Child and Adult Core Set Stakeholder Workgroup:
2020 Annual Review
Webinar to Prepare for May In-Person Meeting Transcript
April 23, 2019, 12:30 – 2:00 PM EST

Hello everyone, and thank you for attending today's event, the Child and Adult Core Set 2020 Annual Review Webinar to Prepare for the May In-Person Meeting. Next slide, please.

Before we begin, we wanted to cover a few housekeeping items. At the bottom of your audience console are multiple application widgets that you can use. You can expand each widget by clicking on the "maximize" icon in the top right of the widget, or by dragging the bottom right corner of the widget panel. Next slide, please.

Additional materials are available in the Resource List widget, indicated by the green file icon at the bottom of your screen. Next slide, please.

During opportunities for workgroup comments, workgroup members can comment either over the phone or through the Q&A widget. To provide a comment over the phone, press "5*" to raise your hand. Then listen for your cue to speak. The presenter will indicate when lines are open, and you will hear a recording telling you that your line has been unmuted. Note, you must be connected to the teleconference via your phone. The same process will apply to public participants, who will have an opportunity to comment at the end of the webinar. Again, public participants can press "5*" to raise their hand to speak. Next slide, please.

If you are unable to join by phone and you'd like to submit a written comment or you have any questions during the webcast, you can also click on the purple Q&A widget at the bottom and submit your question. Next slide, please.

If you have any technical difficulties, please click on the yellow Help widget. It has a question mark icon and covers common technical issues; however, you can also submit questions through the Q&A widget. Please note, most technical issues can be resolved by pressing F5, or command plus R on Macs, to refresh the player console. Next slide, please.

At the end of the webinar, you can provide feedback using the survey widget in the menu at the bottom of the event console. And, finally, an on-demand version of the webcast will be available approximately one day after the webcast and can be accessed using the same audience link that you used to access today's event. Next slide, please.

Now I'd like to introduce Margo Rosenbach of Mathematica. Margo, you now have the floor.

Thank you, Brice. Good afternoon everybody, or good morning if you're joining from another time zone. My name is Margo Rosenbach and I'm a vice president at Mathematica. I direct Mathematica's Technical Assistance and Analytic Support team for the Medicaid and CHIP Quality Measurement and Improvement Program, which is sponsored by the Center for Medicaid and CHIP Services.

Many of you joined us for the orientation webinar to launch the 2020 Annual Review of the Child and Adult Core Sets, which was held on February 14th, and it is my pleasure to welcome you today to the webinar to prepare for the in-person meeting, which will take place in May. I am joined by our co-chairs, Gretchen Hammer and David Kelly, whom you will hear from shortly.

Whether you are listening to the meeting live or listening to a recording after the meeting, thank you for joining us as we continue our journey to review the current Child and Adult Core Sets. We'll consider where there are gaps and seek to strengthen and improve the Core Sets by filling those gaps. Next slide.

First, I'd like to remind everyone of the charge to the Child and Adult Core Set Stakeholder Workgroup for the 2020 Annual Review. The Workgroup is charged with assessing the 2019 Core Sets and recommending measures for removal or addition in order to strengthen and improve the Core Sets for

2020. And to ensure that the measures can meaningfully drive improvement in quality of care and outcomes in Medicaid and CHIP, the workgroup should focus on measures that are actionable, aligned, and appropriate for state-level reporting.

By actionable, we mean that states can use the results to improve care delivery and outcomes in Medicaid and CHIP, and by aligned, we mean that, where possible, the measures are aligned with those used in other programs to minimize the burden on states, plans, and providers. And finally, when we say appropriate for state-level reporting, we mean that the technical specifications, the data collection methods, and the data sources have been tested and validated by states or are easily adapted for reporting by states. Next slide.

Now I'd like to share with you the objectives for this meeting. I'll begin by discussing a strategy for Core Set updates that can provide a framework for considering the measures for removal and addition, then my colleague, Bailey Orshan, will describe the approach to the measure review process. First, she will summarize the 14 measures that workgroup members suggested for removal and the 41 measures they suggested for addition.

Please note that the purpose of this meeting today is not to review or comment on the measures that will be discussed at the May meeting; rather, the goal is to provide guidance to workgroup members on how to prepare for the meeting in May. Bailey will describe the homework to prepare for the May meeting and the resources that are available to workgroup members as they review the measures. Bailey will also present the May meeting approach on logistics, including the plan for voting on the measures. Throughout the meeting, our co-chairs will share their perspectives and facilitate questions from workgroup members, and near the end of the meeting, we will provide an opportunity for public comment.

As you can tell, we have a full agenda today, and the purpose of this meeting is to convey information about the review process. We won't engage in discussion about the measures today. That will be the purpose of the May meeting. Next slide.

Now I'd like to briefly recap the key milestones in the Core Set annual review process. Following our orientation webinar on February 14th, we invited workgroup members to suggest measures for removal or addition, and the recommendations were due on March 8th. Since then, we have been developing resources for the workgroup members to facilitate their review of the measures, and here we are today with the webinar to prepare for the in-person meeting, which will take place May 7th to 9th in Mathematica's Washington, D.C. office. Following the May meeting, we will draft a report, which will be available for public comment in July, and the final report will be released in August. The 2020 Core Set updates will be released by December 31st, 2019. Next slide.

Now I would like to introduce and acknowledge the Workgroup for the 2020 Core Set Annual Review. Next slide.

In the interest of time today, we will not be introducing each workgroup member by name. This slide and the next one, lists the workgroup members by name and show their affiliation and whether they were nominated by an organization. Please note that the full roster is available for download in the Resources section of the webinar console or on our public website. Next slide.

As you can see from these two slides, we have an extremely qualified panel of voting members, who span a range of a stakeholder perspectives, quality measure expertise, and Medicaid and CHIP program experience. Next slide.

This slide shows the federal liaison reflecting CMS's partnership and collaboration with other agencies in collecting, reporting, and using the Core Set measures to drive improvement in Medicaid and CHIP. Thank you to all the workgroup members and federal liaisons for taking part in the 2020 Core Set Annual Review process.

