



Measure Information

This document contains the information submitted by measure developers/stewards, but is organized according to NQF's measure evaluation criteria and process. The item numbers refer to those in the submission form but may be in a slightly different order here. In general, the item numbers also reference the related criteria (e.g., item 1b.1 relates to subcriterion 1b).

Brief Measure Information

NQF #: 0221

Corresponding Measures:

De.2. Measure Title: Needle biopsy to establish diagnosis of cancer precedes surgical excision/resection

Co.1.1. Measure Steward: Commission on Cancer, American College of Surgeons

De.3. Brief Description of Measure: Percentage of patients presenting with AJCC Stage Group 0, I, II, or III disease, who undergo a needle biopsy to establish diagnosis of breast cancer.

1b.1. Developer Rationale: Improve the utilization of needle biopsy prior to surgery for breast cancer with resultant decreased morbidity and increased cost effectiveness, and patient satisfaction

S.4. Numerator Statement: Patients who receive image or palpation-guided needle biopsy (core or FNA) for the diagnosis of breast cancer.

S.7. Denominator Statement: Women with AJCC Stage 0, I, II, or II breast cancer undergoing surgery:

- Women
- Age ≥ 18 at time of diagnosis
- Primary tumors of the breast
- Epithelial invasive malignancy only
- Diagnosis and all or part of first course of treatment performed at the reporting facility

S.10. Denominator Exclusions: Exclusions:

Men; not a first or only cancer diagnosis; non-epithelial tumors; metastatic disease (AJCC Stage IV); phyllodes tumor histology (9020);

Patient refused biopsy,

Patient medically unable to hold position for image guided biopsy,

Patient requires sub-areolar excision for nipple discharge,

Lesion too superficial,

Breast too small,

Lesion inaccessible by needle biopsy,

Cancer found in prophylactic mastectomy,

Benign high risk lesion diagnosed by needle biopsy, requiring excisional biopsy

Discordant biopsy results compared to suspicious imaging

De.1. Measure Type: Process

S.23. Data Source: Paper Medical Records, Registry Data

S.26. Level of Analysis: Facility

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Mar 01, 2007 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Oct 22, 2012

IF this measure is included in a composite, NQF Composite#/title:

IF this measure is paired/grouped, NQF#/title:

De.4. IF PAIRED/GROUPED, what is the reason this measure must be reported with other measures to appropriately interpret results?

1. Evidence, Performance Gap, Priority – Importance to Measure and Report

Extent to which the specific measure focus is evidence-based, important to making significant gains in healthcare quality, and improving health outcomes for a specific high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall less-than-optimal performance. **Measures must be judged to meet all subcriteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form

[0221_Evidence_MSF5.0_Data.doc](#)

1b. Performance Gap

Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating:

- considerable variation, or overall less-than-optimal performance, in the quality of care across providers; and/or
- disparities in care across population groups.

1b.1. Briefly explain the rationale for this measure (e.g., the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)

Improve the utilization of needle biopsy prior to surgery for breast cancer with resultant decreased morbidity and increased cost effectiveness, and patient satisfaction

1b.2. Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis. (This is required for endorsement maintenance. Include mean, std dev, min, max, interquartile range, scores by decile. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included). This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.

There are several studies documenting variation in utilization of needle biopsy based on age, race/ethnicity, provider specialty training and practice context as well as geographic region

1b.3. If no or limited performance data on the measure as specified is reported in 1b2, then provide a summary of data from the literature that indicates opportunity for improvement or overall less than optimal performance on the specific focus of measurement.

1. Williams RT, Yao KT, Stewart AK et al. Needle versus excisional biopsy for noninvasive and invasive breast cancer, report from the National Cancer Data Base 2003-2008. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2011;18(13):3802-10. 2. Friese CR, Neville BA, Edge SB et al. Breast biopsy patterns and outcomes in Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results-Medicare data. *Cancer* 2009;115(4):716-24. 3. Holloway CM, Saskin R, Paszat L. Geographic variation and physician specialization in the use of percutaneous biopsy for breast cancer diagnosis. *Can J Surg* 2008;51(6):453-63. 4. Clarke-Pearson EM, Jacobson AF, Boolbol SK et al. Quality assurance initiative at one institution for minimally invasive breast biopsies as the initial diagnostic technique. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009;208(1):75-8.

