



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 #: 1395

Corresponding Measures:

De.2. Measure Title: Chlamydia Screening and Follow Up

Co.1.1. Measure Steward: National Committee for Quality Assurance

De.3. Brief Description of Measure: The percentage of female adolescents 18 years of age who had a chlamydia screening test with proper follow-up.

1b.1. Developer Rationale: Most individuals infected with chlamydia are asymptomatic. Screening is necessary to detect cases and to reduce the risk of complications. This measure encourages secondary prevention of chlamydia.

S.4. Numerator Statement: Adolescents who had documentation of a chlamydia screening test with proper follow-up by the time they turn 18 years of age.

S.7. Denominator Statement: Sexually active female adolescents with a visit who turned 18 years of age during the measurement year.

S.10. Denominator Exclusions: None

De.1. Measure Type: Process

S.23. Data Source: Electronic Health Data, Electronic Health Records, Paper Medical Records

S.26. Level of Analysis: Clinician : Group/Practice, Clinician : Individual

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Aug 15, 2011 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Aug 15, 2011

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? This measure appears in the composite Comprehensive Well Care by Age 18 Years

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
1395_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)

Most individuals infected with chlamydia are asymptomatic. Screening is necessary to detect cases and to reduce the risk of complications. This measure encourages secondary prevention of chlamydia.

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.*

Despite the widespread availability of non-invasive testing methods for chlamydia and single dose therapy using azithromycin, chlamydia screening rates have, overall, remained low (Fairley, 2005). This rate may reflect barriers to testing that relate to both patients and health care providers. For instance, adolescents may be reluctant to seek care for their sexual health because of embarrassment or concerns about their confidentiality, while health care providers may have limited awareness of chlamydia as an issue or lack the time, knowledge and skills to manage and discuss sexual health issues (Verhoeven, 2005; Poljski, 2004).

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.

Fairley CK, Hocking J, Gunn J, Chen MY: No barriers to chlamydia testing in sexually active young women. Med J Aust 2005 , 183:548-9.

Verhoeven V, Avonts D, Vermeire E, Debaene L, Van Royen P: A short educational intervention on communication skills improves the quality of screening for chlamydia in GPs in Belgium: a cluster randomised controlled trial. Patient Education and Counselling 2005 , 57:101-5.

Poljski C, Atkin L, Williams H: Review of sexual health clinical services in Victoria. Family Planning Victoria, Melbourne 2004.

Samitha Ginige, Christopher K Fairley, Jane S Hocking, Francis J Bowden and Marcus Y Chen. Interventions for increasing chlamydia screening in primary care: a review. BMC Public Health 2007, 7:95

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.*

In general, females have higher rates of chlamydia, though they also utilize screening services more often, which may cause misleading statistics (NRCIM, 2009). In 2003, the highest age-specific rates of reported Chlamydia in women were among 15-19 year olds and 20 to 24 year olds. For females ages 10-14, the age-specific rate was 132 per 100,000 (CDC, 2003). Approximately five to 14 percent of 16-20 year olds and three to 12 percent of 20-24 year old women who were routinely screened are infected with Chlamydia (Walsh, 2002).

African American adolescents have the highest rate of chlamydia than any other racial or ethnic group. African American female adolescents have the highest percentage compared to African American males of the same age group (NRCIM, 2009).

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.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Trends in Reportable Sexually Transmitted Diseases in the United States, 2003 - National Data on Chlamydia, Gonorrhea and Syphilis. STD Surveillance 2003b.

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. Adolescent Health Services: Missing Opportunities. Committee on Adolescent Health Care Services and Models of Care for Treatment, Prevention, and Healthy Development, R.S. Lawrence, J. Appleton Gootman, and L.J. Sim, Editors. Board on Children, Youth, and Families. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. 2009.

Walsh C, Irwin K. Combating the silent chlamydia epidemic. Contemp Ob Gyn 2002;Apr:90-8.

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, High resource use, Severity of illness, 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.

Chlamydia trachomatis is the most common sexually transmitted bacterial infection in the US (USPSTF, 2006). Among women with chlamydial infection, 20-40 percent will experience pelvic inflammatory disease (Mangione-Smith, 1999), 50-75 percent will experience tubal factor infertility if untreated (Mangione-Smith, 1999; Sellors, 1998), and 65 percent will experience an ectopic pregnancy if untreated. It is the leading cause of preventable infertility and, among other adverse pregnancy related problems, can cause preterm birth, miscarriages, infant mortality, and neonatal chlamydial infections (USPSTF, 2007).

Over 900,000 chlamydial infections were reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) from 50 states and the District of Columbia in 2004. Since many cases are not reported or even diagnosed, it is estimated that there are actually 2.8 million new cases of chlamydia each year (Weinstock, 2004). From 1987 through 2004, the reported rate of chlamydial infection in women increased from 78.5 cases to 485.0 cases per 100,000 people. A portion of the increase in prevalence is attributed to continued expansion of chlamydia screening programs (CDC, 2005).

Cost-effectiveness data of Chlamydia screening found that routinely screening women younger than age 25 saves \$45 for every woman screened (Mangione-Smith, 1999). The CDC estimated that every dollar spent on Chlamydia testing and treatment saves \$12 in complications arising from untreated Chlamydia (CDC, 2001). Studies suggest the most cost-effective screening interval is yearly screening for women aged 15-29 followed by screening every 6 months for those with a history of infection (Hu, 2004).