Now I'd like to invite our co-chairs Gretchen Hammer and David Kelley, to offer their welcome and reflections on the objectives of this meeting.

David, I'll turn it over to you and then to Gretchen.

Thanks, Margo. And I'd like to thank all the committee members for being able to join us today. Also, thank CMS for this opportunity to provide feedback. As you will see on some of the subsequent slides, we will certainly have our work cut out for us. In our meeting in Washington, D.C., there are a very large number of measures to be taken under consideration, so hopefully the group that we have assembled here, we have great expertise, and we'll really be asking you to come to the meeting in D.C. fully prepared to really dig in and discuss the core measures, both additions and removal of measures from the Core Set. So, again, I'd like to thank everyone for attending today, and for your dedication to this very, very important effort.

Yes, and I would add my welcome and appreciation for all of the workgroup members. I think as Margo laid out, we have a very clear charge, and as David just laid out, that charge is quite massive at this point, with the number of measures that we need to work through. But I would just remind us of the critical importance of this work and the opportunity to really continue to drive continuous improvement in the program, and meet the goal of improving the health of the beneficiaries of the Medicaid program. So, we have a clear charge. We have a task to accomplish, and we have a clear reason to do it, and in my experience professionally, those things often lead to success, so I am highly confident that we'll be successful at our work. And with that, Margo, I'll turn it back over to you.

Thanks, Gretchen and David. That's actually a really nice segue to the next part of this presentation. Next slide.

Okay. So, now I'd like to take a few minutes to discuss the context and purpose of the Core Set to help frame the approach to the Core Set updates for 2020. Next slide.

I think as everyone knows, the Medicaid and CHIP programs serve more people than Medicare and the Marketplace combined. Together, Medicaid and CHIP served more than 72 million people in 2018. And until 2010, there was no standardized set of quality measures for assessing the performance of the Medicaid and CHIP programs. In fact, many of you were part of the initial efforts to develop the initial Core Sets authorized under the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act or CHIPRA. And similarly, the Affordable Care Act mandated the creation of an initial Core Set of quality measures for adults in Medicaid, and the initial Adult Core Set debuted in 2012.

Together the Child and Adult Core Sets provide a consistent set of health care quality measures for measuring performance in Medicaid and CHIP. They are intended to facilitate analyses of performance for the nation overall, as well as by state, and they are intended to facilitate trending over time to assess improvement in the quality of care in Medicaid and CHIP.

So, what does this mean for the Core Set annual review process? First, it means that the Core Sets should be considered as a whole and not just in terms of the merits of individual measures. It will be impossible to include a measure for every condition, subgroup, or type of service; thus, the workgroup needs to identify a consistent set of measures that can signal the quality of care without overburdening states, plans, and providers. Technically, there are a lot of good measures that could be recommended for additions, which means there will be tough decisions on the prioritization of measures for addition.

Second, it means that the measures need to be feasible and reportable by states. If a measure can't be reported by a majority of states, for example, due to lack of access to reliable and timely data, then the analyses for the nation overall and by state will be limited and incomplete. And third, it means the frequent turnover of measures in the Core Set limits trendability, as it takes at least three reporting cycles

to analyze trends and performance, and if states require additional time to incorporate new Core Set measures into their quality program, it can take even longer. Next slide.

With this context in mind, we now turn to a visual depiction of a framework for designing the 2020 Core Sets, and even looking beyond 2020. As you can see, this Venn diagram has three overlapping circles representing three components for designing the Core Sets for 2020 and beyond; feasibility, desirability, and viability. The goal is to balance these three components in designing the Core Sets, recognizing that the optimal outcome lies at the intersection of these three components.

At the top we have feasibility. This captures whether the data or technology to calculate a measure are available now or within a reasonable timeframe, or how long will it take until they are available. Feasibility is key to achieving the Core Set goals of obtaining complete and consistent data across states and over time.

The next component is desirability. This captures whether a measure is filling a need. Is it adding value to the Core Set, and is it useful? Measures should be added if they have value and are useful, and, conversely, be rejected or removed if they are not.

The final component is viability. This captures whether a measure is aligned with national and state quality goals, with available resources, and whether it's worth an investment. If the measure is not aligned or the budget is not within reach, or the return on investment is low, then a measure may not be viable.

Choosing measures at the intersection of all three components of feasibility, desirability, and viability is the ultimate goal for recommending Core Set measures for removal or addition. This framework is intended to help workgroup members think intentionally about the synergies and the tradeoffs among these three components in their assessment of measures for removal and additions.

I'd now like to invite Gretchen and David, again, to comment on the strategies for the Core Set updates before we turn to details about the measure review process. Gretchen and David.

Thanks, Margo, and, again, I can't really stress enough, from a state Medicaid program, the importance of feasibility. To be able to measure something and then to actually be able to collect that and reliably report upon that is really a huge task that the Medicaid agency at each state level has to deal with. So, as we're looking through the measures to be removed or to be added, we really do need to keep in mind that the measures really do need to be captured.

Also, I think it's extremely important that we think in terms of the key populations that we serve and trying to really drive quality improvement in the Medicaid program. Gretchen, I'll turn it over to you.

Yeah, I don't really have any additional comments. I think that the notion of making sure these are both actionable, aligned, feasible, desirable, viable, these are all great things for each of us to keep in mind as we go through the homework that Bailey is going to assign us before we meet together in May. So, thank you, Margo. Back to you.

Okay. And now I'm going to turn it over to Bailey Orshan, a senior researcher at Mathematica and the task lead for the 2020 Core Set Annual Review. Bailey, it's all yours.

Thank you, Margo. Next slide, please.

I will now spend some time summarizing the measures that workgroup members suggested for addition to or removal from the Core Sets. Before I get started, I want to thank the workgroup members for their time and effort suggesting these measures. The process is dependent on their suggestions, so thank you very much. Next slide, please.

This slide details the characteristics of the 14 measures suggested for removal from the Child or Adult 2020 Core Sets. The measures suggested for removal span almost all of the current domains and include 5 of the 26 measures in the 2019 Core Set, Child Core Set, and 9 of the 33 measures in the 2019 Adult Core Set. We have also included the data collection methods and measure types for the measures suggested for removal. Next slide, please.

