Measure Developer Webinar

Monday, September 28, 2015

Agenda Items

- **Welcome and Introductions**

- **Announcements**
  - Map 2015-2016 Pre-Rulemaking Activities
  - NQF New Projects
  - Restructuring Maintenance Updates
  - NQF Maintenance Webpage Updates
  - Intended Use TEP Updates

- **Educational Session**
  - What Happens After Measure Submission?

- **Q & A**

- **Next Steps**

Announcements: MAP 2015-2016 Pre-Rulemaking

2015-2016 Measure Partnership Applications (MAP) Pre-Rulemaking Activities

Fall Web Meetings

- Clinician Workgroup - **October 8, 11:00-1:00pm EST**

- Hospital Workgroup - **October 13, 12:00-2:00pm EST**

- PAC/LTC Workgroup - **October 16, 1:00-3:00pm EST**

- All MAP Web Meeting - **November 13, 2:00-4:00pm EST**

- Dual Eligible Beneficiaries Workgroup – **January 13, 11:00-1:00pm EST**
  - *Reviews recommendations from other groups and provide cross-cutting input during the second round of public comment*

In-Person Meetings

- Clinician Workgroup - **December 9-10**

- PAC/LTC Workgroup - **December 14-15**

- Hospital Workgroup - **December 16-17**

- Coordinating Committee- **January 26-27**

Announcements: NQF New Projects

NQF New Projects and Submission Deadlines

Project	Project Start	Measure Submission Deadline
All Cause Admissions and Readmissions (Phase 2)	10/9/2015	1/29/2016
Cancer	10/16/2015	3/11/2016
Cardiovascular (Phase 4)	10/23/2015	4/29/2016
Health and Well-being (Phase 3)	10/23/2015	6/30/2016
Neurology	10/9/2015	1/15/2016
Palliative Care	10/16/2015	2/29/2016
Patient Safety (Phase 3)	10/23/2015	5/13/2016
Perinatal	10/16/2015	2/16/2016
Person-and Family-Centered Care (Phase 3)	10/16/2015	3/31/2016
Pulmonary/Critical Care	10/9/2015	12/14/2015
Renal (Phase 2)	10/23/2015	4/15/2016
Surgery (Phase 3)	10/23/2015	5/31/2016

Announcements: Restructuring Maintenance Updates

Restructuring Maintenance Updates
Criteria #1: Importance to measure and report

Current State	Future State
• Evidence – Quantity, quality, consistency (QQC) • Established link for process measures with outcomes	**DECREASED EMPHASIS**: Require measure developer to attest to current evidence; Standing Committee to affirm no change in evidence
• Gap – opportunity for improvement, variation, quality of care across providers	**INCREASED EMPHASIS**: current performance, gap in care and variation

Restructuring Maintenance Updates
Criteria #2: Scientific Acceptability

Current State	Future State
• Measure specifications	NO CHANGE: Require updated specifications
• Reliability • Validity (including risk-adjustment)	**DECREASED EMPHASIS**: If prior testing adequate, no need for additional testing at maintenance with certain exceptions (e.g., change in data source, level of analysis, or setting) Must address the questions for SDS Trial Period

Restructuring Maintenance Updates
Criteria #3-4: Feasibility and Usability and Use

Current State	Future State
Feasibility	
• Measure feasible, including eMeasure feasibility	NO CHANGE: Implementation issues may be more prominent
Usability and Use	
• Use: used in accountability applications and public reporting • Usability: impact and unintended consequences	**INCREASED EMPHASIS**: Much greater focus on measure use and usefulness, including both impact and unintended consequences

Restructuring Maintenance Updates:
Maintenance Checklist for Maintenance Measures

- ## Maintenance Checklist Link (walkthrough)

Announcements: NQF Maintenance Webpage Updates

NQF Maintenance Webpage Updates

NQF Maintenance Webpage Updates

Announcements: Intended Use TEP Updates

Introduction

- NQF strives to continuously improve its processes to reflect the changing needs of the American healthcare system.

- Over the past several years, stakeholder groups have questioned whether endorsement should consider the specific intended or actual use(s) of a measure in its evaluation (e.g., in particular federal quality programs), and more broadly, whether the specific use of a measure should be included in the NQF measure endorsement criteria.

- This effort by the NQF Intended Use Advisory Panel seeks to consider the merit of and the various approaches to considering a measure's specific intended or actual use(s) as part of the measure endorsement process.

Background – Consensus Taskforce

In 2012, NQF's Board of Directors (BoD) empaneled a Consensus Task Force (CTF) that recommended that this Advisory Panel consider two potential new directions:

- **Endorsement of measures for a specific intended or actual use(s)**. Consider endorsement for specific purposes (e.g., internal quality improvement, public reporting, payment), with consideration that measures may not be suitable for all potential uses..

- **Levels of endorsement by measure grading** (independent of use): Levels of endorsement would allow NQF to apply the same criteria to all measures, but to grade endorsed measures differently.

Intended Use Advisory Panel Charge

The Charge of this Panel was to:

- Discuss several critical topic areas, including identifying various use cases for NQF-endorsed measures, distinguishing among the use cases, and identifying the need, if any, for different measure attributes, depending on the specific intended or actual measure use(s);

- Examine if the NQF measure endorsement criteria requires updating;

- Propose a path forward on whether, and if so, how, to incorporate the specific use of measures in the endorsement process.

Request for Comment

Comment is open through September 30, 6:00pm

- The Advisory Panel seeks public comment on the key themes and the recommendations that emerged from its deliberations of the charge outlined by the NQF Board.

- The Panel will consider these comments during an upcoming comment call on October 20, 2015. Following this call, the recommendations will be finalized and presented to the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) and the NQF Board.

Educational Session: What happens after measure submission?

What happens after measure submission? Measure Submission Ends

- NQF staff reviews measures submitted to the project

- Confirm with developers that their measure submissions have been received along with next steps

- Confirm MSA/MSA Addendums are executed by measure steward and NQF General Council

  - **For first time submissions to NQF**
    - » MSA and MSA Addendum

  - **For measure developers with existing MSA:**
    - » MSA Addendum (if submitting new measures)

  - **Measures can not be evaluated by NQF until the MSA is fully executed**

What happens after measure submission?

- NQF staff reviews submission for completeness
- NQF solicits pre-meeting Member and public comments
- NQF staff prepares a preliminary analysis to assist the Committee
- Measure Worksheet Packets
  - » Staff Preliminary Analysis (include eMeasure review if required), pre-meeting public and member comments, and Committee's preliminary survey comments
  - ▫ Supporting submission materials
    - » ICD-9 and ICD-10 code data dictionaries, HQMF specifications, appendices, etc.
- Measure Document Sets are posted on Standing Committee's SharePoint page and are forwarded to developers.
- Hold Standing Committee Pre-Meeting Webinars
  - ▫ New Projects: Orientation Webinar, Q&A Webinars, Workgroup Webinars
  - ▫ Phased Projects: Measure Q&A Webinars

What happens after measure submission? -eMeasure Review

- We review to ensure that the Simple XML, the Health Quality Measure Format (HQMF) XML, the Human Readable eMeasure Format and the Value Set Excel Spreadsheet are included in the submission

- We make sure that the developer used Version 2.0 of the HQMF (the most current version)

- We ensure each of these documents are complete

- We check to make sure the eMeasure Feasibility Scorecard, the Measure Information Form and the Measure Testing Attachment are include with the submission

What happens after measure submission? -eMeasure Review

- We break out the Measure Description, the Measure Rationale, the Numerator/Denominator/Exceptions/and Exclusions from the Human Readable Format.

- We make sure there is consistency between the data elements in the eMeasure logic are in the measure specification

- We check that each of the Value Sets are published in the Value Set Authority Center (VSAC). If they are not, then the disposition of the value sets needs to be documented.

- We look for detail on the Feasibility Scorecard, including: data availability, data accuracy, data standards, workflows, and what types of EHRs were used in the testing itself (unless this is a measure being considered for trial use).

Q&A

NQF-Battelle Joint Webinar Series

Month	Topic	Organizer	Meeting Date
September 2015	Blueprint 101-Introduction to MMS	Battelle MMS	9/24/2015
October 2015	NQF Evidence Criteria including: Systematic Review (Algorithm), Guidelines, and Opportunities for Improvement	NQF	10/19/2015
November 2015	Blueprint 101-Measure Conceptualization	Battelle MMS	11/24/2015
December 2015	MUC Update	Battelle MMS	12/22/2015
January 2016	Harmonization Related and Competing Measures	NQF	1/18/2016
February 2016	Measure Inventory	Battelle MMS	2/25/2016
March 2016	Blueprint 101-Measure Specification	Battelle MMS	3/24/2016
April 2016	eMeasures	NQF	4/18/2016
May 2016	Environmental Scans	Battelle MMS	5/26/2016
June 2016	Blueprint 101-Measure Testing	Battelle MMS	6/23/2016
July 2016	Reliability and Validity Testing	NQF	7/18/2016

Next Steps

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