1b.4. Provide disparities data from the measure as specified (current and over time) by population group, e.g., by race/ethnicity, gender, age, insurance status, socioeconomic status, and/or disability. (This is required for endorsement maintenance. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities include.) This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.

Data demonstrate variation based on age, race/ethnicity, geography, and provider factors

1b.5. If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations.

See 1b.3

1c. High Priority (previously referred to as High Impact)

The measure addresses:

- a specific national health goal/priority identified by DHHS or the National Priorities Partnership convened by NQF; OR
- a demonstrated high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare (e.g., affects large numbers of patients and/or has a substantial impact for a smaller population; leading cause of morbidity/mortality; high resource use (current and/or future); severity of illness; and severity of patient/societal consequences of poor quality).

1c.1. Demonstrated high priority aspect of healthcare

Affects large numbers, Frequently performed procedure, Patient/societal consequences of poor quality

1c.2. If Other:

1c.3. Provide epidemiologic or resource use data that demonstrates the measure addresses a high priority aspect of healthcare.

List citations in 1c.4.

Multiple studies have demonstrated similar accuracy of needle biopsy as open surgical biopsy in the diagnosis of breast lesions, with lower complication rates. Furthermore, women with breast cancer diagnosed by needle biopsy are more likely to be treated with a single surgical procedure, even after excluding the initial surgical biopsy procedure. This decreases morbidity and increases cost effectiveness and patient satisfaction. Recognizing this impact on the optimal care of the breast cancer patient, needle biopsy is the preferred initial diagnostic method endorsed by the National Cancer Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN), Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), National Accreditation Program for Breast Centers (NAPBC), and the American Society of Breast Surgeons (ASBS).

1c.4. Citations for data demonstrating high priority provided in 1a.3

1. Bruening W, Fontanarosa J, Tipton K et al. Systematic review: comparative effectiveness of core-needle and open surgical biopsy to diagnose breast lesions. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152(4):238-46. 2. Golub RM, Bennett CL, Stinson T et al. Cost minimization study of image-guided core biopsy versus surgical excisional biopsy for women with abnormal mammograms. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22(12):2430-7. 3. Silverstein MJ, Recht A, Lagois MD et al. Image detected breast cancer: State-of-the-art diagnosis and treatment. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009;209:504-19.

1c.5. If a PRO-PM (e.g. HRQoL/functional status, symptom/burden, experience with care, health-related behaviors), provide evidence that the target population values the measured PRO and finds it meaningful. (Describe how and from whom their input was obtained.)

2. Reliability and Validity—Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties

Extent to which the measure, as specified, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. ***Measures must be judged to meet the subcriteria for both reliability and validity to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.***

2a.1. Specifications The measure is well defined and precisely specified so it can be implemented consistently within and across organizations and allows for comparability. eMeasures should be specified in the Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF) and the Quality Data Model (QDM).

De.5. Subject/Topic Area (check all the areas that apply):

Cancer, Cancer : Breast

De.6. Non-Condition Specific (check all the areas that apply):

Care Coordination, Disparities Sensitive

S.1. Measure-specific Web Page (Provide a URL link to a web page specific for this measure that contains current detailed specifications including code lists, risk model details, and supplemental materials. Do not enter a URL linking to a home page or to general information.)

<https://www.facs.org/quality-programs/cancer/ncdb/qualitymeasures>

S.2a. If this is an eMeasure, HQMF specifications must be attached. Attach the zipped output from the eMeasure authoring tool (MAT) - if the MAT was not used, contact staff. (Use the specification fields in this online form for the plain-language description of the specifications)

Attachment:

S.2b. Data Dictionary, Code Table, or Value Sets (and risk model codes and coefficients when applicable) must be attached. (Excel or csv file in the suggested format preferred - if not, contact staff)

Attachment:

S.3. For endorsement maintenance, please briefly describe any changes to the measure specifications since last endorsement date and explain the reasons.

The title of this measure has been changed from: Image or palpation guided biopsy (core or FNA)

S.4. Numerator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the measure focus or what is being measured about the target population, i.e., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome)

IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.

Patients who receive image or palpation-guided needle biopsy (core or FNA) for the diagnosis of breast cancer.