This slide lists the 14 measures suggested for removal from the Core Sets by domain. This slide also shows the NQF number for measures that are endorsed and the measure steward. I will not go through each individual measure, as we will have plenty of time to discuss them at the in-person meeting in May. Also, the slides are available in the resource widget on the webinar platform and on the Core Set Review webpage. Next slide, please.

Workgroup members suggested 41 measures for addition to the 2020 Core Sets. The suggested measures are in the domains currently in the Core Set, as well as two new domain, long-term supports and services, and other measures. Over half of the measures use the administrative method or the administrative method plus another method, and the majority of measures are process measures. Next slide, please.

The next three slides list the measures suggested for addition by domain. The list also shows the NQF number and measure steward. This slide shows the nine measures related to primary care access and preventative care, three measures related to maternal and perinatal health, and eight measures related to behavioral health care. Again, I will not spend time walking through each additional measure. Next slide, please.

This slide shows the six measures related to the care of acute and chronic conditions, six measures related to long-term services and supports, which is a new Core Set domain, and three measures related to dental and oral health services. Next slide, please.

And, finally, this slide shows the four suggested experience of care or patient-reported outcome measures, and two measures related to continuity of insurance and health-related social needs. I would now like to turn it over to our co-chairs, Gretchen and David, for their comments.

Thank you. And, again, you can see there's quite an extensive list of 14 suggested for removal and 41 suggested to the addition to the Core Set, so, again, we will have our work cut out for us, so we meet face to face in Washington, D.C. Again, hopefully everyone will diligently do their homework. Obviously, you know, we have to do our due diligence, but, again, this is vitally important that we're able to come to consensus in order to make our recommendations to CMS. Gretchen, I'll turn it over to you.

Great. And, David, the only other thing I would add is that we recognize that organizing these measures into domains was really just an effort by David and I, as the co-chairs, and the staff at Mathematica, to make the number of measures easier to process. You know, just giving you all a list or giving us all a list of 41 measures without some organizing infrastructure, we thought could lead to chaos.

So, if you have a quibble with where some of the measures have been organized in terms of their domain, we could certainly talk through that. We recognize that we had to make some choices, and, you know, those really were just an organizing mechanism. So, we'd ask that you not get hung up on where the domain is organized but, rather, we will work through the domain as it is written, and Bailey will be giving you some insights as to the kinds of materials you'll be getting to support that conversation. But we really did think that we needed to organize the measures into some structure to support our ability to work through them and to help each of our brains sort of understand the constellation of issues and measures that are in each domain.

So, if you saw something in those last couple slides that gave you some pause, please just hold onto that pause. It's not that big of a deal. We were just trying to organize it into some structure that we could be

effective in working through the measures. Each of the measures will be considered independently and will be considered as they relate to the rest of the Core Sets.

Great.

Bailey, I'll turn it back over to you.

Perfect. Next slide, please. And now we're going to open up for questions from workgroup members about what has been covered so far. As a reminder, for workgroup members, if you'd like to speak, if you could hit "5*" on your phone, it will open up your line, and you will hear a recording when you're unmuted.

Invalid option.

Just a reminder, for our workgroup members, if you'd like to make a comment or ask a question, please hit "5*."

Operator, I understand we have one comment. Can you please unmute the line?

Certainly. So, I'm now unmuting that line. You should have your line unmuted, so please state your name, and feel free to make your comment.

Yes, this is Lowell Arye, and although you just told us not to be concerned about where things are, since I put forward most of -- you know, some of the provisions for the long-term services and supports, I do have a question, because when I sent them, I had to send them individually. But I'd also sent an e-mail asking that that they all be tied together under one rubric so that we could have a conversation as a whole under several of the different -- about all of the different outcome measurements for long-term services. And I noticed that two of them were put into one of the other components, so I'm trying to kind of get my hands around that and how that might be discussed. And if you want me to explain which ones they are, I can. But I just kind of didn't understand why some of the long-term services, ones that I put forward, were put into -- I forget which ones they were put into, but were put into the other.

Thank you, Lowell, for that comment. We will look at it before we meet in May. But, just to underscore what Gretchen said, a lot of the measures will be -- or all the measures will be considered individually, and we were really looking for a way to organize the discussion. So, we will look at it, and we appreciate that comment.

Thank you.

And I believe we have another comment.

We do. So, I'm unmuting that line right now. Caller, your line should be open, and you can make your comment at this point.

Hi. This is Jeff Schiff from Minnesota DHS. I was just curious if all of the measures that were nominated by committee members are on the list?

Yes, they are.

Okay. Thank you.

Okay. At this point, I'm going to move on. We will have more time later to continue discussion and comments. Next slide, please.

I will now spend time providing guidance to workgroup members on the approach to reviewing the measures suggested for removal from or addition to the Core Sets. Next slide, please.

In preparation for the May meeting, we request that workgroup members review all of the measures suggested for removal or addition. Workgroup members will have access to a SharePoint site that includes materials to help assess each measure's appropriateness and feasibility for the Core Sets. To guide your review, workgroup members should refer to the characteristics to consider for removal of existing measures in addition of new measures to the Core Sets. I will review these characteristics later in the webinar. Next slide, please.

The Mathematica Core Set team has prepared a number of materials to assist workgroup members with reviewing the measures. First, we have created a measure information sheet for each measure that was suggested for removal or addition. The information sheet standardized the information available for each measure to facilitate review. They include descriptions of the measures, numerators, denominators and other elements, the reason the workgroup member or members suggested the measures for removal or addition, use of the measures in other programs, and links to more detailed information about the measures.

Next, to provide context for the review, we provide information on the current 2019 Child and Adult Core Set measures. The information includes measure descriptions and the data collection method for each measure. We also prepared a fact sheet for workgroup members that details the reasons states provided for not reporting the Core Set measures for FFY 2017, which is the most recently available publicly reported data. This fact sheet is intended to help workgroup members understand the feasibility and challenges of state Core Set reporting.

