



## 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 sub criterion 1b).

### Brief Measure Information

**NQF #: 0429**

**Corresponding Measures:**

**De.2. Measure Title:** [Change in Basic Mobility as Measured by the AM-PAC:](#)

**Co.1.1. Measure Steward:** CREcare

**De.3. Brief Description of Measure:** The Activity Measure for Post Acute Care (AM-PAC) is a functional status assessment instrument developed specifically for use in facility and community dwelling post acute care (PAC) patients. It was built using Item Response Theory (IRT) methods to achieve feasible, practical, and precise measurement of functional status (Hambleton 200, Hambleton 2005). Based on factor analytic work and IRT analyses, a Basic Mobility domain has been identified which consists of functional tasks that cover in the following areas: transfers, walking, wheelchair skills, stairs, bend/lift/ and carrying tasks. (Haley, 2004, 2004a, 2004b).

The AM-PAC adaptive short form (ASF) versions of the Basic Mobility scale are being submitted to The National Quality Forum. The ASF version of the Basic Mobility scale consists of 2 different 10-item forms, one for inpatients versus those receiving care in a community setting. Built using IRT methods, the Basic Mobility ASFs allow different questions to be targeted to each setting (inpatient/community), generating an interval level score that is common across both ASFs. The scale is transformed from a logit scale to a standardized scale which ranges from 0 - 100 where 100 is the best possible mobility function. We believe that these short forms are the best compromise between needed breadth of functional content across inpatient and community functional tasks, and the need to minimize response burden.

The ASFs for Basic Mobility were built from an item bank that contains a rich assortment of 131 calibrated items that have been developed, tested, calibrated and applied in clinical research over the past seven years. In developing and evaluating the AM-PAC, we employed two different samples of 1081 patients who received post acute care in acute inpatient rehabilitation units, long-term care hospitals, skilled nursing homes, home health care, and outpatient therapy care settings. The ASFs were developed on an initial sample of 485 post acute care patients (see Haley et al, 2004)

The existence of a detailed item bank enables the basic AM-PAC forms to be enhanced and improved in a very timely fashion (Jette et al, 2007, Haley et al, 2008) for examples of this process).

Scoring estimates from the ASFs and the computer adaptive test (CAT) are directly comparable, given they are taken from the same item bank, the same IRT analysis and use the same scoring metric. Using computer simulations with the AM-PAC item bank, we demonstrated excellent scoring comparability between the AM-PAC adaptive short forms and the CAT. (Haley et al., 2004)

Advantages of using the CAT over the short forms include: less test burden on patients, decreased standard errors around score estimates, and improved scoring accuracy at the lower and higher ends of the AM-PAC functional scales. (Haley et al., 2004) However, the adaptive short forms can generate sufficiently accurate scores on the AM-PAC functional domains and those scores can be directly compared to scores provided from a CAT application of the same item pool.

---

Cella D, Gershon R, Lai J-S, Choi S. The future of outcomes measurement:item banking, tailored short forms, and computerized adaptive assessment. Qual Life Res. 2007;16:133-141.

Haley SM, Coster WJ, Andres PL, et al. Score comparability of short-forms and computerized adaptive testing: simulation study with the Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC). Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2004;85:661-666.

Jette AM, Haley SM. Contemporary measurement techniques for rehabilitation outcome assessment. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* 2005; 37: 339-345.

Haley SM, Coster WJ, Andres PL, Ludlow LH, Bond T, Sinclair SJ, Jette AM. Activity outcome measurement for post-acute care. *Medical Care* ; 42: Suppl. 1: I-49 – I-61, 2004.

Coster WJ, Haley, SM Andres PL, Ludlow LH, Bond T. Refining the conceptual basis for rehabilitation outcome measurement: personal care and instrumental activities domain. *Medical Care* ; 42: Suppl. 1: I-62 - I-72, 2004.

Coster, WJ, Haley, SM, Ludlow LH, Andres PL, Ni PS. Development of an Applied Cognition Scale to Measure Rehabilitation Outcomes. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* ; 85:2030-2035, 2004a.

