



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 #: 0518

Corresponding Measures:

De.2. Measure Title: [Depression Assessment Conducted](#)

Co.1.1. Measure Steward: [Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services](#)

De.3. Brief Description of Measure: [Percent of patients who were screened for depression \(using a standardized depression screening tool\) at start or resumption of home health care](#)

1b.1. Developer Rationale: [As noted above, studies focused on depression assessment in home health care patients indicate that the condition is frequently underreported, thus there is room for improvement. It is envisioned that this measure will improve the assessment of depression in home care patients, providing information to home care agencies and consumers that will enable them to address and monitor the care received by patients with depression.](#)

S.4. Numerator Statement: [Number of home health episodes of care in which patients were screened for depression \(using a standardized depression screening tool\) at start/resumption of care.](#)

S.7. Denominator Statement: [Number of home health episodes of care ending during the reporting period, other than those covered by generic or measure-specific exclusions.](#)

S.10. Denominator Exclusions: [Episodes in which the patient was nonresponsive at the time of assessment.](#)

De.1. Measure Type: [Process](#)

S.23. Data Source: [Electronic Health Records](#)

S.26. Level of Analysis: [Facility](#)

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: [Mar 31, 2009](#) Most Recent Endorsement Date: [Mar 31, 2009](#)

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? [NA](#)

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
[0518_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)

As noted above, studies focused on depression assessment in home health care patients indicate that the condition is frequently underreported, thus there is room for improvement. It is envisioned that this measure will improve the assessment of depression in home care patients, providing information to home care agencies and consumers that will enable them to address and monitor the care received by patients with depression.

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.

Agency	Std. Avg	Std. Dev	Skew	Min	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	Max
96%	11%	-5.21	0%	90%	96%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Performance Gap:

90th - 10th Percentile	75th - 25th Percentile
10%	4%

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.

OASIS-C data from Medicare certified agencies with at least 20 quality episodes to which this measure applies. 88% of agencies (10,217) met the 20 episode threshold for this measure. The measure applied to 98% of all quality episodes (5.63 million out of 5.72 million) that ended between 7/1/2011 and 6/30/2012.

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.

There were no significant disparities in care related to depression assessment identified in our analysis of measure scores.

Descriptive statistics of measure scores (distribution by race, age and gender)

Observed Rate (Numerator/Denominator) by Patient Race

White	Black	Hispanic	Other
98%	97%	97%	97%

Observed Rate (Numerator/Denominator) by Patient Age

<65	65-75	75-85	85+
97%	98%	97%	97%

Observed Rate (Numerator/Denominator) by Patient Gender

Male	Female
97%	97%

There is also no evidence from the environmental scan that there are health disparities issues on depression assessment, although one study indicates that white patients report more depressive symptoms when compared to Blacks or Hispanics (9)

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.**Reference List**

- (1) Bruce ML, McAvay GJ, Raue PJ, Brown EL, Meyers BS, Keohane DJ et al. Major depression in elderly home health care patients. *Am J Psychiatry* 2002; 159(8):1367-1374.
- (2) Ell K, Unutzer J, Aranda M, Sanchez K, Lee PJ. Routine PHQ-9 depression screening in home health care: depression, prevalence,

clinical and treatment characteristics and screening implementation. Home Health Care Serv Q 2005; 24(4):1-19.

(3) Brown EL, McAvay G, Raue PJ, Moses S, Bruce ML. Recognition of depression among elderly recipients of home care services. Psychiatr Serv 2003; 54(2):208-213.

(4) Brown EL, Bruce ML, McAvay GJ, Raue PJ, Lachs MS, Nassisi P. Recognition of late-life depression in home care: accuracy of the outcome and assessment information set. J Am Geriatr Soc 2004; 52(6):995-999.

(5) McAvay GJ, Raue PJ, Brown EL, Bruce ML. Symptoms of depression in older home-care patients: patient and informant reports. Psychol Aging 2005; 20(3):507-518.

(6) Tullai-McGuinness S, Madigan EA, Fortinsky RH. Validity testing the Outcomes and Assessment Information Set (OASIS). Home Health Care Serv Q 2009; 28(1):45-57.