Finally, we have provided a table that lists all measures ever included in the Child and Adult Core Sets, and which year the measures were added or removed. The Core Set history table shows the longevity and turnover of measures. We have also created a document that includes links to other useful resources on the Core Sets, including the 2019 Resource Manuals and Technical Specifications, as well as the 2018 chart packs, which detail information from FFY 2017 reporting.

Finally, we have provided a Medicaid and CHIP beneficiary profile that details the characteristics, health status, access, utilization, expenditures, and experience of the population covered by these programs. This profile can help workgroup members assess the gaps in the Core Sets and frame the salience of suggested measures for the 2020 Core Sets.

In addition to the resources to assist workgroup members with their review of the suggested measures, we have provided a measure review worksheet. With the large number of measures to review, this worksheet can help workgroup members prepare for the May meeting by organizing their assessment questions and preliminary vote. Next slide, please.

The next two slides are a reminder of the characteristics to consider for removal of existing measures, in addition of new measures to the Core Sets. These characteristics were originally shared during the orientation meeting in February. First are the five characteristics to consider for removal. These include actionability, which would include measures that are not considered useful to drive improvement in state Medicaid and CHIP programs, as well as clinical relevance and whether the measure no longer adheres to clinical evidence or guidelines; feasibility in terms of whether states have experienced significant challenges to reporting the measure, such as barriers to accessing data; whether a new measure or an alternate measure was suggested to replace the existing Core Set measure; and, finally, performance - have states consistently reported a high level of performance on the measure, which indicates little room for improvement?

Much of the information needed to assess these characteristics is included in the measure information sheets, and more detail can be found in the other materials posted on SharePoint. Next slide, please.

Next, I will discuss the characteristics to consider when reviewing the measures suggested for addition to the Core Sets. First, actionability, by which we mean, will the measure results be useful to states help them improve their Medicaid and CHIP program?

Next, alignment: Is the measure used in other reporting programs, such as the merit-based incentive payment system or MIPS program? Is the measure appropriate for state-level reporting; meaning, has the measure been tested and validated for state-level reporting, and is it currently used by any states?

Feasibility: Are states likely to be able to access the data needed to calculate the measure or could CMS offer technical assistance to facilitate complete and accurate reporting of the measure in the future?

And finally, strategic priority: Does the measure fill a gap area in the Child and/or Adult Core Sets? Again, much of this information is available in the measure information sheets or supplementary information for review. Next slide, please.

This slide is a screenshot from the workgroup member SharePoint site. It shows what workgroup members will see when you access the site. The measure information sheets will be available under either the Measures Suggested for Removal or Measures Suggested for Addition links. The other resources that I discussed are available under the Resource for Reviewing the Measures link, and we have also included a link to the Measure Review worksheet that I described earlier. We will be sending more information out about how to access and use SharePoint directly to workgroup members tomorrow, Wednesday, April 24th. Next slide, please.

To facilitate discussion at the May meeting, we are asking the workgroup members to do some homework. We are asking to review each measure suggested for removal or addition prior to the meeting. As a reminder, please use the Measure Review worksheet to report any questions, points for discussion, and your preliminary vote whether you recommend or do not recommend the measure for removal or addition.

Thank you in advance for taking time to prepare for the meeting, and we look forward to the discussion in May. I would now like to turn it over to our co-chairs, Gretchen and David.

Thank you. And, again, we have lots of work to do between now and the May meeting, and from my standpoint, we have, I think, 55 measures, so when you do some of the math, it doesn't leave a lot of time for a measure to be considered. So, I think it really is vital that we take a look at these measures, kind of deliberate on your own, and then come prepared to really have a good discussion where we can reach consensus around what measures really are the most important to be removed and/or added to the measure set.

I would also highly suggest that we not fall into the trap of trying to alter the measures or doing nuances to the measures, because that can, again, sometimes lead to inconsistencies and technical issues down the road. So, I think that we need to put our lenses on that the measures are, as they are specified by whatever organization has developed those measures. So, this is really very, very important work that we're asking everybody to do. We know that it's a huge time commitment. But, again, well really look forward to meeting with you and really, hopefully, coming to consensus on both additions and deletions to the Pediatric and Adult Core Sets. Gretchen, over to you.

Great. I would just reiterate that the materials that Bailey went through are really a treasure-trove of information. The Mathematica team has worked incredibly hard to pull together all of the information that they think we need as workgroup members to be prepared to successfully debate and come to consensus on the measures as they have been proposed.

So, I would really encourage a lot of time with the Measure Review sheet, spending time on that SharePoint site, and then, as David suggested, coming with a pretty strong point of view about where you think that measure should be, either removed or added, or not, in which case, and then obviously being open to hear the conversation and the debates. But we will have such limited time, it is critical that we all do the upfront homework, and I think Mathematica has done an amazing job in preparing resources for us to do that.

So, with that, I believe we'll open it up again to workgroup members for technical and clarifying conversation or questions around the materials that Mathematica is preparing and the approach that we're asking you all to take in terms of your homework prior to us coming together in a few weeks.

Yes, thank you, Gretchen. I believe we have one comment.

Yes, we do. I am unmuting your line now, caller, so please state your name and feel free to make your comment at this time.

Hello.

Yes, we can hear you.

Hello. Oh, okay. Great. I wasn't sure if the line was unmuted. Hi. This is Alice Tsai with the National Vaccine Program Office. Thank you so much for providing such thorough next steps for the homework. And I think this is a suggestion to all to consider, and as I noticed that several measures that were presented, I think, essentially if the workgroup can have a pre-discussion prior to May, in submitting our homework, that may help to streamline some of these debates, you know, which is always great, but just in term of time and efficiency and streamlining of measures. Just my two cents. Thank you.

Alice, this is Gretchen, could you clarify what you mean by a pre-discussion. I'm not sure I understand what you're suggesting.

Well, I think if I may, may I use one of the measures as an illustration?

Yes.

Okay. And I need to find the slides that you have for -- I'm sorry, I've lost track of which slide number did you present the measures to be added, if you can just give me the slide number?

23, 24, and 25.

Okay, great. Thank you. So, for example, the adult immunization status measure already includes influenza, as well as the influenza vaccine for adults 65 and older, given that it's a composite measure. So, that's an example, you know, in terms of the immunization domain, which is what my office represents.

Alice this is Margo, I can answer that. So, as you point out, we do have a number of immunization measures that have been recommended for addition to the Core Set, and, actually, one that's been recommended for removal from the Core Set, and we do plan to discuss all of them at the meeting. We do not plan any advance conversations because we want the meeting to be an open public meeting in May, and to provide an opportunity for all workgroup members to discuss all of the measures that have been suggested for removal or addition.

So, I think you'll find, and the workgroup members will find, that the materials that we have prepared, particularly the measure information sheets, provide a lot of detail about the descriptions of the measures, as well as what's in the numerators, the denominators, the reasons for recommending the measures for

addition or removal. And we're hoping that that information, which is really quite detailed, will help the workgroup members prepare for the meeting.

And as Bailey mentioned, the measure information worksheets that we're providing will provide an opportunity for you to note your questions that you have about the measures, any reflections that you have as you're reviewing the measures, and we know it's a lot of work to go through all the measures. We're going through all of the measures ourselves and really trying to understand them. There are links to all of the technical specifications in the measure information sheets, so people can really dig in and take a look at the measures if you like, and then bring that information to the meeting.

We also encourage people to be thinking preliminarily about how they might vote so that that information will be available when you come to the meeting. So, we're appreciative of all of the homework that workgroup members will be doing and then also looking forward to a very open conversation during the meeting as well.

And may I clarify, that's the package that workgroup members will be receiving tomorrow; is that correct?

That's correct. It will be posted on the SharePoint site tomorrow, probably in the afternoon.

Thank you.

Sure.

And, Operator, next comment, please.

Certainly. So, I am now unmuting the next line. Caller, you should hear your line unmute, and you can state your name and make your comment now.

Hi. This is Jennifer Tracey with Zero to Three and the Healthy Steps program, and I just had a quick question. In all of the materials that we will be receiving, is there a tally that would indicate for each measure how many workgroup members possibly submitted a measure for consideration or removal?

Yes. That information will be included.

Okay, great. Thank you.

Next comment, Operator.

Okay. I have unmuted the next line. Please state your name and make your comment at this time.

This is Sally Turbyville, Children's Hospital Association. Can you hear me?

Yes.

Yes, we can.

Okay, great. I've been having technical issues. I'm sure it's on our side. We've gone through some big IT transitions here. So, I have a couple questions. One, it is a lot of measures, both for removal and for addition, and I just wondered if some thought had been given to divvying up, you know, three or four measures across workgroups to be lead discussants, still requiring workgroup members to review all of them but perhaps presenting the pros and cons at the in-person meeting rather than just go to voting one or the other way?

And then my second comment is, we have to keep in mind when we're tallying how many workgroup members may have recommended a particular measure or not. There may have been an understanding that another representative was putting forth a measure for recommendation and that's all that was required was one recommendation, either for removal or addition doesn't mean that it's not informative information, but at least I did not approach this in trying to get in, you know, making sure that a measure has as many workgroup members pushing it forward. If I knew a measure was being put forward by someone else, given my own time constraints, I didn't put that measure forward as well, so just as a thought as we look at that. At least that's how I did it.

So, I would appreciate a comment, though, on the lead discussant's approach, realizing the downside might be that folks might not review all the measures. But we really have the responsibility to do that, but whether the lead discussant might be of use when we're at the in-person meeting to make it as efficient and effective, or two co-leads or something of that nature.

Sally, this is Margo. I'll start, and then others can jump in. So, first of all, thank you for your comment about the number of workgroup members suggesting a measure for addition or removal not being indicative necessarily of the importance of that recommendation. We 100 percent agree. I think we felt that we needed to include that information, in part, because we were reflecting a census of comments from multiple people in the cases where there was more than one person recommending the measure for addition or removal. But I agree that should not be reflected as any kind of weight of importance of the measure, either for addition or removal, so thank you for that comment.

In terms of the lead discussant, I think at this point, we have talked about various options for organizing the conversation. We do encourage everybody to review the measures and come to the meeting with their questions, their comments, their preliminary votes, and we will be calling on people during the meeting to provide those comments. We will be doing -- the Mathematica team will be doing an introduction to each of the measures. We have looked at the measures very, very carefully, and then we will encourage other workgroup members to provide their input, as opposed to having a lead discussant.

If you feel strongly about wanting to be able to talk about a measure, you will certainly have an opportunity to indicate that this is a measure that you will want to talk about at the beginning of each discussion. The co-chairs will be identifying who has an interest in speaking. But, otherwise, I think right now we're just hoping that all the workgroup members will do their own reviews and be prepared to come to the meeting to reflect on the value of the measures based on the criteria that we've been talking about.

That's really helpful, and thank you. I think the team at Mathematica kicking off each measure makes a lot of sense. It occurred to me as you were speaking, Margo, that I did have one other question that implicates how I review all these measures. So, we've brought the Adult and the Child Core Set teams together, and so does everyone vote on every measure regardless of its placement within the Adult or the Child Core Set?

Hi, Sally. This is Bailey. Yes, everyone will vote. And we thought about this one as well, and we believe that the workgroup has been comprised of people with different expertise, and some people, you know, have child expertise, some have adult. Others have measure expertise, and we really feel like, as a whole, you guys are best qualified to assess the measures, so we do want everyone that is eligible to vote to be voting on the measures together.

Okay. Okay. Thank you.

And this is Gretchen. I would just pick up on that. I do think that we would ask that each of us, as workgroup members, come with a collective mindset; that we're here on behalf of and as stewards of the Medicaid program, not as individual advocates for a particular point of view. It's my humble opinion that when you sign up to be on a workgroup, you're taking on the responsibility for doing what's best for the program not just advocating. We certainly need the breadth of expertise of people and their subject

matter expertise, but our charge, as clearly outlined by Margo in the opening remarks, is to create a Core Set that reflects the needs and the experiences of beneficiaries and the Medicaid programs that serve them across the nation, and that's why it's so critical that the beneficiary information is included in some of the material.

So, it is a balancing act to be both the subject matter experts that we all are in our particular areas. We all put measures in that are important to us, and a perspective that we have. But when we show up, we'll be asking everyone to transition away from that individual perspective to a collective perspective of what's best for the Medicaid program nationally and how do we, as a workgroup, you know, on behalf of Mathematica and on behalf of CMS, really deliver a product that will make the program better and stronger over time.

This is Margo. I'd like to follow up on one point that Gretchen just made, and also the information that Bailey provided about the resources we've developed. One of the new resources available this year is a Medicaid and CHIP beneficiary profile. It's a series of charts, of probably about 50 pages or so, that provide a lot of information about the characteristics, the access utilization, experience of care expenditures within the Medicaid program, and it's very wide ranging. It's not a hard document for you to look at, so I don't want people to feel overwhelmed when you open it up and see that it's a lot of pages. But I think what it does, to Gretchen's point, is it really gives a nice overview of the Medicaid and CHIP programs and helps to think about where there may be gaps in the Core Sets.

And I'll spoiler alert, you'll see that there are a number of slides that talk about long-term services and supports and the amount of resources, expenditures being devoted to that. And so, when you look at that, I think that provides really nice background information on the full scope of the Medicaid and CHIP programs and really thinking about how the program might reflect and how the quality measures might reflect the full scope of the program. I don't think you would need to be an expert in long-term services and supports to be able to reflect on that, and then think about how as a Core Set those measures might be incorporated.

We'll certainly have experts and long-term services and supports, and I think you'll see the write-ups about the measures try to reflect the variation, what the different measures might contribute. So, I think it will provide a really nice opportunity to engage in a bigger-picture conversation about what we want the Core Sets to look like. With that, I'll turn it back to Brice and Bailey, because we have a lot of questions in the queue again.

Sure. I'll go ahead and unmute the next caller in line here. Your line should be unmuted, so please state your name and make your comment at this time.

Hi. This is Laura Seeff from CDC. Can you hear me?

We can.

Oh, great. So, thank you, again, to the chairs and Mathematica for all the work you've done, and for what sounds like incredibly helpful material that you've assembled. A couple questions: Is there any expectation for additional homework for those of us who submitted a measure. It sounds like maybe the materials you've assembled did that for us. So that's the first question. The second is, in many instances or in some instances, a removal and an addition would have been paired, and I'm assuming that your materials would make that clear, because other committee members would want to see that context. And then the third question is, in addition to your request to us to either add or remove, you asked us to identify gaps where there were not yet measures. And it sounds like there may not be time in the two-and-a-half days to discuss it, but I'm wondering how you plan to address those, because I think, you know, at some point, those would be incredibly rich discussions?

Sure, Laura, I can take a first attempt to answering those. So, no, there is not any additional homework asked of the workgroup members that submitted measures. We appreciate that. We've taken your submissions and put them into the measure information sheets, so just the same homework for the rest of the workgroup members to go through, review those, process them, think about them. So, no additional work.

Yes, the measure information sheets do include when a measure was specifically recommended to be replaced by another measure, or if it was recommended as the replacement measure, so that information is there. And then, as for the gap, there is a little bit of time that we are planning for during the meeting to discuss that. As you know, this is an ongoing discussion, but there will be some time during the May meeting to start talking about that and, you know, that will be built on past conversations as well.

Great. Thanks.

This Dave Kelley again. I would expect if you submitted something for addition or deletion, that during discussion, we would hope that you would speak up, especially if you really are, you know, expert to that particular measure. And then, secondly, I think as we proceed, we need to be able to quote, unquote, harmonize the measures so that we're not deleting something and then adding something that's very similar. So, I think that they need to be discussed in that context.

Okay. So, we're going to take one more question, and I'm unmuting the caller right now. You will hear the recording come over, so please now state your name and make your comment.

Thank you. This is Lindsay Cogan from the New York State Department of Health. So, my question actually falls in line very nicely with the point you made David. Can you all hear me?

Yes we can, Lindsay.

Okay, great. So, when we go through the measures, I would just suggest that we not disjoint measures. For example, I wouldn't do all of the measures for removal and then go through all the measures for addition first. This is where I think, in the past, we've gotten into issues with that harmonization. I would encourage us to, instead, organize this where people have put up measures for addition to replace measures they've also suggested for removal, that you think about pairing those things together. It helps to kind of avoid the issues at the very end, where you would have maybe looked at this a little bit differently if you had taken into consideration the fact that the measure was suggested for removal because there's a superior measure, and they want it to put in its place.

So, just in thinking through the flow and logistics of the meeting, I'm not sure if you all had thought through maybe even pairing measures together; for example, there's several immunization measures. I would put them as a group. So, a lot of the issues we may have or points we want to make go across multiple measures, so that might be a way to help. It's not necessarily going to 55 discrete individual measures. You can almost group them a little bit more. I don't know if you've thought about that at all.

Lindsay, we have, and we will be, actually, sharing the agenda for the main meeting tomorrow, probably in the afternoon. And you will see that we have paired the measures for removal, in addition, by topic area. Immunization being one discrete area, as a matter of fact. I think that that is definitely something that we have in mind, to make sure that we streamline the conversation, and also enrich the conversation, as well.

Great.

Great. Thank you. So, I'm going to move on. I do know we have a couple comments remaining, and we will have another opportunity in a few minutes to get to those. So, next slide, please.

So, now I'll spend a few minutes discussing the approach for the May meeting. Next slide.

So, as I think we've mentioned a number of times, the workgroup will discuss a total of 55 measures -- 14 measures that were suggested for removal and 41 measures that were suggested for addition. The measures will be reviewed by domain, without regard to Core Set, and each measure should be reviewed in its specified form. For each domain, the Mathematica Core Set review team will provide an overview of the existing measures in the Core Set in that domain, then describe the measures suggested for removal, followed by the measures suggested for addition. Then we will provide an opportunity for workgroup discussion, followed by public comment. The voting workgroup members will then vote on each measure.

Please note that to be eligible to vote, all workgroup members will need to provide the Mathematica Core Set review team his or her Declaration of Interest form. For those who have not already submitted it, we will be following up between now and May 7th to request the form. And for those of you that have submitted it, we will be asking you if you have any updates. We appreciate your assistance with submitting or updating these forms. Next slide, please.

I'll now spend a little time providing additional information on the voting process for the main meeting. As I mentioned, voting will take place for each domain after workgroup discussion and public comment. We will be using an iClicker, which is a device used in many academic classrooms. Each workgroup number will receive their own device and will use it to vote on each measure. Prior to the first vote, we will have a few practice votes to give everyone the opportunity to familiarize yourself with the device and the voting process.

For each measure for removal, workgroup members will vote yes or no, where yes equals, I recommend removing the measure from the Core Set, and no equals, I do not recommend removing the measure from the Core Set. Similarly, for each measure for addition, a yes vote equals I recommend adding the measure to the Core Set, and a no vote equals I do not recommend adding the measure to the Core Set.

All measures will be voted on in their specified form, and there will be no votes for conditional support for measures. For a measure to be recommended for removal from or addition to the Core Sets, the yes vote needs to receive two-thirds of the eligible workgroup member votes. Prior to the main meeting, we will also be provided a fact sheet on how to vote. I would now like to turn over to Gretchen and David for any additional comments.

Thanks, and again, I want to thank everyone for being on the call today, and for being willing to take on this very large task of reviewing these 55 measures. This is very important to the CHIP and Medicaid programs, and we really need to come up with good recommendations that will really help to improve the quality of lives of those individuals that are covered under these programs nationally. So, I just want to thank all the committee members for your commitment and the time that you will put into this in the near future and really look forward to seeing and meeting with all of you in Washington, D.C. Gretchen.

And this is Gretchen. The only thing I would add is, you know, in some of our early conversations, and as we have approached this process, one of the guiding principles has been for it to be highly transparent and democratic, and I think as you have experienced in this webinar, the Mathematica team, again, has done just an incredible job of making sure that we are all equally prepared with the information that we'll be receiving tomorrow; that we're having the conversations in the open and in a transparent way; and that we're using a process that is highly democratic.

And so, again, I just want to call out the structures of this process and what we hope we are putting in place to ensure our success, and to give you all, as fellow workgroup members, confidence that we're following these structures to ensure our success. So, with that, I'll turn it back to you, Bailey.

Great. Thank you, Gretchen. And, Brice, now, can we go back to the remaining workgroup comments, please?

Certainly. So, I'm unmuting the next caller in the queue. Please state your name and make your comment at this time.

Hi. This is Carolyn Langer from Fallon Health. Thanks again for all your efforts. Just a quick question. Can you please remind me if we have finalized on a specified number of measures, or is that also something that we might be discussing?

Hi, it's Bailey. So, there is not a specified number of measures that the workgroup is striving to get to for the Core Sets. That is something that we're asking you to consider as you look at the measures that are there and you look at the other materials that are available, to consider what number that may be, and so that's up for discussion.

Okay. That's helpful, because if we were to, for example, conclude that we want no more than 30 measures, you know, that might lead some to prioritize in a certain way. Is that something that is worth setting time aside for as a discussion of its own during our in-person meeting?

Carolyn, this is Margo. I can make a few comments and, then, yes, I think this will be a topic of conversation at the May meeting. First of all, there is no magic number in the Core Set. CMS has not established one. Congress never established a magic number in the Core Set, and it has varied from year to year, depending upon the number of measures added, removed, and so on. And the measure, the numbers do vary, especially as measures change. For example, the immunization measure now incorporates the HIV immunization measure, and so once you do that, the number of measures goes down by one.

So, I think the number of measures probably is worth talking about, from the standpoint of parsimony and burden, and also just generally constituting a Core Set that reflects the program as a whole. But I think to mention the -- I just want to mention that there is no magic number, no target for the Core Set, and the prior authorization can take place in the absence of a target number of measures as well. But I'm sure that will come up, from the standpoint of parsimony and general burden on states' feasibility. Gretchen or David.

Thank you. That's helpful.

Gretchen or David, Anything about number of measures and parsimony?

Well, as a state Medicaid program, there are, I'll say all challenges when there becomes a very large number of measures, and we tend to perhaps lose focus if there are too many measures. With that being said, you know, we're a state that is primarily managed care, and we require our managed care plan to do the entire HEDIS measure set. So, again, other states don't have managed care and there are bigger challenges, so I think feasibility is really a big variable. But I think our homework is to really try to come up with the best additions, and if things do need to be removed, to think in terms of why they need to be removed and then replaced with others. So, we do not have a distinct number in place.

Obviously with 41 new measures, that would massively increase the Core Set, and so I think we do have a task in hand to be able to stratify those which would not be included, and, you know, maybe we need to think in terms of prioritizing, even those that do get approved. Again, these are all recommendations that will go to CMS, and they will be the ones to, you know, make the final determination.

Thanks, David. Brice, any other comments?

We do. We have one more, and I'm unmuting that line now, so please state your name and make your comment at this point.

Hello? Hello?

Hi. We can hear you.

Yeah, think is Rich Antonelli from Boston Children's Hospital. Again, a thanks, a big thanks to Mathematica, to CMS, and to our chairs. I'm trying to sort of weave all of this stuff together. I have to admit that I'm considering 41 new measures for the Core Set, David, I'm having a little bit of flashback to conversations that we've had in other forums about just, you know, how many measures do state Medicaid programs need to pay attention to, so I wanted to frame this. I wasn't able to extract this information from the discussion so far about the process. I think it's great that the staff will present the measures. I embrace the opportunity to discuss them within a domain. But I still don't have an appreciation yet about parsimony and harmonization. David, you used that term, and I absolutely want to echo that.