Coster W, Haley S, Jette A: Measuring patient-reported outcomes after discharge from inpatient rehabilitation settings. *J of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 38:237-242, 2006

Haley S, Ni P, Hambleton R, Slavin M, Jette A: Computer Adaptive Testing Improved Accuracy and Precision of Scores over Random Item Selection in a Physical Functioning Item Bank. *J Clin Epidem*, 59: 1174-1182, 2006.

Haley SM, Ni P, Jette AM, Tao W, Moed R, Meyers D, Zurek M, Ludlow LH. Replenishing a Computerized Adaptive Test (CAT) of Patient Reported Outcomes. In press, *Quality of Life Research* 2008).

Cella, D., Gershon, R., Lai, J.-S., & Choi, S. (2007). The future of outcomes measurement: Item banking, tailored short forms, and computerized adaptive assessment. *Quality of Life Research*, 16, 133-141.

Tao W, Haley SM, Coster WJ, Ni P, Jette AM. An exploratory analysis of functional staging using an Item Response Theory approach. *Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, in press 2008

Jette A, Haley S, Tao W, Ni P, Meyers D, Zurek M: Prospective evaluation of the AM-PAC-CAT in outpatient rehabilitation settings. *PHYSICAL THERAPY*. 87(4): 385-398, 2007

Jette A, Tao W, Norweg A, Haley S: Interpreting rehabilitation outcome measurements. *J of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 39(8):585-90, 2007..

---

Haley SM, Coster WJ, Andres PL, Ludlow LH, Bond T, Sinclair SJ, Jette AM. Activity outcome measurement for post-acute care. *Medical Care* ; 42: Suppl. 1: I-49 – I-61, 2004.

Haley SM, Coster WJ, Andres PL, Kosinski M, Ni P. Score comparability of short-forms and computerized adaptive testing: an illustration with the Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC) *Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*. :85; 661-666, 2004a.

Haley SM, Andres PL, Coster WJ, Kosinski M, Ni P, Jette AM. Short-form activity measures for post-acute care (AM-PAC) *Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*. 85;649-660, 2004b.

Jette A, Haley S, Tao W, Ni P, Meyers D, Zurek M: Prospective evaluation of the AM-PAC-CAT in outpatient rehabilitation settings. *PHYSICAL THERAPY*. 87(4): 385-398, 2007.

Haley SM, Ni P, Jette AM, Tao W, Moed R, Meyers D, Zurek M, Ludlow LH. Replenishing a Computerized Adaptive Test (CAT) of Patient Reported Outcomes. *Quality of Life Research*, 2008

Hambleton RK (2000). Emergence of item response modeling in instrument development and data analysis. *Medical Care* 38(9):II-60.

Hambleton RK (2005). Applications of Item Response Theory to Improve Health Outcomes Assessment: Developing Item Banks, Linking Instruments, and Computer-Adaptive Testing. In: Lipscomb J, Gotay CC, Snyder C, editors. Outcomes Assessment in Cancer. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; p 445-64.

**1b.1. Developer Rationale:**

**S.4. Numerator Statement:** The number (or proportion) of a clinician's patients in a particular risk adjusted diagnostic category who meet a target threshold of improvement in Basic Mobility functioning. We recommend that the target threshold is based on the percentage of patients who exceed one or more Minimal Detectable Change (MDC) thresholds. The percentage threshold is derived from a normative database used for benchmarking. MDC is considered the minimal amount of change that is not likely to be due to measurement error. It is one of the more common change indices, which can be used to identify reliable changes in an outcome like Basic Mobility function adjusting for the amount of measurement error inherent in the measurement. MDC can be reported at different confidence levels. (see Haley & Fragala, 2006)

Haley SM, Fragala-Pinkham MA. Interpreting change scores of tests and measures used in physical therapy. Physical Therapy 2006; 86(5): 735-743.

