Future Directions for the National Healthcare Quality and Disparities Reports

Public Release
April 14, 2010
Washington, DC
Overview

• The Committee’s charge
• A vision for the NHQR and NHDR
• Changes to products
• Summary of 10 recommendations
Committee Charge

- Establish priority areas for quality improvement and disparities
- Update previous IOM guidance for the NHQR and NHDR (e.g., measure selection, framework, presentation, and data issues)
Committee Vision for NHQR & NHDR

- Be more forward-looking and action-oriented
- Focus on priority areas and on measures with greatest potential for impact on population health
- Ensure that equity is conveyed as integral to quality improvement
NHQR and NHDR

• Maintain two annual reports
  ▪ parallelism in measures
  ▪ flexibility on number of topics each year

• Use a shared *Highlights* section
  ▪ more broadly distributed as a standalone product
  ▪ include potential impact of closing performance gaps, state scorecard, summary of disparities, action messages to different audiences

• Add access measures to the NHQR and State Snapshots
Enhancements to Derivative Products

- State Snapshots (e.g., clearer dashboard ratings, easier access to rankings by measure, more detail on substate variation and subpopulation data)

- Online customization of reports by topic area

- Factsheets and mini-reports with more in-depth analysis for use in expanded outreach

- Greater access to primary data and tools for analysis
#1: AHRQ Use of Priority Areas

- NHQR and NHDR should report progress on national priority areas identified by IOM and identified as a result of the health reform quality improvement strategy.
- Align measure selection with priority areas.
- Priority areas would not change annually.
IOM List of Priority Areas

- Patient/family engagement*
- Population health*
- Safety*
- Care coordination*
- Palliative care*
- Overuse*

- Access
- Health systems infrastructure capabilities

*NPP priority area
#2: Updated Framework for Overall Balance in Portfolio of Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosscutting Dimensions</th>
<th>Components of Quality Care</th>
<th>Type of Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preventive Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acute Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic condition management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient/family-centeredness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Care Coordination

Health Systems Infrastructure Capabilities
The Relationship Between Priority Areas and the Quality Framework

- Priority setting and use of the framework are sequential steps
- First, establish priority areas
- Then, choose the metrics that are relevant to priorities:
  - using the framework to categorize by components of quality
  - applying value and equity in the committee’s recommended measure selection process
#3: Transparent and Quantitative Measure Selection Process

Appoint Technical Advisory Subcommittee for Measure Selection to NAC that should consider:

- Priority areas
- Ranking of measures by contribution to value (greater population health impact) and equity if performance gaps were closed
#4: Expanded Use of Subnational Data

- Use when national measure and data gaps exist

- Criteria for reporting subnational data:
  - Measure of interest (e.g., priority area)
  - Reliable and well-validated
  - Sample is representative of population on which it reports

- Be aspirational in identifying measures and data sources
#5: Expanded Use of Sociodemographic Data in NHQR and NHDR

- Informed by subcommittee report (August 2009): *Race, Ethnicity, and Language Data: Standardization for Health Care Quality Improvement*

- Stratify measures by at least OMB race, Hispanic ethnicity, SES, and insurance status; assess relationship of SES to race/ethnicity disparities

- Analyze by language need and granular ethnicity when data are available

- Document shortcomings in data availability
#6: Make Products More Action-Oriented and Aligned with User Needs

- Incorporate priority areas, benchmarks, promising practices
- Integrate NHQR and NHDR findings
- Build capacity for customized reports by topic (easy access to data about specific topics, fact sheets and/or mini-reports)
- Enhance access to primary data for researchers
#7: Include Realistic Benchmarks

- Base on best known level of attained performance
- Use same benchmark across NHQR and NHDR
#8: Consult with Communication and Presentation Experts

- Use graphics with embedded messages
- Use text to offer more in-depth analyses
- Include online more detail on statistical aspects of measurement for researchers
Telling a Quality Improvement Story

- *Messages about performance gap*: years to closure, relative benefit of closure
- *Ways to affect change*: data to inform policy, links to promising practices
- *Catalysts for achievement*: benchmarks for best-in-class performance, data presented by accountable units
- *Identification of measure and data needs*
#9: Additional Funds for AHRQ

- AHRQ should reallocate existing funds and leverage resources by partnering with other stakeholders (within and outside HHS)

- Additional funds are needed to:
  - Support the work of the Technical Advisory Subcommittee for Measure Selection
  - Enhance report-related products and engagement activities
  - Develop new measures and supporting data sources
#10: Regular Evaluation of National Report Products

- Do products meet audience needs?
- To what degree is information in the NHQR, NHDR, and State Snapshots leveraged to spur action?
Questions?
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