S.5. Time Period for Data (What is the time period in which data will be aggregated for the measure, e.g., 12 mo, 3 years, look back to August for flu vaccination? Note if there are different time periods for the numerator and denominator.)

S.6. Numerator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the observed outcome is identified/counted. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.

Surgical Diagnostic And Staging and Procedure [NAACCR Item#1350]=2-A biopsy (incisional, needle or aspiration) was done to the primary site

S.7. Denominator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)

Women with AJCC Stage 0, I, II, or III breast cancer undergoing surgery:

- Women
- Age >=18 at time of diagnosis
- Primary tumors of the breast
- Epithelial invasive malignancy only
- Diagnosis and all or part of first course of treatment performed at the reporting facility

S.8. Target Population Category (Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):

Elderly

S.9. Denominator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

Sex [NAACCR Item#220]=2; Pathologic Stage Group [NAACCR Item#910] = IA, IB, IIA, IIB, IIIA, IIIB or IIIC, AND Behavior {NAACCR Item#523} = 2,3

S.10. Denominator Exclusions (Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)

Exclusions:

Men; not a first or only cancer diagnosis; non-epithelial tumors; metastatic disease (AJCC Stage IV); phyllodes tumor histology (9020);

Patient refused biopsy,

Patient medically unable to hold position for image guided biopsy,

Patient requires sub-areolar excision for nipple discharge,

Lesion too superficial,

Breast too small,

Lesion inaccessible by needle biopsy,

Cancer found in prophylactic mastectomy,

Benign high risk lesion diagnosed by needle biopsy, requiring excisional biopsy

Discordant biopsy results compared to suspicious imaging

S.11. Denominator Exclusion Details (All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

See: <https://www.facs.org/~media/files/quality%20programs/cancer/quality%20breast.ashx>

S.12. Stratification Details/Variables (All information required to stratify the measure results including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format with at S.2b)

No stratification applied

S.13. Risk Adjustment Type (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in S.12 and for statistical model in S.14-15)

No risk adjustment or risk stratification

If other:

S.14. Identify the statistical risk model method and variables (Name the statistical method - e.g., logistic regression and list all the risk factor variables. Note - risk model development and testing should be addressed with measure testing under Scientific Acceptability)

S.15. Detailed risk model specifications (must be in attached data dictionary/code list Excel or csv file. Also indicate if available at measure-specific URL identified in S.1.)

Note: Risk model details (including coefficients, equations, codes with descriptors, definitions), should be provided on a separate worksheet in the suggested format in the Excel or csv file with data dictionary/code lists at S.2b.

S.15a. Detailed risk model specifications (if not provided in excel or csv file at S.2b)

S.16. Type of score:

Rate/proportion

If other:

S.17. Interpretation of Score (Classifies interpretation of score according to whether better quality is associated with a higher score, a lower score, a score falling within a defined interval, or a passing score)

Better quality = Higher score

S.18. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic (Describe the calculation of the measure score as an ordered sequence of steps including identifying the target population; exclusions; cases meeting the target process, condition, event, or outcome; aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)

See: <https://www.facs.org/~media/files/quality%20programs/cancer/quality%20breast.ashx>

S.19. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic Diagram URL or Attachment (You also may provide a diagram of the Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic described above at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)

URL

S.20. Sampling (If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)

IF a PRO-PM, identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.

S.21. Survey/Patient-reported data (If measure is based on a survey, provide instructions for conducting the survey and guidance on minimum response rate.)

IF a PRO-PM, specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.

S.22. Missing data (specify how missing data are handled, e.g., imputation, delete case.)

Required for Composites and PRO-PMs.

S.23. Data Source (Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).

If other, please describe in S.24.

[Paper Medical Records, Registry Data](#)

S.24. Data Source or Collection Instrument (Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.)

IF a PRO-PM, identify the specific PROM(s); and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.

[Hospital cancer registry data, reported to the American College of Surgeons, Commission on Cancer, National Cancer Data Base](#)

S.25. Data Source or Collection Instrument (available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)

[URL](#)

S.26. Level of Analysis (Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

[Facility](#)

S.27. Care Setting (Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

[Inpatient/Hospital](#)

If other:

S.28. COMPOSITE Performance Measure - Additional Specifications (Use this section as needed for aggregation and weighting rules, or calculation of individual performance measures if not individually endorsed.)