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

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2004 Supplement, Chlamydia Prevalence Monitoring Project. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, December 2005.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Chlamydia in the United States. April 2001b.

Hu, Delphine, MD, et al. Screening for Chlamydia trachomatis in Women 15 to 29 Years of Age: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Annals of Internal Medicine. October 5, 2004. Volume 141: 501-513.

Humphreys JT, Henneberry JF, Rickard RS, Beebe JL. Cost-benefit analysis of selective screening criteria for Chlamydia trachomatis infection in women attending Colorado family planning clinics. Sex Transm Dis 1992, 19:47-53.

Mangione-Smith R, O'Leary J, McGlynn EA. Health and cost-benefits of chlamydia screening in young women. Sexually Transmitted Diseases: Vol 26(6) July 1999 pg 302-316.

Sellors JW, Mahony JB, Cherneski MA, Rath DJ. Tubal factor infertility: an association with prior chlamydia infection and asymptomatic salpingitis. Fertility and Sterility 1998;49:451-457.

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Screening for chlamydial infection: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. Ann Intern Med 2007 Jul 17;147(2):128-34

Weinstock H, Berman S, Cates W. Sexually Transmitted Diseases Among American Youth: Incidence and Prevalence Estimates, 2000. Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health 2004;36(1):6-10.

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):
[Perinatal Health](#)

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.)

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)

[No data dictionary](#) 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.

[Adolescents who had documentation of a chlamydia screening test with proper follow-up by the time they turn 18 years of age.](#)

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.)

[Numerator: 2 years \(24 month period\)](#)

[Denominator: 1 year \(12 month period\)](#)

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.

[Documentation must include a note indicating the date and each of the following:](#)

- A chlamydia test result
- For abnormal or indeterminate results, evidence of confirmatory testing, referral or treatment

S.7. Denominator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)
Sexually active female adolescents with a visit who turned 18 years of age during the measurement year.

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

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)

Sexually active female adolescents who turned 18 years of age during the measurement year and who had documentation of a face-to-face visit between the clinician and the adolescent that predates the adolescent's birthday by at least 12 months.

Evidence of sexual activity includes any of the following:

- Documentation of sexual activity
- Prescription for contraception
- Treatment or Screening for sexually transmitted disease
- Pregnancy
- Pelvic examination

S.10. Denominator Exclusions (Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)
None

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)

NA

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)

None

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

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.)

Step 1: Determine the denominator

Children who turned the requisite age in the measurement year, AND

Who had a visit within the past 12 months of the child's birthday

Step 2: Determine the numerator

Children who had documentation in the medical record of the screening or service during the measurement year or the year previous to the measurement year.

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.)

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

For this physician-level measure, we anticipate the entire population will be used in the denominator. If a sample is used, a random sample is ideal. NCQA's work has indicated that a sample size of 30-50 patients would be necessary for a typical practice size of 2000 patients.

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 Data, Electronic Health Records, Paper Medical 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.

Medical Record

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)

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

Clinician : Group/Practice, Clinician : Individual

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

Outpatient Services

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

[1395_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 \(e.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims\)](#)

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)*

[No](#)

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.

[NCQA plans to eventually adapt this measure for use in electronic health records.](#)

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.

[Based on field test results, we have specified the measure to assess whether screening was documented and whether use of a standardized tool was documented. Our field test results showed that these data elements are available in the medical record. In addition, our field test participants noted that many were able to program these requirements into their electronic health record systems, and several implemented point-of-service physician reminders for this measure.](#)

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.

During the measure development process the Child Health MAP and measure development team worked with NCQA's certified auditors and audit department to ensure that the measure specifications were clear and auditable. The denominator, numerator and optional exclusions are concisely specified and align with our audit standards.

5. Comparison to Related or Competing Measures

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

5. Relation to Other NQF-endorsed Measures

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

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

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

5a. Harmonization

The measure specifications are harmonized with related measures;

OR

The differences in specifications are justified

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

Are the measure specifications completely harmonized?

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

5b. Competing Measures

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

OR

Multiple measures are justified.

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

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

Appendix
<p>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.</p> <p>Attachment:</p>
Contact Information
<p>Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner): National Committee for Quality Assurance</p> <p>Co.2 Point of Contact: Bob, Rehm, nqf@ncqa.org, 202-955-1728-</p> <p>Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: National Committee for Quality Assurance</p> <p>Co.4 Point of Contact: Rita, Lewis, lewis@ncqa.org, 202-955-5102-</p>
Additional Information
<p>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. Child Health Measurement Advisory Panel: Jeanne Alicandro Barbara Dailey Denise Dougherty, PhD Ted Ganiats, MD Foster Gesten, MD Nikki Highsmith, MPA Charlie Homer, MD, MPH Jeff Kamil, MD Elizabeth Siteman Mary McIntyre, MD, MPH Virginia Moyer, MD, MPH, FAAP Lee Partridge Xavier Sevilla, MD, FAAP Michael Siegal Jessie Sullivan</p>
<p>Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance Ad.2 Year the measure was first released: Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision: Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?</p>
<p>Ad.6 Copyright statement: © 2009 by the National Committee for Quality Assurance 1100 13th Street, NW, Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20005</p>
Ad.7 Disclaimers:
Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: