

## Electronic Clinical Quality Measures (eCQM) Design Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Date	Meeting Time	Location – Zoom Web Conference
February 28, 2017	10:00 am – 11:30 am	<b>Webinar link:</b> <a href="https://zoom.us/j/159823584">https://zoom.us/j/159823584</a> <b>Telephone:</b> (408) 638-0968 <b>Meeting ID:</b> 159 823 584

Design Group Members					
Patricia Checko, DrPH, MPH	x	Michael Hunt, DO	x	Tom Woodruff, PhD	
David Fusco, MS	x	Robert Rioux, MA	x	Nitu Kashyap, MD	
Craig Summers, MD	x	Nicolangelo Scibelli, LCSW	x		
Design Group Support					
Karen Bell, MD, CedarBridge	x	Sarju Shah, HIT PMO	x	Wayne Houk, CedarBridge	x
Carol Robinson, CedarBridge	x	Faina Dookh, SIM PMO	x	Betsy Boyd-Flynn, CedarBridge	x
Allan Hackney, OLG	x	Mark Schaefer, SIM PMO	x		

Summary	
<b>Stakeholder Sectors</b>	<p>Various eCQM stakeholders were identified and discussed. It was decided that federal payers and employers should be added to the Payers stakeholder group, with the caveat that connecting to systems outside of the state is a goal that is beyond the initial stages of eCQM planning. It was discussed that the ability to integrate measures and claim level data will be important for payers, and that understanding the value proposition of a centralized eCQM utility will be foundational to moving an eCQM system forward.</p> <p>It was discussed that consumers are a large stakeholder group, encompassing behavioral health, and an important issue for consumers is the confidential sharing of information with providers. It was discussed that health information crosses into community health and public health, where the issue of equity needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Various provider groups, including behavioral health providers and Federally Qualified Health Centers, were discussed by the members. Reporting efforts already under way were discussed, and it was recommended that as different provider groups are collecting data from different sources and providing data for different uses, the provider groups should be considered as separate individual stakeholder groups for the purpose of the Design Group.</p>
<b>Value Propositions</b>	<p>Various value propositions were reviewed by the members. The value proposition “Decreased administrative costs for all quality measurement activities” was discussed and that decreasing administrative burden is a long-term value. It was noted that in the short term, eCQMs may increase costs in the FQHC environment.</p> <p>The value proposition “marketing advantages” was discussed, and it was noted that there is a general lack of understanding about how healthcare is delivered and how healthcare business is managed. It was recommended that “marketing advantages” be included in the list of value propositions.</p> <p>At this time “accreditations / certifications” is not considered a priority value proposition and has been tabled.</p> <p>An example of the value proposition “clinical quality improvement efforts” was discussed, in that there would be immediate value for a localized aggregator to pull in data sources to show if tests (eye exam, colonoscopies, etc.) were completed after a physician order, closing the care gap. It was</p>

**Electronic Clinical Quality Measures (eCQM) Design Group  
Meeting Summary**

	<p>discussed that a localized aggregator would remove the need for a patient to inform their PCP that they have seen a specialist.</p> <p>It was recommended that “health equity” be added to the value proposition “assessment of health status by non-clinical characteristics.” The point was raised that having non-clinical data which become determinants of health alongside the eCQM would help in the effort toward equity for consumers.</p> <p>Discussion took place on the nature of the proposed eCQM solution. Two approaches were noted: a gathering and housing of data for quality measurement only, and a functional exchange mechanism for sharing data elements that could be used for patient care purposes. Further discussion will take place at future meetings.</p>
<b>Next Steps and Final Comments</b>	<p>A matrix of stakeholders / value propositions will be developed and circulated to members for comment along with a use case template to be filled out. It was requested that members solicit feedback from their respective stakeholder sectors on value propositions and priority use cases.</p> <p>It was recommended that the group be as clear and direct as possible in articulating the nomenclature surrounding the eCQM solution.</p>

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Circulate Stakeholder/Value Proposition Matrix	CedarBridge Group	3/1/17
Circulate Use Case Template	CedarBridge Group	3/1/17
Review Use Case Template and Stakeholder/Value Proposition Matrix	Design Group members	3/3/17