



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 #: 0522

Corresponding Measures:

De.2. Measure Title: Influenza Immunization Received for Current Flu Season (Home Health)

Co.1.1. Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

De.3. Brief Description of Measure: Percentage of home health episodes of care during which patients received influenza immunization for the current flu season.

1b.1. Developer Rationale: This measure meets the National Priorities Partnership (NPP) Goal of providing preventive services recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. There is the potential to reduce illness, mortality and hospitalization by provision of IV, particularly for older home health care patients.

TEP comments:

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. When asked to rate opportunity for improvement, the majority (9 of 11) of the TEP members rated the measure as partially or completely meeting the criteria of sufficient variation in performance to justify continued measurement and public reporting.

S.4. Numerator Statement: Number of home health episodes of care during which the patient a) received vaccination from the HHA or b) had received vaccination from HHA during earlier episode of care, or c) was determined to have received vaccination from another provider.

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: Measure-specific exclusions: Episodes which (1) do not include any days during the flu season (October 1 - March 31), OR episode ended with patient death, OR the patient does not meet the CDC guidelines for influenza vaccine.

Generic exclusions: None, except that HHAs are exempt from reporting OASIS data to CMS on certain categories of patients/clients as described in the next section.

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:** May 02, 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? N/A

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

[0522_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)

This measure meets the National Priorities Partnership (NPP) Goal of providing preventive services recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. There is the potential to reduce illness, mortality and hospitalization by provision of IV, particularly for older home health care patients.

TEP comments:

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. When asked to rate opportunity for improvement, the majority (9 of 11) of the TEP members rated the measure as partially or completely meeting the criteria of sufficient variation in performance to justify continued measurement and public reporting.

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 Avg: 66%

Std Dev: 22%

Skew: -0.93

Min: 0%

10th: 33%

25th: 54%

50th: 70%

75th: 81%

90th: 90%

Max: 100%

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 10 quality episodes to which the measure applies. 79% of agencies (8,025) met the ten episode threshold for this measure. The measure applied to 42% of all quality episodes (1.22 million out of 2.89 million), since many of the episodes were outside the time parameters for the measure (i.e. outside of influenza season). As less than 12 months of data were available for testing, we relaxed the public reporting constraint of 20 episodes per agency in 12 months to 10 episodes per agency in 9 months.

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.

Observed Rate by Patient Race

White 69%

Black 57%

Hispanic 55%

Other 68%

Observed Rate by Patient Age

<65 58%
65-75 65%
75-85 59%
85+ 70%

Observed Rate by Patient Gender

Male 66%

Female 66%

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.

OASIS-C data from Medicare certified agencies with at least 10 quality episodes to which the measure applies. 79% of agencies (8,025) met the ten episode threshold for this measure. The measure applied to 42% of all quality episodes (1.22 million out of 2.89 million), since many of the episodes were outside the time parameters for the measure (i.e. outside of influenza season). As less than 12 months of data were available for testing, we relaxed the public reporting constraint of 20 episodes per agency in 12 months to 10 episodes per agency in 9 months.

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, A leading cause of morbidity/mortality

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.

Influenza vaccination is recommended worldwide for older people to reduce morbidity and mortality. There are differential adverse impacts on older people from influenza, including higher rates of mortality, hospitalization and long term health effects, accounting for more than 60% of the influenza-related hospitalizations and 85% of the influenza-related deaths (1). There is at least one report that 10% of the winter time deaths represent influenza-related deaths (2) which is much less than previous reports (3) but explained by study design (lack of RCTs; over-reliance on cohort studies). One explanation is that providers do not use the entire influenza vaccination season to provide vaccination, generally using a two to three month time frame when there is a seven month influenza season (4;5).

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

- (1) Nichol KL. Influenza vaccination in the elderly: impact on hospitalisation and mortality. *Drugs Aging* 2005; 22(6):495-515.
- (2) Simonsen L, Reichert TA, Viboud C, Blackwelder WC, Taylor RJ, Miller MA. Impact of influenza vaccination on seasonal mortality in the US elderly population. *Arch Intern Med* 2005; 165(3):265-272.
- (3) Simonsen L, Taylor RJ, Viboud C, Miller MA, Jackson LA. Mortality benefits of influenza vaccination in elderly people: an ongoing controversy. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2007; 7(10):658-666.
- (4) Poland GA, Johnson DR. Increasing influenza vaccination rates: the need to vaccinate throughout the entire influenza season. *Am J Med* 2008; 121(7 Suppl 2):S3-10.
- (5) Stinchfield PK. Practice-proven interventions to increase vaccination rates and broaden the immunization season. *Am J Med* 2008; 121(7 Suppl 2):S11-S21.

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):

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

Primary Prevention

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.)

<http://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/HomeHealthQualityInits/HHQIQualityMeasures.html>

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)

[This is not an eMeasure](#) 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 Attachment: [OASISQM_data_dictionary-635477576826225076-635821644012087698.xls](#)

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 during which the patient a) received vaccination from the HHA or b) had received vaccination from HHA during earlier episode of care, or c) was determined to have received vaccination from another provider.

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 include at least one day between October 1 and March 31, inclusive, and 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.

