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

Restructuring Maintenance Updates Criteria #2: Scientific Acceptability

Сι	urrent State	Future State
•	Measure specifications	NO CHANGE: Require updated
		specifications
•	Reliability	DECREASED EMPHASIS: If prior
•	Validity (including risk-adjustment)	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 	INCREASED EMPHASIS : Much greater focus on measure use and		
 Usability: impact and unintended consequences 	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

1.1.1. A.	50	earch Q У in
IOITAN		
QUALIT	TY FORUM	
		About Us News NQF Work *
Setting Priorities	Measuring Performance Topics News & Resources	Events Membership
Measuring Performance	+ / - Text Size Print Email Share	Related Information
ABCs of Measurement		Electronic Quality Measures
Consensus Development	Submitting Standards	
Process		Health Information Technology
NQF Projects	Performance Measures	Measure Submission Help
Submitting Standards	NQF endorses performance measures as voluntary consensus standards. Interested stewards	Patient-Reported Outcomes
Measure Maintenance NQF-Endorsed® Standards	and/or developers of performance measures may submit their candidate standards for consideration by NQF.	
Improving NQF's Processes	Online Measure Submission	NQF Resources
Prioritizing Measures	To submit a performance measure, a steward must complete and electronically submit the	
	online measure submission form for each measure they wish to submit to NQF for consideration.	The Field Guide is an online resource designed to help you easily access NQF resources.
	NQF is using an online Measure Submission Form, Version 6.5. The online submission form includes a variety of features and allows the user to:	Access the Field Guide NQF Glossary (PDF)
	Gain secure access to the submission form from any location with an internet	Standing Committee Policy (PDF)
	 connection; Save a draft version of the form and return to complete it at his or her convenience; 	 Standing Committee Guidebook (PDF)
	and Print a hard copy of the submission form for reference. 	Developer Guidebook (PDF)
	To review the questions included in the measure submission form, the evidence attachment and/or the testing attachment, templates of the online forms are available below:	
	NQF Measure Submission Form (DOCX)	Measure Inventory Pipeline
	NQF Evidence Attachment (DOCX) NQF Testing Attachment (DOCX)	Entre NOTI - La
	View the Measure Submission Form Demonstration	Explore NQF's new virtual space and learn about current and
	If the performance measure to be submitted is not owned by a government entity, the steward must also complete and submit a Measure Steward Agreement (PDF).	planned measure development activities. Access the Measure Pipeline
	If a current measure stewards wishes to add new measures to their existing measure steward agreement, they must complete and submit a Measure Steward Agreement Addendum (PDF).	
	Call for Measures	Downloads
	In advance of most consensus development projects, NQF issues a formal call for candidate	Measure Evaluation Criteria:
	standards, customarily, performance measures. The online submission form can be accessed from the project page with the call for measures.	Access the 2015 Measure
		Evaluation Criteria and

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 <u>specific</u> 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 <u>NQF measure</u> <u>endorsement criteria</u>.
- 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? <u>-eMeasure Review</u>

- 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? <u>-eMeasure Review</u>

- 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	Торіс	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 <u>measuremaintenance@qualityforum.org</u>.