**S.6. Denominator Statement:** All patients in a risk adjusted diagnostic category with a mobility goal for an episode of care. Cases to be included in the denominator could be identified based on ICD-9 codes or alternatively, based on CPT codes relevant to treatment goals focused on Basic Mobility function.

**S.8. Denominator Exclusions:** Those patients who did not have one or more mobility function goals for the episode of care.

**De.1. Measure Type:** Outcome

**S.17. Data Source:** Other

**S.20. Level of Analysis:** Clinician : Individual, Facility

**IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date:** Jul 31, 2008 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Jul 31, 2008

**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 sub criteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

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

[0429\\_Evidence\\_MSF5.0\\_Data.doc](#)

**1a.1 For Maintenance of Endorsement: Is there new evidence about the measure since the last update/submission?**

Do not remove any existing information. If there have been any changes to evidence, the Committee will consider the new evidence. Please use the most current version of the evidence attachment (v7.1). Please use red font to indicate updated evidence.

### 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., how the measure will improve the quality of care, the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)**

*If a COMPOSITE (e.g., combination of component measure scores, all-or-none, any-or-none), SKIP this question and answer the composite questions.*

**1b.2. Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis.** *(This is required for maintenance of endorsement. 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 include.) This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.*

**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.**

**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 maintenance of endorsement. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included.) For measures that show high levels of performance, i.e., “topped out”, disparities data may demonstrate an opportunity for improvement/gap in care for certain sub-populations. This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.*

**1b.5. If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b.4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations. Not necessary if performance data provided in 1b.4**

## 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 sub criteria 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):*  
[Musculoskeletal](#)

**De.6. Non-Condition Specific***(check all the areas that apply):*  
[Health and Functional Status : Change](#)

**De.7. Target Population Category** *(Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):*  
[Elderly](#)

**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.)*

**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.2c.** Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.

**Attachment:**

**S.2d.** Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.

**S.3.1. For maintenance of endorsement:** Are there changes to the specifications since the last updates/submission. If yes, update the specifications for S1-2 and S4-22 and explain reasons for the changes in S3.2.

**S.3.2. For maintenance of endorsement,** please briefly describe any important changes to the measure specifications since last measure update and explain the reasons.

**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) DO NOT include the rationale for the measure.

*IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).*

The number (or proportion) of a clinician's patients in a particular risk adjusted diagnostic category who meet a target threshold of improvement in Basic Mobility functioning. We recommend that the target threshold is based on the percentage of patients who exceed one or more Minimal Detectable Change (MDC) thresholds. The percentage threshold is derived from a normative database used for benchmarking. MDC is considered the minimal amount of change that is not likely to be due to measurement error. It is one of the more common change indices, which can be used to identify reliable changes in an outcome like Basic Mobility function adjusting for the amount of measurement error inherent in the measurement. MDC can be reported at different confidence levels. (see Haley & Frigala, 2006)

Haley SM, Frigala-Pinkham MA. Interpreting change scores of tests and measures used in physical therapy. Physical Therapy 2006; 86(5): 735-743.

**S.5. 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, time period for data collection, 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 (S.14).*

**S.6. Denominator Statement** (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)

All patients in a risk adjusted diagnostic category with a mobility goal for an episode of care. Cases to be included in the denominator could be identified based on ICD-9 codes or alternatively, based on CPT codes relevant to treatment goals focused on Basic Mobility function.

**S.7. Denominator Details** (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, 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 target population is identified. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).*

**S.8. Denominator Exclusions** *(Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)*

Those patients who did not have one or more mobility function goals for the episode of care.

**S.9. Denominator Exclusion Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, 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.)*

**S.10. Stratification Information** *(Provide all information required to stratify the measure results, if necessary, including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets, and the risk-model covariates and coefficients for the clinically-adjusted version of the measure when appropriate – 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.)*

**S.11. Risk Adjustment Type** (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in measure testing attachment)

Statistical risk model

If other:

**S.12. Type of score:**

If other:

**S.13. 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)*

**S.14. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic** *(Diagram or 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; time period for data, aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)*

**S.15. Sampling** *(If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)*

IF an instrument-based performance measure (e.g., PRO-PM), identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.