2a. Reliability – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

2b. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

[0221_MeasureTesting_MS5.0_Data.doc](#)

3. Feasibility

Extent to which the specifications including measure logic, require data that are readily available or could be captured without undue burden and can be implemented for performance measurement.

3a. Byproduct of Care Processes

For clinical measures, the required data elements are routinely generated and used during care delivery (e.g., blood pressure, lab test, diagnosis, medication order).

3a.1. Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes.

[Abstracted from a record by someone other than person obtaining original information \(e.g., chart abstraction for quality measure or registry\)](#)

If other:

3b. Electronic Sources

The required data elements are available in electronic health records or other electronic sources. If the required data are not in electronic health records or existing electronic sources, a credible, near-term path to electronic collection is specified.

3b.1. To what extent are the specified data elements available electronically in defined fields? (i.e., data elements that are needed to compute the performance measure score are in defined, computer-readable fields)

[Some data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources](#)

3b.2. If ALL the data elements needed to compute the performance measure score are not from electronic sources, specify a credible, near-term path to electronic capture, OR provide a rationale for using other than electronic sources.

[The ACoS/CoC implementation of this measure is framed around the feasibility of data collection and reporting considerations. Cancer registries in the United States depend on a multitude of information sources in order to completely abstract case records and be in compliance with State, Federal and private sector accreditation requirements. There is continuing work within the cancer registry and surveillance community, lead largely by the CDC/NPCR program, to help prepare the registries for the universal implementation of EHRs, but until such a time presents itself, registry data will depend upon some level of human review and](#)

intervention to ensure data are complete and accurately recorded.

3b.3. If this is an eMeasure, provide a summary of the feasibility assessment in an attached file or make available at a measure-specific URL.

Attachment:

3c. Data Collection Strategy

Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, costs associated with fees/licensing of proprietary measures) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use). For eMeasures, a feasibility assessment addresses the data elements and measure logic and demonstrates the eMeasure can be implemented or feasibility concerns can be adequately addressed.

3c.1. Describe what you have learned/modified as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure regarding data collection, availability of data, missing data, timing and frequency of data collection, sampling, patient confidentiality, time and cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues.

IF a PRO-PM, consider implications for both individuals providing PROM data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured.

1) The data for this measure are key elements already collected in all hospital registries. This measure has been reviewed using cancer registry data. The CoC data demonstrates variation in the measure. 2) The infrastructure to monitor compliance with this measure is already in place through the >1,500 Commission on Cancer accredited centers, accounting for 70-80% of patients affected by this measure. Through the National Cancer Data Base (NCDB) the CoC currently plans to include this measure in its "real clinical time" feedback to centers through its Rapid Quality Response System (www.facs.org/cancer/ncdb/rqrs.html). In addition, this measure will also be monitored using the CoC retrospective Cancer Program Practice Profile Report (CP3R) web-based audit and feed-back reporting tool (www.facs.org/cancer/ncdb/cp3r.html). Both of these reporting tools have been utilized in the cancer registry community and will not produce an undue burden on the data collection network.

3c.2. Describe any fees, licensing, or other requirements to use any aspect of the measure as specified (e.g., value/code set, risk model, programming code, algorithm).

4. Usability and Use

Extent to which potential audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) are using or could use performance results for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4a. Accountability and Transparency

Performance results are used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement and are publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement (or the data on performance results are available). If not in use at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible plan for implementation within the specified timeframes is provided.

4.1. Current and Planned Use

NQF-endorsed measures are expected to be used in at least one accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement in addition to performance improvement.

| Planned | Current Use (for current use provide URL) |
|---|---|
| Public Reporting | |
| Regulatory and Accreditation Programs | |
| Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization) | |
| Not in use | |

4a.1. For each CURRENT use, checked above, provide:

- Name of program and sponsor
- Purpose
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included

4a.2. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application (e.g., payment program, certification, licensing) what are the reasons? (e.g., Do policies or actions of the developer/steward or accountable entities restrict access to performance results or impede implementation?)

4a.3. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application, provide a credible plan for implementation within the expected timeframes -- any accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement. (Credible plan includes the specific program, purpose, intended audience, and timeline for implementing the measure within the specified timeframes. A plan for accountability applications addresses mechanisms for data aggregation and reporting.)