(7) Sheeran T, Byers AL, Bruce ML. Depression and increased short-term hospitalization risk among geriatric patients receiving home health care services. Psychiatr Serv 2010; 61(1):78-80.

(8) Byers AL, Sheeran T, Mlodzianowski AE, Meyers BS, Nassisi P, Bruce ML. Depression and risk for adverse falls in older home health care patients. Res Gerontol Nurs 2008; 1(4):245-251.

(9) Peng TR, Navaie-Waliser M, Feldman PH. Social support, home health service use, and outcomes among four racial-ethnic groups. Gerontologist 2003; 43(4):503-513.

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, 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.

Studies specific to depression in home health care from 2002 – 2012 were reviewed. Major depression among home health care patients is reported to have a prevalence rates between 6.4% and 14% (1-3) in the most rigorous studies done in home health care patients. When considering minor depression and sub-syndromal levels of symptoms, the prevalence rates are much higher: up to 30% of home health care patients (2-4). Research has found that patients and home health care nurses under-report depressive symptoms (1;5-7), suggesting that the extent of symptoms based on self-report or professional clinical judgment underestimates the prevalence, which may then lead to undertreatment. As well, the former version of the OASIS (OASIS-B1) under-reported the extent of depressive symptoms (5;8), in part because it only considered depressed mood, one of the two primary symptoms of depression (9). One study found that a single depression screening item could be effective in identifying home health care patients who may be depressed, providing that additional evaluation follows a positive screen (10). Peng, Navaie-Waliser and Feldman (2003) found that depressive symptoms were more likely to be reported in white elders (11).

There are outcome associations as well: a rapid repeat hospitalization (mean 8 days) is more likely for home health care patients with depressive symptoms (12) and there is an almost double risk for falls (odds ratio = 1.9) among patients who have depressive symptoms (13). Depression in patients with diabetes and congestive heart failure has been associated with higher costs for home healthcare patients (14). In addition, one study found longer home care lengths of stay for patients with depression (15). Other important outcomes associated with depression (e.g., self-management) in a general population were not addressed in the literature specific to home health care. Thus there are substantial numbers of patients affected, there is room for improvement and there are associations with outcomes that make depressive screening important to report.

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

- (1) Shao, H, Peng, TR, Bruce, ML, Bao, Y. Diagnosed depression among Medicare Home Health Patients: National estimates of prevalence and key characteristics. Psychiatr Serv 2011; 62(5): 638-540.
- (2) Bruce ML, McAvay GJ, Raue PJ, Brown EL, Meyers BS, Keohane DJ et al. Major depression in elderly home health care patients. Am J Psychiatry 2002; 159(8):1367-1374.
- (3) Ell K, Unutzer J, Aranda M, Sanchez K, Lee PJ. Routine PHQ-9 depression screening in home health care: depression,

- prevalence, clinical and treatment characteristics and screening implementation. Home Health Care Serv Q 2005; 24(4):1-19.
- (4) Brown EL, McAvay G, Raue PJ, Moses S, Bruce ML. Recognition of depression among elderly recipients of home care services. Psychiatr Serv 2003; 54(2):208-213.
- (5) Brown EL, Bruce ML, McAvay GJ, Raue PJ, Lachs MS, Nassisi P. Recognition of late-life depression in home care: accuracy of the outcome and assessment information set. J Am Geriatr Soc 2004; 52(6):995-999.
- (6) McAvay GJ, Raue PJ, Brown EL, Bruce ML. Symptoms of depression in older home-care patients: patient and informant reports. Psychol Aging 2005; 20(3):507-518.
- (7) Gellis, ZD. Depression screening in medically ill homecare elderly. Best Pract Ment Health 2010; 6(1): 1-16.
- (8) Tullai-McGuinness S, Madigan EA, Fortinsky RH. Validity testing the Outcomes and Assessment Information Set (OASIS). Home Health Care Serv Q 2009; 28(1):45-57.
- (9) Sheeran, R, Reilly, CF, Raue, PJ, Weinberger, MI, Pomerantz, J, Bruce, ML. The PHQ-2 on OASIS-C: A new resource for identifying geriatric depression among home health patients. Home Health Nurse 2010; 28(2): 92-104
- (10) McCormack, B, Boldy, D., Lewin, G, McCormack GR. Screening for depression among older adults referred to home care services: A single-item depression screener versus the Geriatric Depression Scale. Home Health Care Management and Practice 2010; 23(1): 13-19.
- (11) Peng TR, Navaie-Waliser M, Feldman PH. Social support, home health service use, and outcomes among four racial-ethnic groups. Gerontologist 2003; 43(4):503-513.
- (12) Sheeran T, Byers AL, Bruce ML. Depression and increased short-term hospitalization risk among geriatric patients receiving home health care services. Psychiatr Serv 2010; 61(1):78-80.
- (13) Byers AL, Sheeran T, Mlodzianowski AE, Meyers BS, Nassisi P, Bruce ML. Depression and risk for adverse falls in older home health care patients. Res Gerontol Nurs 2008; 1(4):245-251.
- (14) Junutzer, J, Shoenbaum, M., Katon, WJ, Fan, M, Pincus, HA, Hogan, D, Taylor, J. Healthcare costs associated with depression in medically ill fee-for-service Medicare participants. J Am Geriatr Soc 2009; 57(3): 506-510.
- (15) Friedman, B, Delvan, RL, Sheeran, TH, Bruce ML. The effect of major and minor depression on Medicare home healthcare services use. J Am Geriatr Soc 2009; 57(4): 669-675.

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):

Behavioral Health, Behavioral Health : Depression

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

Primary Prevention, Screening

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.cms.gov/HomeHealthQualityInits/Downloads/HHQTechnicalDocOfMeasures.pdf>

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)

URL Attachment:

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

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

Number of home health episodes of care in which patients were screened for depression (using a standardized depression screening tool) at start/resumption of care.

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.)

CMS systems report data on episodes that end within a rolling 12 month period, updated quarterly.

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.

Numerator is calculated based on response to item M1730 in the Home Health Outcome and Assessment Information Set (OASIS-C). See section 2a1.26. for additional information about the OASIS-C.

Number of home health patient episodes of care where at start of episode:

- (M1730) Depression Screening conducted = 1 (yes – PHQ2) or 2 (yes – other standardized assessment – meets criteria) or 3 (yes - other standardized assessment – does not meet criteria)

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

Number of home health episodes of care ending during the reporting period, other than those covered by generic or measure-specific exclusions.

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

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)

Number of home health patient episodes of care, defined as:

A start/resumption of care assessment ((M0100) Reason for Assessment = 1 (Start of care) or 3 (Resumption of care)) paired with a corresponding discharge/transfer assessment ((M0100) Reason for Assessment = 6 (Transfer to inpatient facility – not discharged), 7 (Transfer to inpatient facility – discharged), 8 (Death at home), or 9 (Discharge from agency)), other than those covered by denominator exclusions.

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

Episodes in which the patient was nonresponsive at the time of assessment.

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)

Measure-specific exclusions:

Number of home health patient episodes of care where at start of episode:(M0100) Reason for Assessment = 1 (Start of care) or 3 (Resumption of care); AND the value recorded on (M1700) Cognitive functioning = 4 - Totally dependent due to disturbances such as constant disorientation, coma, persistent vegetative state, or delirium; or the value recorded on M1710 "When Confused" or M1720 "When Anxious" is NA on the start (or resumption) of care, indicating the patient is non-responsive.

Generic Exclusions:

Medicare-certified home health agencies are currently required to collect and submit OASIS data only for adult (aged 18 and over) non-maternity Medicare and Medicaid patients who are receiving skilled home health care. Therefore, maternity patients, patients less than 18 years of age, non-Medicare/Medicaid patients, and patients who are not receiving skilled home services are all excluded from the measure calculation. However, the OASIS items and related measures could potentially be used for other adult patients receiving services in a community setting, ideally with further testing. The publicly-reported data on CMS' Home Health Compare web site also repress cells with fewer than 20 observations, and reports for home health agencies in operation less than six months.

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)

NA

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)

NA - process measure

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.)

Steps in calculating "Depression Assessment Conducted"

1. Construct Home Health Episodes of Care, defined as starting with an admission to home health care (M0100 Reason for assessment = 01) or resumption of home health care after an inpatient facility stay (M0100 Reason for assessment = 03), and ending with a discharge from home health care, including discharge due to death, or admission to inpatient facility for 24 hours or more (M0100 Reason for assessment = 06, 07, 08, or 09), as described in the technical specifications.

2. For each Episode of Care, do the following:

IF M1700_COG_FUNCTION[1] = 04 OR M1710_WHEN_CONFUSED[1] = NA OR M1720_WHEN_ANXIOUS[1] = NA
THEN


```
Depression_Asmt = MISSING
ELSE IF M1730_STDZ_DPRSN_SCRNG[1] = 01 OR M1730_STDZ_DPRSN_SCRNG[1] = 02 OR M1730_STDZ_DPRSN_SCRNG[1] = 03
THEN
Depression_Asmt = 1
ELSEIF M1730_STDZ_DPRSN_SCRNG[1] = 00
THEN
Depression_Asmt = 0
END IF
```

Note that OASIS data items are referred to using field names specified in OASIS Data Submission Specifications published by CMS. "[1]" is appended to the field name to show that the value is taken from the beginning assessment (Start or Resumption of Care).
3. For each agency, the agency rate is (# of Episodes of Care with Depression_Asmt = 1)/(# of Episodes of Care with Depression_Asmt = 1 or 0).

For additional details, please consult the technical specifications available at: <http://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/HomeHealthQualityInits/Downloads/HHQI-Revision1TechnicalDocumentationofMeasures.zip>

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.

Not applicable, completion of OASIS-C assessments is mandated by CMS and all completed assessments are used to calculate measure.

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.

Electronic Health Records

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.

The measure is calculated based on data obtained from the Home Health Outcome and Assessment Information Set (OASIS-C), which is a core standard assessment data set that home health agencies integrate into their own patient-specific, comprehensive assessment to identify each patient's need for home care. The data set is the foundation for valid and reliable information for patient assessment, care planning, and service delivery in the home health setting, as well as for the home health quality assessment and performance improvement program. HH agencies are required to collect OASIS data on all non-maternity Medicare/Medicaid patients, 18 or over, receiving skilled services. Data are collected at specific time points (admission, resumption of care after inpatient stay, recertification every 60 days that the patient remains in care, transfer, and at discharge). HH agencies are required to encode and transmit patient OASIS data to the state OASIS repositories. Each HHA has on-line access to outcome and process measure reports based on their own OASIS data submissions, as well as comparative state and national aggregate reports, case mix reports, and potentially avoidable event reports. CMS regularly collects OASIS data from the states for storage in the national OASIS repository, and makes measures based on these data (including measure 0518 "Depression Assessment Conducted") available to consumers and to the general public through the Medicare Home Health Compare website.

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)

Home Care

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

0518_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.

generated by and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care, e.g., blood pressure, lab value, medical condition, Coded by someone other than person obtaining original information (e.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims), 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)

ALL data elements are in defined fields in a combination of 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.

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.

OASIS data collection and transmission is a requirement of the Medicare Home Health Conditions of Participation. OASIS data are collected by the home health agency during the care episode as part of the Conditions of Participation, and transmitted electronically to the state and CMS national OASIS repository. No issues regarding availability of data, missing data, timing or frequency of data collection, patient confidentiality, time or cost of data collection, feasibility or implementation have become apparent since OASIS-C was implemented 1/1/2010.

In 2008, CMS contractors Abt Associates and subcontractors University of Colorado Health Sciences Center and Case Western Reserve University conducted field testing including analysis of time required for collection of OASIS-C and focus groups with clinicians on perceived burden of OASIS-C. CMS eliminated a number of items that participants reported to be burdensome prior to OASIS-C implementation. Focus group feedback and data collected during the field test indicated minimal additional time burden related to collection of OASIS C data items.

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	
Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)	

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.

Inaccuracies may result either due to confusion on the part of the clinician completing the OASIS or intentionally, to manipulate scores on quality measures. CMS has created and disseminated manuals and training materials to maximize accurate reporting of this data. Data accuracy could be audited through a review of medical records for evidence of the results of pain assessment.

All home health agencies serving adult, non-maternity Medicare and/or Medicaid patients must submit their OASIS assessment data to their respective state OASIS repository in a standard format. The repository software passes each incoming OASIS assessment record through an extensive set of quality edits. These include internal range and logic checks that assure that assessment items include only allowable values and that they are consistent with each other. When there are significant errors in an assessment, it is not accepted by the repository and the erroneous data are not available to be included in any published quality information. Data accuracy is also supported by the state survey process. Surveyors use OASIS to characterize each agency's caseload and to select sample patients to be interviewed. They also review and assess the accuracy of the agency's OASIS assessments. In addition, CMS payment contractors assess the accuracy of a sample of the OASIS assessments as part of their medical review processes. We are unable to provide results of these audit activities as we do not currently have access to the findings of the CMS surveyors, the data repository or CMS contractors regarding OASIS data accuracy.

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)

0712 : Depression Utilization of the PHQ-9 Tool

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?

No

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

We found 5 measures that dealt with the same topic but different populations. 0418 Screening for Clinical Depression 0712 Depression Utilization of the PHQ-9 Tool 1394 Depression Screening by 13 years of age 1515 Depression Screening by 18 years of age 1401 Maternal Depression Screening The measures all have slightly different specifications, so it is not possible to harmonize with all of them. However the measure is harmonized with the other measures in several significant ways. Four of the five listed measures (all except 1401) require use of a standardized tool. Of these, one (0712) requires the use of the PHQ-9, while another (Measure 0418, used in the SNF setting) has the PHQ-9 embedded in the data collection tool. The home health (HH) measure (0518) has the PHQ-2 embedded in the tool. It was selected because it is briefer, there is evidence that it provides sufficient data for screening and more appropriate for administration at the time of first encounter in the HH setting. Measure 0518 is also harmonized with Measure 0418 in that they both exclude patients with severe mental incapacity where the person is unable to express himself/herself in a manner understood by others (e.g., cases such as delirium or severe cognitive impairment).

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.)

There are no measures that have both the same measure focus and the same target population.

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): Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Co.2 Point of Contact: Corette, Byrd, corette.byrd@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-8532-

Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Co.4 Point of Contact: Robin, Dowell, Robin.Dowell@CMS.hhs.gov, 410-786-6738-

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.

In December 2010, a Technical Expert Panel (TEP) was convened to review the analysis conducted on the home health measures that received NQF time limited endorsement. The TEP was comprised of individuals selected by CMS for their expertise and perspectives related to the panel objectives, from a pool of individuals who were nominated in response to the September 2010 Call for TEP notice. At the end of a two day meeting, during which the measure developer presented the TEP with a variety of information about each measure, the TEP members were asked to individually rate each measure for importance, validity, and usability using a score card, created by the measure developer and modeled after the NQF criteria.

2010 HH TLE Measure Review TEP Members:

Mary Carr RN, MPH - Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, National Association of Home Care and Hospice

Rick Fortinsky, PhD- Professor of Medicine, Physicians Health Services Endowed Chair in Geriatrics and Gerontology, UConn Center for Health Services Research

Barbara Gage, PhD - Deputy Director of Aging, Disability, and Long-termCare, Post-Acute Care Research Lead, Research Triangle Institute

Margherita Labson, R.N., Executive Director for the Home Care Programat The Joint Commission

Steve Landers MD, MPH - Director, Center for Home Care and Community Rehabilitation, Cleveland Clinic

Bruce Leff, MD – Associate Director, Elder House Call Program,

Barbara McCann, MSW - Chief Industry Officer, InterimHealth Care

Jennifer S. Mensik PhD, RN, NEA-BC, FACHE - Director, Clinical Practices and Research, Banner Health, Arizona and Western Regions

Dana Mukamel, Professor, Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine & Primary Care, University of California, Irvine & Senior Fellow, Health Policy Research Institute, Irvine, California

Robert J. Rosati Ph.D - Vice President, Clinical Informatics, Visiting Nurse Service of New York, Center for Home Care Policy and Research

Judy Sangl Sc.D. – Health Scientist Administrator, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), Center for Patient Safety and Quality Improvement (CQulPS), Rockville, MD

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance

Ad.2 Year the measure was first released: 2010

Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision: 12, 2012

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? 09, 2013

Ad.6 Copyright statement: NA

Ad.7 Disclaimers: NA

Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: NA