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• Introductions and Context

• Measure Inventory
  ➢ Construction of measure inventory
  ➢ Deep Dive
  ➢ Lessons Learned

• Discussion with Expert Panel

• Questions
Context for APCD Measurement Project

APCD Council http://www.apcducouncil.org/state/map
Measure Inventory Overview

• Overall goal of measure inventory: provide useful and useable inventory of measures that can be derived from APCDs

• Overall inventory:
  ➢ 384 measures

• More extensive “deep dive” on high priority topics of diabetes, mental health, and medication usage:
  ➢ 19 measures
Use Cases

• Different audiences
  ➢ Policymakers
  ➢ Consumers
  ➢ Payers
  ➢ Providers

• Relevant measures may vary by use case
  ➢ Use case may be condition-specific
  ➢ May want different types of measures (quality, utilization, cost (out of pocket costs vs. reimbursements vs. charges))
Use Cases

• Population health and policy: assess population health care delivery and outcomes
  ➢ Example measure types: total cost of care for state residents, medication use, disease-specific outcomes, quality variations
Use Cases

• Choice: consumer or purchaser decisions
  ➢ Examples: price and quality measures for consumer transparency

http://www.cahealthcompare.org/search.jsp
Use Cases

• Negotiation: measures used by payers for hospitals or medical group negotiation
Measure Inventory Selection Process

Initial measure inventory N=1536

• Sources: literature review and environmental scan

After exclusions for lack of feasibility N=1295

• Review done by team members, with approximately 75 measures reviewed by all team members to gauge inter-rater reliability

After exclusions for inpatient measures N=1024

• Review done by team members

Measures addressing high priority conditions N=684

• High priority conditions chosen

After exclusion of duplicate or non-claims-based measures N=384
Measure Prioritization Criteria

- Two types of measures in the inventory: cross-cutting (non-condition-specific) and condition-specific
- Focus on ambulatory or cross-setting measures (inpatient and outpatient episodes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Prioritization Criteria According to Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policymakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High morbidity and mortality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deep Dive

- Step 1: ID high priority condition of interest
- Step 2: ID use case
- Step 3: Look for measure suites that are relevant to use case
- Step 4: Evaluate measures specs for appropriateness to use case
Deep Dive

• BRIEF MEASURE INVENTORY WALK-THROUGH TO FIND A MEASURE SUITE
Criteria to Consider in Measure Selection

• Important—high burden condition
• Focus on cost, quality, or utilization
• Availability of measure definitions & specifications
• NQF endorsement
• Use in federal programs
Criteria to Consider in Measure Selection

• Scientific acceptability
  - Tested at the level of measurement of interest (health plan, hospital, medical group)
  - Validity—demonstrated relationship with an outcome, or has high face validity

• For Consumer measures: a shoppable condition (predictable, non-urgent, subject to deductibles)
Lessons Learned from Deep Dive

• Measure specifications are key to determining measure relevance and feasibility

• Choosing a measure suite is iterative process

• Sometimes organizations modify measures to fit specific use cases
  ➢ e.g., stratification by age, gender, region
  ➢ However, modified measures may not have been tested for validity and reliability
Lessons Learned Overall

• Large number of measures exist that can be used with APCDs and are being used in different contexts.

• Only a few measures have been rigorously tested and not in every context

• Measure suites can be put together to address the Triple Aim, but currently limited in number

• APCDs may not yet be able to meet the needs of all use cases – e.g., consumer use case
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