



Building a Roadmap from Patient-Reported Outcome Measures to Patient-Reported Outcome Performance Measures Web Meeting 8

The National Quality Forum (NQF) convened a public web meeting for the Building a Roadmap From Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) to Patient-Reported Outcome Performance Measures (PRO-PMs) Technical Expert Panel (TEP) on September 29, 2021.

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Web Meeting Objectives

Chuck Amos, NQF Director, welcomed TEP members and other participants to the web meeting. Co-Chair Dr. Sam Simon made a brief opening remark to welcome meeting participants. Mr. Amos reviewed the housekeeping reminders, introduced the NQF project team, reviewed the meeting agenda, and provided a project update. Jhamiel Prince, NQF Analyst, conducted attendance of the TEP members and Mr. Amos conducted attendance of the Federal Liaisons, as well as recognized members of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) in attendance.

Recap of Web Meeting 7

Mr. Amos provided a brief recap of Web Meeting 7, held on August 3rd, 2021. During Web Meeting 7, the project team obtained TEP input on Draft 1 of the Technical Guidance, discussed shifting away from a sequential description of the process in favor of stages and tasks, identified TEP members to assist with offline work, and gained feedback that led to significant revisions of Draft 2 of the Technical Guidance.

Review Public Comments Received on Technical Guidance Report

Mr. Amos presented the public comments received on the Technical Guidance Report. NQF posted the report on the project webpage for public and NQF member comment from September 3, 2021, through September 24, 2021. Comments were elicited through the public commenting tool and through additional organizational and external outreach. During the commenting period, NQF received eight comments from four organizations. At the end of the commenting period, NQF categorized the comments into the following themes:

- Appropriate balance of high-level guidance with detailed information
- Critical points for stakeholder advisory engagement
- Emerging and unforeseen changes to digital measurement
- Suggestions for additional content on digital measurement, including
 - Calculations of measures
 - Data sharing
 - Interoperability

Appropriate balance of high-level guidance with detailed information

Mr. Amos informed the TEP that the project team has already identified and implemented improvements to the report, such as linking to the CMS Blueprint and referencing key NQF documents,

such as the Measure Evaluation Criteria, earlier in the document. Mr. Amos solicited TEP feedback on whether the report struck the right balance of high-level guidance for new measure developers and if not, what areas need to be further addressed. Co-Chair Dr. Cathy MacLean stated that she believes the report has the right balance and opened the discussion for other members of the TEP to provide their recommendations. An analogy of “building a plane while flying it” was repeatedly mentioned in the meeting as the TEP considered whether the report contained the proper balance of guidance on digital measure development, given that digital measure development is a growing field that is not entirely standardized yet. Some recommendations from the TEP included mentioning that a digital PRO-PM should not require any manual abstraction of information from the patient chart, the importance of reference codes, and the need to make the measure EHR agnostic. The TEP expressed concern that the report requires additional detail in order to be useful to the measure development community, and Mr. Amos informed the TEP that discussions with CMS about the second year of work on the project are ongoing, and if awarded, the second year will largely focus on digital measurement.

Critical points for stakeholder advisory engagement

Mr. Amos stated that critical stakeholder advisors play an important role in ensuring that the measures developed are meaningful to patients, caregivers, and the broader community. The advisors consist of patient and caregiver perspectives, clinicians, payers, along other stakeholders that actively ensure the measures can lead to optimal health outcomes. The TEP discussed the critical stakeholder points for engagement and acknowledged that while the patient voice is important the aim of PRO-PM is to assess the performance of the entities at the organization level. Various TEP members expressed that one purpose of providing PRO-PM information to patients, caregivers, and consumers is to enable them to make an informed decision on whether they want to seek care at a specific facility. The TEP members discussed that the ideal state is for information to be shared in a way that is understandable for patients, and that informs them on the quality that a provider or entity can provide to them. The TEP did not identify specific points on when stakeholder involvement is critical to PRO-PM development, so the report will continue to advise measure developers to engage stakeholder advisory group(s) throughout the development life cycle.

Emerging and unforeseen changes to digital measurement

The TEP members stated that while challenges exist in the digital measure space there are opportunities to provide guidance and overcome them. Professionals in the digital quality measurement field would benefit from more inclusion and discussion of challenges specific to PRO-PM’s being collected in a digital and interoperable environment. The TEP reiterated that providing guidance on a good future state of digital measurement would be beneficial.

Suggestions for additional content on digital measurement

TEP members discussed that the report should include a layout of specifications that can help inform developers when considering digital measures. The TEP members reiterated that the digital component should be addressed, and while there are not many digital measures the report can highlight considerations or existing digital measures. Mr. Amos noted that due to time constraints the report will not cover digital measures extensively, but this can be a focus during the Option Year portion of this work.

Discuss Proposed Improvements to the Technical Guidance Report

Mr. Amos provided an overview of the proposed improvements to the Technical Guidance. The report will further put emphasis on available resources to help build on existing measurement information and avoid duplicating existing work. The resources will be introduced in an early section of the report and

include links to the NQF Measure Developer Guidebook, Measure Evaluation Criteria, and the CMS Measures Management System Blueprint. Mr. Amos shared that the order of the field test stage will be moved from stage 4 to stage 3, and stage 3 and will include additional tasks that should be addressed in the development of the PRO-PM, including:

- Develop of a test plan
- Identify test sites
- Conduct alpha testing
- Conduct beta testing

Mr. Amos highlighted that the additional tasks will provide guidance to those developing a test plan and include considerations when identifying the test sites, in alignment to the information outlined in the Blueprint.

Mr. Amos noted that the report would not reflect a consensus of the TEP on whether PRO-PMs should ideally use data from one PROM or from multiple different PROMs, and that the report would reflect language from the Environmental Scan, that identified advantages of both approaches. TEP members briefly discussed the benefits of using one PROM compared to the ability to collect data from multiple different PROMs, conflicting ideas and opinions emerged. The TEP discussed examples of a knee replacement PRO-PM that uses a crosswalk to accept scores from two different PROMs. TEP members stated that while the environmental scan shared the implications of using more than one PROM, the report should communicate the additional development steps that are needed to justify the creation of a measure that incorporates multiple PROMs (e.g., development of a crosswalk to ensure scores from different PROMs are normalized for the PRO-PM) as an important development consideration. The TEP reflected different positions on how many PROMs should be used and did acknowledge the importance of treating each PRO-PM uniquely.

Following the discussion, the TEP did not object to incorporate the proposed improvements to the final technical guidance report.

Public Comment

Mr. Amos opened the meeting for public comments, no comments were received.

Next Steps

Evelyn Thomas, Senior Analyst, informed the TEP that the Technical Guidance Report will be published on November 30 and the project team will provide further details about the Option Year of the project.

Adjourn

Mr. Amos thanked the TEP, CMS, and NQF staff as the meeting adjourned.