



Quality Improvement Committee

NetWork or Guideline Panel Review Form

January 10, 2006

The American College of Chest Physicians (ACCP) Quality Improvement Committee (QIC) requests your comments regarding the attached set of performance measures, best practices, or other standards for which the ACCP has been asked to provide comments. The QIC developed a set of criteria to use in the review of proposed performance measures for improvement purposes and possible ACCP endorsement. These criteria will not only define the scope of the group's determinations but also the specific standards by which the performance measures and other standards should be evaluated.

QIC objectives:

1. Reliable and valid criteria
2. Measurability
3. Clinical applicability
4. Ease of implementation, including education on implementation

Please check the appropriate boxes on this form and, if you have additional comments or concerns, list them on the grid that is included at the end. Comments provided on the grid are particularly important, because they can provide additional specifications, references, or other guidance to justify suggested modifications.

Please return this form by the specified deadline to:

Sandra Zelman Lewis, PhD
Research Specialist
Health and Science Policy/Quality Improvement
American College of Chest Physicians
3300 Dundee Road
Northbrook, IL 60062-2348
T: (847) 498-8322
F: (847) 498-5460
slewis@chestnet.org

Thank you. We are grateful for your review and expertise.

REVIEW FORM

Measure Set: _____

Developer or Endorsing Organization: _____

CONTACT INFORMATION

ACCP Reviewer (your name), including NetWork or Guideline Panel affiliation:

Institution and Address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

e-Mail: _____

Measure/Standard/Item Number: _____

RATIONALE:

The rationale for the measure or standard is clinically sound.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

NUMERATOR:

The numerator includes the appropriate patient populations.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

The numerator inclusions are appropriate and correctly stated.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

The numerator exclusions are appropriate and correctly stated.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

DENOMINATOR:

The denominator includes the all of the appropriate patient populations.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

The denominator inclusions are appropriate and correctly stated.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

The denominator exclusions are appropriate and correctly stated.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

AGE GROUPS:

The listed age groups are appropriate for this measure/standard/practice.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

RISK ASSESSMENT:

The risk assessment is correct.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

PRACTICALITY:

This would be helpful to ACCP members, including physicians, nurses, and other practitioners.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

It is appropriate to the diversity of physicians and type of hospitals of ACCP members, including variation in practice size and location.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

ACCP members should not be burdened by the data collection necessary.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

There are no other barriers that are specific to ACCP chest, critical care, and sleep medicine physicians.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

IMPORTANCE:

This item assesses an important leverage point for improving quality, is significant to target audiences, and makes an important impact on health.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This item provides an opportunity for improvement as considerable variation in quality of care exists.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This aspect of quality is under provider's or health system's control.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This measure does not create incentives or rewards to improve without truly improving quality of care.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

SCIENTIFIC ACCEPTABILITY:

The relationship to quality is based on best available scientific evidence.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This item is well defined and precisely specified.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This item is valid, measures the intended aspect of quality, accurately represents the concept being evaluated, and has data sources that are comparable.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

An adequate proportion of total variation is explained by provider performance, and the amount of variation in measurement is small after provider performance and patient characteristics are taken into account.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This item is reliable, producing the same results a high proportion of time in the same population.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This item is precise and adequately discriminating between real differences in provider performance; a reasonable sample size exists to detect actual differences; and this item captures all possible cases and bias related to case exclusion, or limited data are minimal.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

Risk adjustment is adequate to address confounding bias, if applicable.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

USABILITY

This item is effective (understandable and clear) in presentation (and dissemination strategies exist).

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

Statistical testing can be applied to communicate when differences in performance levels are greater than would be expected by chance.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

This item has been used effectively in the past and/or has high potential for working well with other indicators currently in use.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

There is compelling content for stakeholder decision-making.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

FEASIBILITY

There is consistent construction and assessment of the measure.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

It is feasible to calculate, and the benefits exceed the financial and administrative burden of implementation.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

Confidentiality concerns are addressed.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

An audit strategy can be implemented; quality of data is known.

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

OVERALL

Overall, is this performance measure acceptable as written?

YES NO See attached Review Grid for further details

See specific additional comments on the attached grid:

Comments Grid*

PAGE	ITEM NUMBER OR LINE	COMMENT	JUSTIFICATION

* Wordsmithing should be performed only when it is necessary to influence the interpretation or meaning.