Frankly, I'm really nervous about adding 41 measures and having one potential example is the fact that we've got several immunization measures, and that's not the only one. But I guess, can you say a little bit more about the process; that is it just going to be on the basis of the merits of each individual measure, but actually, truly, have a criteria for what the best measure is within a group of potentially suitable measures, so, the goal here being true parsimony, if not true harmonization?

Thanks, Rich. Again, from my previous comments, you can't just look at each measure individually. I think we need to think in terms of certain groupings of those measures and what's already on the Core Sets, and think in terms of what is the value add of adding something, especially if it's very similar, or subtracting something.

So, for instance, what is the value add of influenza immunization in adding an older age band, and, again, when you look at LTSS, that's the growing population within managed care and within waiver programs that -- you know, it's an important topic. So, that's an example of harmonization of looking at, well, what's already on there, and what's the value add of adding a new immunization, or is there? Do we need to back up and look at the adult immunization package in general?

So, I think we will review measures, but I think there's certain ones that will naturally need to be lumped together as part of the discussion, and that's really the harmonization concept. And by the way, we do expect some bird calls during the meeting.

Thank you. Just in terms of the stats review, so the templates that we're going to be asked to review, will there will be an explicit component around the harmonization piece, or will that have to happen spontaneously and organically as well lump the measures together? I just want to make sure that there's a structured approach to that broader issue, and I don't know if that's to the chairs or to the Mathematica staff.

So, this is Bailey. I can comment on what is in the measure information sheet, and then the chairs can comment more on the discussion. So, the measure information sheet includes information on what other programs the measures are included in, and that was based on information that we had, so it may not be all inclusive, but it will help start that discussion. And if there's any information, we have those provided by workgroup members on other measures or things like that, that's included, it does not go beyond that. So, the discussion on harmonization with other measures and stuff like that, that is up for the workgroup.

Okay. Thank you.

And this is Gretchen -- go ahead, David.

I was just going to say that that's going to be part of our work, working with Mathematica, prior to and during the meeting, to make sure that we organize the discussion so that we can really look at the full

picture. But you should fill out the -- you know, look at the information, look at each measure kind of independently on its standalone merits, knowing full well that you really do need to take the full context into what's already on the Core Set. Is this adding value or is it redundant, or is the not adding any value?

And I was just going to confirm, David, the same thing. I mean, I think the reason we had this call was to explain to you how we were approaching. I think we've heard loud and clear that, while we want to maintain the commitment to looking at each measure on its merit, we cannot do it without the notion of the other measures that it relates to, whether those that are going to be added, potentially, or those that are going to be removed, or those that they're very similar to. So, that's the take-home message to David and I, and the team at Mathematica, that we appreciate getting that guidance and feedback.

The materials that you get should help us get there, and if you see relationships between measures, we encourage you to be prepared to share that information when we all come together. But David and I have heard loud and clear, as I think the Mathematica team has, that we need to organize the content in ways that supports the collective decision-making to not only look at the measures on their individual merits but also on behalf of the entire Core Set.

And this is Margo. I'd also like to note that on the last day of the meeting, when we convene on that Thursday, we have allowed the morning to come back and really take that high-level review of all the measure discussions that we've had, think about the prioritization, think about next steps for constituting the Core Sets, with the notion that while we're kind of heads down in each of the measures, that it may be hard to step back, and that we've allowed the morning on Thursday to really do that stepping back.

And there's one other thing I wanted to mention, and that is to apologize for misspeaking. When I mentioned the immunization measure, I inadvertently mentioned HIV, and I meant HPV, and so I'm sorry for anybody that had heart failure when I mentioned HIV when I really meant to mention HPV. So, wanted to correct the record for that. Now I'll turn it back to Bailey and open it up to public comment.

Great. Thank you, Margo. As Margo just mentioned, we'll now open the floor for public comment. As a reminder, public participants should press "5*," and an operator will unmute your line.

Okay. And, again, if anyone from the public has a comment, if you could press "5*," we'll unmute your line. Operator, can you confirm whether we have any comments.

We have no one with a hand raised at this time.

Okay. I will go ahead and move on then, and if anyone has a comment, we can get to it at the end. So next slide, please.

I will now mention a few logistics and reminders before we wrap up. Next slide, please.

The in-person meeting will take place May 7th through 9th at Mathematica's Washington D.C. office, which is located on the 12th Floor at 1100 First Street Northeast. The meeting will start at 8:30 a.m. on the 7th, and conclude at 12:00 p.m. on the 9th. We will open registration tomorrow afternoon, April 24th, and will provide an agenda for each day at that time. The public is welcome to attend the meeting, either in person or online. We ask that when you register you indicate whether you will be attending in person or via the webinar. Next slide, please.

As we mentioned, tomorrow the Mathematica Core Set team will send an e-mail to Workgroup members on how to access the SharePoint site to review the measures. If you need any help using SharePoint, or if you have any questions about the measure review, please e-mail our team at MACCoreSetReview@mathematica-mpr.com. Next slide, please.

On this slide, you will see links for more information on the Child and Adult Core Sets, and the measure review process. Next slide, please.

And as a reminder, if anyone has questions about the Child and Adult Core Set review process, please email our inbox that's listed on this slide. I will now check again to see if we have any public comments or any final workgroup comments.

None from either group at this time.

Thank you. Gretchen or David, any final thoughts?

Thanks, Bailey. Again, I want to thank everyone for taking time today, and for the time that will be expended in the near future, and really look forward to a very productive meeting face to face in D.C., and hopefully everyone will have safe travels. Thanks again. Gretchen.

Yes, I echo all of your sentiments, David, and, again, appreciation to the Mathematica team for hosting such a productive webinar. Bailey, back to you.

Great. Thank you. Brice, one more check on if there are any comments.

No. No hands raised.

Okay. Then please conclude the webinar.

Thank you, Bailey. So, this concludes the webcast for today. Please submit feedback to the presentation using the survey in your browser window when the event concludes. The on-demand recording will be available approximately one day after the webcast and can be accessed using the same audience link that was sent to you following registration.

If you have any questions, they can be directed to the MACCoreSetReview@mathematica-mpr.com mailbox. Thank you.