All Standing Committee Meeting

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Friday, November 6, 2015

Agenda Items

- Welcome and Introductions
- Role of the Standing Committee
- NQF Processes
  - Restructuring Maintenance
  - Trial Approval Program
  - SDS Trial Period
- Feedback Loops
- Off-Cycle Activities
- Public and Member Comment
- Announcements/Next Steps

Role of the Standing Committee

Background

- In the past, NQF initiated the steering committee nominations process and seated new project-specific committees only when funding for a particular project had been secured
- Seating new committees with each project not only lengthened the project timeline, but also resulted in a loss of process continuity and consistency because committee membership changed—often quite substantially—over time.
- To address these weaknesses in the CDP, NQF began transitioning to the use of Standing Committees for CDPs in 2013 with the goal of seating a Standing Committee for each of the 22 topic areas.

Role of the Standing Committee
General Duties

- These Standing Committees oversee the various measure portfolios and:
  - oversees the evaluation of NQF's measure evaluation criteria
  - identifies gaps in the measurement portfolio
  - provides feedback on how the portfolio should evolve
  - serves on any ad hoc or expedited projects within designated topic areas.
- To date, thirteen of the twenty-two standing committees have been seated through recent projects.

NQF Consensus Development Process (CDP)

8 Steps for Measure Endorsement

- Call for nominations for Standing Committee
- Call for candidate standards
- Candidate consensus standards review
- Public and member comment
- NQF member voting
- Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) decision
- Board Ratification
- Appeals

NQF Processes

Refinements to Maintenance Process

Restructuring Maintenance Updates

FORMER STATE	REVISED STATE
IMPORTANCE TO MEASURE AND REPORT	
• Gap – opportunity for improvement, variation, quality of care across providers	**INCREASED EMPHASIS**: gap in care and variation
• Evidence – Quantity, quality, consistency • Established link for process measures with outcomes	**DECREASED EMPHASIS**: Require measure developer to attest to current evidence; Standing Committee to affirm there is no change in evidence
SCIENTIFIC ACCEPTABILITY OF MEASURE PROPERTIES	
• Require updated specifications	**NO CHANGE:** Require updated specifications
• Reliability • Validity (including risk adjustment)	**DECREASED EMPHASIS**: If prior testing is adequate, there is no need for additional testing at maintenance review, with certain exceptions (e.g., change in data source, level of analysis, or setting)
USABILITY AND USE	
• Use: used in accountability applications and public reporting • Usability: impact and unintended consequences	**INCREASED EMPHASIS:** Must greater focus on measure use and usefulness, including both impact and unintended consequences
FEASIBILITY	
• Measure feasible, including eMeasure feasibility	**NO CHANGE:** Implementation issues may be more prominent

Updates to Electronic Clinical Quality Measure (eCQM) Process

Review of eCQM Submission Process

- **Four different scenarios for eCQM Submission**
  - **De Novo** - Brand new eCQMs; must adhere to NQF's measure submission and testing process
  - **Re-specified eCQMs** – Current claims measures that are being re-specified into ecQMS; must adhere to NQF's measure submission and testing process
  - **Legacy eCQMs** – Current NQF endorsed measures being used in national quality improvement programs and are being respecified into eCQMs; can use BONNIE for testing
  - **Trial Approval** – Measures are submitted for consideration into the NQF Trial Approval Program

NQF Trial Approval Program

- Designed to encourage the development and use of innovative and needed quality measures without initially meeting the testing requirement.
- An eCQM accepted into this program can be put into the field for a period not to exceed three years and then can be considered for endorsement (assuming it passes testing during the time it is in the field).
- This is **not** time-limited endorsement as that was part of a process NQF piloted that expired at the beginning of this year.

Submission for the Trial Approval Program

- Measure must be submitted as a candidate for the Trial Approval Program
- Must meet all criteria under *Importance to Measure and Report*
- eMeasure Feasibility Assessment must be completed with results from a simulated (or test) data set to justify the results
- If accepted to the program, a plan for testing the measure must be included as part of the submission package
- Must present a plan for the future use of the measure and how it will be useful for accountability and improvement
- Any related or competing measures must be identified along with a plan for harmonization

Feedback Loops

FORMER STATE	REVISED STATE
IMPORTANCE TO MEASURE AND REPORT	
• Gap – opportunity for improvement, variation, quality of care across providers	**INCREASED EMPHASIS**: gap in care and variation
• Evidence – Quantity, quality, consistency • Established link for process measures with outcomes	**DECREASED EMPHASIS**: Require measure developer to attest to current evidence; Standing Committee to affirm there is no change in evidence
SCIENTIFIC ACCEPTABILITY OF MEASURE PROPERTIES	
• Require updated specifications	**NO CHANGE:** Require updated specifications
• Reliability • Validity (including risk adjustment)	**DECREASED EMPHASIS**: If prior testing is adequate, there is no need for additional testing at maintenance review, with certain exceptions (e.g., change in data source, level of analysis, or setting)
USABILITY AND USE	
• Use: used in accountability applications and public reporting • Usability: impact and unintended consequences	**INCREASED EMPHASIS:** Must greater focus on measure use and usefulness, including both impact and unintended consequences
FEASIBILITY	
• Measure feasible, including eMeasure feasibility	**NO CHANGE:** Implementation issues may be more prominent

SDS Trial Period

NQF SDS Trial Period

- SDS factors: Socio-demographic Status (SDS) refers to a variety of socioeconomic (e.g., income, education, occupation) and demographic factors (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, primary language)

- NQF will conduct a two-year trial of a temporary policy change that will allow inclusion of SDS factors in the risk-adjustment approach for performance measures.
  - Starting April 2015, any new measure submitted for possible endorsement or any endorsed measure that is undergoing maintenance review will be included in the SDS trial

Measure Evaluation

- NQF Standing Committees will examine each measure submitted to their project to determine if there is agreement with the risk-adjustment approach used by a measure developer.

- Where there is a potential conceptual basis for SDS adjustment, the Standing Committee will evaluate whether the developer assessed SDS factors according to the guidelines for selecting risk factors recognized by the NQF Expert Panel.

- In addition, the Standing Committee will consider the utility of the SDS factors that are available, the developer's analyses and interpretation regarding the importance of SDS factors in their risk adjustment model, and comparison of performance scores with and without SDS-adjustment.

Feedback Loops

Off Cycle Activities

Off-Cycle Activities

- What is considered “off-cycle”?
  - During the periods in which no measures are being reviewed, or the “off cycle”, Standing Committee activities that may occur outside a funded project’s scope.
  - In order to enable ongoing engagement of committee members throughout their two (or three) year terms, NQF will host quarterly, two-hour web meetings or conference calls for each Standing Committee during the off cycle timeframe.

Off-Cycle Activities

Potential Activities:

- Collaborative opportunities with developers, specialty societies, and implementers
- Ongoing updates on NQF policy/process
- Addressing and setting measurement priorities for topic area
- Reviewing current measurement landscape
- Follow–up from the Consensus Development Process
  - Deferred decisions
  - Directives from CSAC or Board of Directors
  - Related and competing measures/harmonization
- Ad hoc reviews
- Topic area consultation to other Committees

Opportunity for Public Comment

Announcements/ Next Steps

NQF Upcoming Projects and Submission Deadlines

Project	Nomination Close Date	Measure Submission Deadline
All Cause Admissions and Readmissions (Phase 2)	1/11/2016	1/29/2016
Cancer*	2/22/2016	3/11/2016
Cardiovascular (Phase 4)	4/11/2016	4/29/2016
Health and Well-being (Phase 3)	6/10/2016	6/30/2016
Neurology*	12/18/2015	1/15/2016
Palliative Care*	2/9/2016	2/29/2016
Patient Safety (Phase 3)	4/25/2016	5/13/2016
Perinatal*	1/26/2016	2/16/2016
Person-and Family-Centered Care (Phase 3)	3/11/2016	3/31/2016
Pulmonary/Critical Care*	11/20/2015	12/14/2015
Renal (Phase 2)	3/28/2016	4/15/2016
Surgery (Phase 3)	5/11/2016	5/31/2016

Resources

Standing Committee Guidebook 2.0

Next All Committee Meeting- *Early Spring 2016*

Should you have any questions, please contact measuremaintenance@qualityforum.org.

Thank you for joining!