4b. Improvement

Progress toward achieving the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations is demonstrated. If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible rationale describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4b.1. Progress on Improvement. (Not required for initial endorsement unless available.)

Performance results on this measure (current and over time) should be provided in 1b.2 and 1b.4. Discuss:

- Progress (trends in performance results, number and percentage of people receiving high-quality healthcare)
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included

4b.2. If no improvement was demonstrated, what are the reasons? If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, provide a credible rationale that describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4c. Unintended Consequences

The benefits of the performance measure in facilitating progress toward achieving high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations (if such evidence exists).

4c.1. Were any unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations identified during testing; OR has evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations been reported since implementation? If so, identify the negative unintended consequences and describe how benefits outweigh them or actions taken to mitigate them.

This measure, as specified, is unlikely to be systematically susceptible to under-reporting due to the integral dependence of the measure upon the coordination of the surgical management of the patient within the reporting institution. Once this measure is implemented through the CoC's CP3R (<http://www.facs.org/cancer/ncdb/cp3r.html>) and RQRS (<http://www.facs.org/cancer/ncdb/rqrs.html>) on-line reporting tools later in 2012, the CoC's 2012 Program Standards (<http://www.facs.org/cancer/coc/cocprogramstandards2012.pdf>) will require direct review and oversight of this measure and the data supporting the denominator and numerator be monitored by an attending physician (Cancer Liaison Physician, CLP) on staff at the center on a quarterly basis.

5. Comparison to Related or Competing Measures

If a measure meets the above criteria and there are endorsed or new related measures (either the same measure focus or the same target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and the same target population), the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure.

5. Relation to Other NQF-endorsed Measures

Are there related measures (conceptually, either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (conceptually both the same measure focus and same target population)? If yes, list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures.

5.1a. List of related or competing measures (selected from NQF-endorsed measures)

5.1b. If related or competing measures are not NQF endorsed please indicate measure title and steward.

5a. Harmonization

The measure specifications are harmonized with related measures;

OR

The differences in specifications are justified

5a.1. If this measure conceptually addresses EITHER the same measure focus OR the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):

Are the measure specifications completely harmonized?

5a.2. If the measure specifications are not completely harmonized, identify the differences, rationale, and impact on interpretability and data collection burden.

5b. Competing Measures

The measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., is a more valid or efficient way to measure);

OR

Multiple measures are justified.

5b.1. If this measure conceptually addresses both the same measure focus and the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):

Describe why this measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., a more valid or efficient way to measure quality); OR provide a rationale for the additive value of endorsing an additional measure. (Provide analyses when possible.)

Appendix

A.1 Supplemental materials may be provided in an appendix. All supplemental materials (such as data collection instrument or methodology reports) should be organized in one file with a table of contents or bookmarks. If material pertains to a specific submission form number, that should be indicated. Requested information should be provided in the submission form and required attachments. There is no guarantee that supplemental materials will be reviewed.

Attachment:

Contact Information

Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner): [Commission on Cancer, American College of Surgeons](#)

Co.2 Point of Contact: [Erica, McNamera, emcnamera@facs.org, 302-202-5194-](#)

Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: [Commission on Cancer, American College of Surgeons](#)

Co.4 Point of Contact: [Andrew, Stewart, astewart@facs.org, 312-202-5285-](#)

Additional Information

Ad.1 Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development

Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.

Christopher Pezzi, MD, FACS (Abington Memorial Hospital, Abington PA); Lawrence Shulman, MD (Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston MA); Stephen Edge, MD, FACS (Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo NY); David Winchester, MD, FACS (Northshore University Health System, Evanston IL); Diana Dickson-Witmer, MD, FACS (Christiana Health Care System, Wilmington DE); Kelly Hunt, MD, FACS (MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston TX); Marilyn Leitch, MD, FACS (University of Texas – Southwestern, Dallas TX); Katherine Virgo, PhD (American Cancer Society)

This panel meets at least once a calendar quarter to review quality measures currently supported and implemented by the ACoS Commission on Cancer and to investigate and consider/review development of possible new measures.

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance

Ad.2 Year the measure was first released: 2007

Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision: 06, 2007

Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? Annual

Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? 05, 2012

Ad.6 Copyright statement:

Ad.7 Disclaimers:

Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: