial gap remains and passed the measure on the performance gap criterion.

The lead discussant reviewed data on reliability; they noted that the beta-binomial methodology was appropriate and questioned whether this measure will be consistently implemented across plans. The developer expressed confidence in their audit procedures in ensuring that health plans are reporting legitimate data. Another Standing Committee member expressed concern with comparability across plans: Some plans might use different data sources for comparability purposes. In response, the developer expressed confidence that these four vaccines will be beneficial despite their complexity.

On the topic of validity, the Standing Committee reviewed the testing information. The developer conducted face validity and empirical construct validity testing of measure performance regarding whether the indicators within this measure were correlated to each other, as well as to other measure correlates. One Standing Committee member noted the issue of assuming that health plans that perform well on certain measures should also perform well on vaccine measures for pregnant women, adolescents, adults, older adults, and so on. The Standing Committee voted to pass the measure with a moderate rating for both reliability and validity. The Standing Committee did not express any concerns with the feasibility of the measure and voted to pass the measure on the feasibility criterion. Use and usability information were described to the Standing Committee. This measure is publicly reported and planned for use in an accountability program. The developer also reported that no unintended findings were identified for this measure during testing or since implementation. Ultimately, the Standing Committee voted to pass the measure on the use criterion and gave it a moderate rating for the usability criterion. The Standing Committee voted to recommend the measure for endorsement and

observed that several [related measures are present](#), but it did not consider these measures to be competing.

### Public Comment

No public or NQF member comments were provided during the measure evaluation meeting.

### Next Steps

NQF reviewed the next steps for the project, noting that NQF will incorporate the Standing Committee's spring 2021 measure evaluation discussion and voting results into the *Spring 2021 Draft Technical Report*. NQF will post the draft technical report on August 27, 2021, for a 30-calendar day public commenting period. The continuous public commenting period with member support will close on September 27, 2021. NQF will reconvene the Standing Committee for the post-comment web meeting on October 28, 2021. NQF also informed the Standing Committee that the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) will consider the Standing Committee's endorsement recommendations during its meetings on November 30 – December 1, 2021. Following the CSAC meeting, the 30-day Appeals period will be held from December 7 – January 5, 2022.