**S.16. Survey/Patient-reported data** *(If measure is based on a survey or instrument, provide instructions for data collection and guidance on minimum response rate.)*

Specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.

**S.17. Data Source** *(Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).*

If other, please describe in S.18.

Other

**S.18. Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument (e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc., and describe how data are collected.)*

IF instrument-based, identify the specific instrument(s) and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.

**S.19. Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)*

**S.20. Level of Analysis** *(Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)*

Clinician : Individual, Facility

**S.21. Care Setting** (Check *ONLY* the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care

If other:

**S.22. 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.)

## 2. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

[0429\\_MeasureTesting\\_MSF5.0\\_Data.doc](#)

### 2.1 For maintenance of endorsement

*Reliability testing: If testing of reliability of the measure score was not presented in prior submission(s), has reliability testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.*

### 2.2 For maintenance of endorsement

*Has additional empirical validity testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.*

### 2.3 For maintenance of endorsement

*Risk adjustment: For outcome, resource use, cost, and some process measures, risk-adjustment that includes social risk factors is not prohibited at present. Please update sections 1.8, 2a2, 2b1,2b4.3 and 2b5 in the Testing attachment and S.140 and S.11 in the online submission form. NOTE: These sections must be updated even if social risk factors are not included in the risk-adjustment strategy. You MUST use the most current version of the Testing Attachment (v7.1) -- older versions of the form will not have all required questions.*

## 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.

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) Update this field for **maintenance of endorsement**.



**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. For maintenance of endorsement, if this measure is not an eMeasure (eCQM), please describe any efforts to develop an eMeasure (eCQM).**

**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. Please also complete and attach the NQF Feasibility Score Card.**

**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. Required for maintenance of endorsement.** Describe difficulties (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 instrument-based,** consider implications for both individuals providing data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured.

**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.*

Specific Plan for Use	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
Public Reporting	
Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)	

**4a1.1 For each CURRENT use, checked above (update for maintenance of endorsement), provide:**

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

**4a1.2. 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?)

**4a1.3. 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.)

**4a2.1.1. Describe how performance results, data, and assistance with interpretation have been provided to those being measured or other users during development or implementation.**

**How many and which types of measured entities and/or others were included? If only a sample of measured entities were included, describe the full population and how the sample was selected.**

**4a2.1.2. Describe the process(es) involved, including when/how often results were provided, what data were provided, what educational/explanatory efforts were made, etc.**

**4a2.2.1. Summarize the feedback on measure performance and implementation from the measured entities and others described in 4d.1.**

**Describe how feedback was obtained.**

**4a2.2.2. Summarize the feedback obtained from those being measured.**

**4a2.2.3. Summarize the feedback obtained from other users**

**4a2.3. Describe how the feedback described in 4a2.2.1 has been considered when developing or revising the measure specifications or implementation, including whether the measure was modified and why or why not.**

#### **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.

**4b1. Refer to data provided in 1b but do not repeat here. Discuss any progress on improvement (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.)**

**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.**

#### **4b2. 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).

**4b2.1. Please explain any unexpected findings (positive or negative) during implementation of this measure including unintended impacts on patients.**

**4b2.2. Please explain any unexpected benefits from implementation of this measure.**

## 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.

Yes

**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 of Related Measures

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 harmonized to the extent possible?**

**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:**

<b>Contact Information</b>
<b>Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner):</b> CREcare <b>Co.2 Point of Contact:</b> Richard, Moed, <a href="mailto:richmoed@crecare.com">richmoed@crecare.com</a> , 617-780-8815- <b>Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward:</b> <b>Co.4 Point of Contact:</b>
<b>Additional Information</b>
<b>Ad.1 Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development</b> Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.
<b>Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance</b> <b>Ad.2 Year the measure was first released:</b> <b>Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision:</b> <b>Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure?</b> <b>Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?</b>
<b>Ad.6 Copyright statement:</b> <b>Ad.7 Disclaimers:</b>
<b>Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments:</b>