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

OASIS* item M1046 (Influenza Vaccine Received) = 1, 2, or 3 (yes, received from agency during current or prior episode of care or from another health care provider)

*Currently, there are three versions of OASIS assessments on the CMS repository that are used to calculate quality measures for

home health agencies. OASIS-C was in use from 1/1/2010 through 12/31/2014. OASIS-C1 / ICD-9 Version was in use from 1/1/2015 through 9/30/2015, and OASIS-C1 / ICD-10 Version is in use from 10/1/2015 onward. Because the influenza immunization items changed in the transition from OASIS-C to OASIS-C1, the specifications shown here apply to OASIS-C1 only. The logical criteria for numerator and denominator inclusion have not changed, although the algorithm has changed due to changes in the response categories for the OASIS items.

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):*

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)*

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)*

Measure-specific exclusions: Episodes which (1) do not include any days during the flu season (October 1 - March 31), OR episode ended with patient death, OR the patient does not meet the CDC guidelines for influenza vaccine.

Generic exclusions: None, except that HHAs are exempt from reporting OASIS data to CMS on certain categories of patients/clients as described in the next section.

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:

Home health patient episodes of care where at end of episode:

M0100 (Reason for Assessment) = 8 (Death at home) OR

M1055 (Reason Influenza Vaccine not Rec'd) = 5 (not indicated, patient does not meet age/condition guidelines) OR

M0030 (Start of Care Date) or M0032 (Resumption of Care Date), combined with M0906 (Discharge/Transfer Date) indicate that no part of the episode occurred during flu season (October 1 to March 31)

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. Publicly reported data for HHAs on CMS's Home Health Compare Web site require that the HHA have at least 20 observations for the quality measure and that the HHA has been in operation at least 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)*

N/A - not stratified.

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)

N/A - 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)

N/A - process measure.

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.)

The unit of analysis for patient outcome quality measures is an episode of care, defined as starting with an admission to home health care (M0100 (Reason for assessment) = 1 or 2) or resumption of home health care after an inpatient facility stay (M0100 (Reason for assessment) = 3), 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) = 6, 7, 8, or 9). In the specifications below, variable names from the CMS data submission specifications are used, with a [1] appended to indicate the data come from the start or resumption of care assessment and a [2] appended to indicate the data come from the discharge or inpatient facility transfer assessment.

```
IF (MONTH(M0906_DC_TRAN_DTH_DT[2]) > 3 AND MONTH(M0906_DC_TRAN_DTH_DT[2]) < 10) AND
((M0100_ASSMT_REASON[1] = 01 AND MONTH(M0030_START_CARE_DT[1]) > 3 AND MONTH(M0030_START_CARE_DT[1]) < 10
AND YEAR(M0906_DC_TRAN_DTH_DT[2]) = YEAR(M0030_START_CARE_DT[1]))
OR (M0100_ASSMT_REASON[1] = 03 AND MONTH(M0032_ROC_DT[1]) > 3 AND MONTH(M0032_ROC_DT[1]) < 10 AND
YEAR(M0906_DC_TRAN_DTH_DT[2]) = YEAR(M0032_ROC_DT[1]))) THEN
Influenza_Immunization = MISSING
ELSE
IF M0100_ASSMT_REASON[2] = 08 THEN
Influenza_Immunization = MISSING
ELSE
IF M1046_INFLNZ_RECD_CRNT_SEASON [2] = 01 OR M1046_INFLNZ_RECD_CRNT_SEASON[2] = 02 OR
M1046_INFLNZ_RECD_CRNT_SEASON[2] = 03 THEN
Influenza_Immunization = 1
ELSEIF M1046_INFLNZ_RECD_CRNT_SEASON [2] = 06 THEN
Influenza_Immunization = MISSING
ELSE
Influenza_Immunization = 0
```

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)

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

<p>IF a PRO-PM, identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed. N/A</p> <p>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.</p> <p>S.22. Missing data (specify how missing data are handled, e.g., imputation, delete case.) <u>Required for Composites and PRO-PMs.</u></p>
<p>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</p> <p>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. OASIS-C data set collected by Home Health Agency clinicians and submitted electronically to state data repositories.</p> <p>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</p> <p>S.26. Level of Analysis (Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED) Facility</p> <p>S.27. Care Setting (Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED) Home Care If other:</p> <p>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.)</p>
<p>2a. Reliability – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form</p> <p>2b. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form 0522_MeasureTesting_MSF5.0_Data.doc</p>

<p>3. Feasibility</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>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).</p> <p>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) If other:</p>
<p>3b. Electronic Sources The required data elements are available in electronic health records or other electronic sources. If the required data are not in</p>

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)

Yes

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.

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.

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	

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/lack of training 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 claims related to immunizations. 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)

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.)

N/A - Influenza Immunization Received measures the rate of influenza immunization in a different target population - home health patients.

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: Helen, Dollar-Maples, Helen.Dollar-Maples@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-7214-

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 (including PPV Ever Received). 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.

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, Interim Health 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 (CQuIPS), 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:

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? 06, 2012

Ad.6 Copyright statement:

Ad.7 Disclaimers:

Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: