

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

eMeasure Learning Collaborative

Planning Committee Meeting and Worksession

Meeting Minutes

May 9, 2012

2:00-3:00 pm ET

The ***eMeasure Learning Collaborative Planning Committee*** met on Wednesday, May 9, 2012.

Members Present: Zahid Butt, Dwight Brown, Kendra Hanley, Sharon Hibay, Ginny Meadows, Karen Nielsen, Ted Palen, Dave Stumpf, Ann Watt, John Maese

Federal Liaisons Present: Jesse James, Kevin Larsen

Members Not Present: Delane Heldt, Louis Hochheiser, Liz Johnson, Greg Pawlson, Amit Popat, Jacob Reider, Greg Sharpe, Aldo Tinoco, Dana Alexander, Jason Colquitt, Michael Mirro, Lori Nichols, Christopher Snyder

NQF Staff: Floyd Eisenberg, Beth Franklin, Helen Imbernino, Rosemary Kennedy, Christina Mandzuk, Danielle Sims

Welcome – Floyd Eisenberg

Minutes Approval Date: 05/21/12

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome/Review Minutes from April 23rd Planning Committee Meeting
2. Review Summary Points from April 26th Breakout Sessions
3. Moving the eMeasure Learning Collaborative Forward
 - a. eMeasure Learning Collaborative Evaluation and Feedback
 - b. Aligning Content Objectives
 - c. Planned/Proposed Interactions
 - d. In-Person Meeting August 9th

Welcome/Review Minutes from April 23rd

Review Summary Points from April 26th Breakout Sessions (*refer to slides*)

1. Impressions and Suggestions of the April 26th In-Person Meeting:

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

- a. Great work having Dr. Mostashari and Kate Goodrich, MD, as keynote speakers. It was inspirational; having two leaders in the industry taking time out to speak reinforces that they take this work seriously. (Karen Nielson)
 - b. The Implementation *Acute* breakout session had a strong start. There was a lot of energy and a good mix of people including: vendors, measure developers and people from CMS, which facilitated great discussion. (Ginny Meadows)
 - c. Attendees spoke very highly of the event; Debbie Krauss from CMS was very complimentary of the discussion. (Zahid Butt)
 - d. During the recap of the sessions, overlap of breakout track themes became very apparent. The focus is a little different, but the amount of synergy needed among the topics of the breakout groups to make the ultimate product come together is really an interdependent process to make these eMeasures work. (Ted Palen)
 - e. There was not enough time to facilitate the summary and condense the discussion into four or five bullet points. This was also demonstrated during Dr. Griffin's presentation. More time would be needed to create something more substantive. (Zahid Butt, Floyd Eisenberg, Ted Palen)
2. HHS deliverables focused on: (Floyd Eisenberg)
 - a. Key Success Factors
 - b. Gaps
 - c. Recommendations
 3. The DRAFT Summary Findings document was compiled and sent out to the eMeasure Learning Collaborative Planning Committee on May, 8th, 2012. NQF staff identified three common themes from the breakout sessions at the In-Person Meeting: (Floyd Eisenberg)
 - a. Organizational Factors/Leadership
 - b. Learning Health System Environment
 - c. Data Capture/Workflow
 - i. Data availability
 - ii. Measure expression
 4. The DRAFT Summary Findings document includes goals from the Technical Breakout session, general concepts from the Innovation Breakout Session and points from Dr. Mostashari's presentation. Some of the goals from Technical were challenging; such as unique personal health identifier and others were easy such as transparency of performance of quality measures. (Floyd Eisenberg)
 5. The DRAFT Summary Findings document was nicely categorized; it captures what was said and discussed that day. (Dwight Brown, Zahid Butt)

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

- a. This is a great document for people who could not attend the meeting. It describes the gaps, along with what we currently can measure and what we would like to do with measurement; it is a roadmap of what steps we will need to take. (Jesse James)
- 6. Considerations for the August 9th In-Person Meeting and beyond:
 - a. Propose having the meeting start at noon, consolidate findings in the evening and reconvene the next morning. Have an afternoon and morning meeting to allow time to consolidate the content from the afternoon session, and also continue into a second day.
 - i. Current funding only permits for a one day in-person meeting. (Floyd Eisenberg)
 - b. One of the challenges in the breakout session was that many of the attendees did not work in the field. Is it possible for the August meeting to be moved to a new location to engage participants that work in the field? (Ginny Meadows, Karen Nielson)
 - i. Great idea – however, at this time it will not be possible to move the August 9th meeting to a new location. This has been noted for a future consideration. (Floyd Eisenberg)

Moving the eMeasure Learning Collaborative Forward

eMeasure Learning Collaborative Evaluation and Feedback (refer to slides)

- 1. On Thursday, May 3rd, NQF sent out an evaluation to all of the participants who attended the meeting; both web and in person. Response Rate as of 5/9/2012: (Christina Mandzuk)
 - a. Attended in-person: 24
 - b. Attended via Web: 6
 - c. Total completed evaluations: 27
 - d. Total respondents: 31
- 2. Satisfaction of 'Opening Session' speakers: (Christina Mandzuk)
 - a. Kate Goodrich, MD - 83.8% were 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' (26 respondents)
 - b. Farzad Mostashari, MD – 90.4% were 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' (28 respondents)
- 3. Evaluation Elements (Christina Mandzuk)
 - a. The breakout session achieved its stated objective – 82.8% 'strongly agree' or 'agree' (24 respondents)
 - b. The closing session report outs were effective – 70.0% 'strongly agree' or 'agree' (21 respondents)
 - c. The eMeasure Learning Collaborating meeting was effective in identifying:
 - i. Best practices – 74.0% 'strongly agree' or 'agree' (20 respondents)
 - ii. Gaps - 88.8% 'strongly agree' or 'agree' (24 respondents)

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

- iii. Recommendations – 77.7% ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ (21 respondents)
- 4. The evaluation will close on 5/9/12 and Christina is compiling all of the general comments from the evaluation. (Floyd Eisenberg)
- 5. The aforementioned preliminary statistics are a good indicator of the nation’s status regarding eMeasure Implementation. It is easy to identify the gaps; identifying best practices or recommendations is more challenging. (Dwight Brown, Zahid Butt, Floyd Eisenberg)
- 6. In the Clinical Data Analytics Breakout Session, the vignette speakers lead the discussion on best practices. One suggestion for the next meeting would be to bring in more “bright lights” to help facilitate the discussion and share best practices (other than vignette speakers). (Karen Nielson, Ted Palen)

Aligning Content Objectives (refer to slides)

- 1. Potential focal points for the next meeting:
 - a. Proposed meeting start time is noon, consolidate findings in the evening and reconvene the meeting the next morning. (Floyd Eisenberg)
 - b. How do the shared best practices maneuver around some of the gaps? Additional stakeholders are needed for this discussion; preferably the ground participants such as measure developers. (Floyd Eisenberg)
 - c. Data quality and availability to get the information that is required - The ability of the user to test that quality of the data is important; however education is still needed in this arena. (Jesse James)
 - d. How does one engage local organizations and providers in their own data governance? Some people only have an informative view, and are not part of the data governance. However, what is the appropriate venue to have this discussion? (Floyd Eisenberg and Kevin Larsen)
 - e. Focus on the knowledge that was collected from the April 26th In-Person Meeting and take that to the next level. Discussion boards could be an avenue to continue these conversations post August 9. (Zahid Butt, Floyd Eisenberg)
 - f. DRAFT a list of priorities and decide a meeting topic based off that. (Kevin Larson)
 - i. The meeting attracts a wide audience which makes it difficult to have a leveling conversation. There is a large variation in knowledge and capability, which can make it difficult to have a conversation that is at the right level. (Helen Imbernino)
 - ii. What do providers feel are appropriate ways to know that someone is your patient? Is a topic like this “too hot to handle” or would a discussion board be the right place to get the ball rolling? Identifying a strawman of

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

how things would look moving forward is one way to determine the appropriate avenue to have this conversation. (Floyd Eisenberg)

- iii. Attribution is a hot topic. What does sharing look like and what does it mean? Do we have a “wiki-world” where everyone can go make their own contributions or changes? Do we have measure developers make all the changes? Do we have a value set world? This may be a good place to start small, such as looking at the basics of data management, and expand from there. (Dwight Brown, Kevin Larsen)

Planned/Proposed Interactions (refer to slides)

1. The Planning Committee is anxious to know the structure of the August 9th In-Person Meeting. One topic of interest is whether or not the breakout track discussion will continue or disband. (Sharon Hibay)

June 14th Task 9.9 eMeasure Webinar – Proposed Outline (refer to slides)

Proposed Ideas

1. Under Task 9.9, NQF will be hosting an eMeasure webinar. We would like to align the webinar with the eMeasure Collaborative’s work. This webinar could host a series of ‘rapid fire’ presentations from attendants at the April 26 In-Person Meeting. These presenters could discuss the progress made between the 1st In-Person Meeting and the webinar regarding eMeasure implementation. Speakers can also indicate the next steps they plan to take. (Floyd Eisenberg, Dwight Brown)
 - a. Having speakers discuss best practices and share their progress in eMeasure implementation would address the need for the continuous sharing of gaps, best practices and recommendations based off experience. (Karen Nielsen)
2. Another idea is to have a vendor present on the work they are doing. Measure developers are interested in hearing the challenges from that perspective. (Floyd Eisenberg)
3. Contractors working on the retooled measures could speak on their current and future efforts. (Zahid Butt)
 - a. OFMQ
 - b. AMA
 - c. Abt
 - d. NCQA – they are starting work on Delta Measures

Action Items

1. Email Floyd with suggestions/ideas for June 14th webinar and August 9th In-Person Meeting – Planning Committee

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Next eMeasure Learning Collaborative Conference Call:

May 21st, from 2:00pm to 3:00pm ET

A calendar invite has been sent to the group with a **new** conference line and webinar link:

Dial-in #: **877-224-4655** Conference Code: **4533611326**

<http://nqf.commpartners.com/se/Rd/Mt.aspx?180947>

1. Parking Lot
None
2. Agenda Items for next Collaborative Planning Meeting:
 - a. June 14th Webinar: topic ideas and potential speakers
 - b. August 9th In-Person Meeting: topic ideas and potential speakers