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Agenda for Center Outcomes Forum - 2020

• Center specific survival analysis 2020 – brief summary
  – Activities related to the Center Outcomes Forum 2018
• Is Minimal Residual Disease for acute leukemia ready for use as a risk adjustment factor in the center specific analysis?
• Are there new approaches to account for social determinants of health beyond those currently assessed in risk adjustment model?
• Can CIBMTR adequately adjust for the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in the center specific analysis and if so, how?
• Center Specific Analysis research project proposals
• Update on consequences of public reporting
Topics from 2018 COF – what has happened?

• Discuss impact of “enhanced” risk adjustment model implemented in 2018 - √

• Recommendations for variables to improve risk adjustment for pediatric non-malignant diseases √

• Consider new modeling techniques to handle center effect, prediction √

• Follow-up on recommendations about managing consequences – in progress

• Develop a research agenda regarding impacts – in progress
Recommendations 2018 COF: Consequences

• Work with ASBMT, FACT and payer representatives, develop a standardized process, timeline and documentation set for centers’ responses to first year performance below expected
  – Explore whether an approach using the FACT CAP process with purposeful center-payer communication can provide a better collaboration around quality improvement

• Define and propose research studies that advance our understanding of the impacts of Center-Specific Survival Analysis and public reporting on the practice of HCT
  – CIBMTR Health Services and International Health WC
  – ASBMT QOC, FACT QOC
ASBMT (now ASTCT)/CIBMTR Task Force
Proposal For Managing Center Consequences
Of SCTOD Center Outcomes Report

Navneet Majhail, MD, MS
On Behalf Of ASTCT/CIBMTR/FACT Task Force
Task Force Objectives

• Identify proactive and responsible recommendations for stakeholders to manage the consequences of center specific survival reporting

• Develop recommendations for constructive, actionable responses to be taken by various stakeholder groups in relation to the consequences of center specific survival analysis
General Recommendations

• Educate stakeholders about appropriate use of center outcomes report:
  • High-quality report and useful tool for evaluating center performance – provides only one aspect of center quality
  • Statistical methodology needs to be understood and limitations of the analysis considered
  • Tool to facilitate center quality improvement efforts
• Educational initiatives will be coming over the following year to assist centers, payers and other stakeholders understand appropriate usage of center outcomes report
Recommendation For Center CAP

• Background:
  • Provide a mechanism that reassures payers in a timely manner that centers are actively using center outcomes report for quality improvement – payers don’t drop centers from their COE networks in response to underperformance on the analysis
  • Build on mature and robust process that FACT has established to review corrective action plans for underperforming centers
Proposed Process

Program identifies low 1 year survival compared to international and national data

Program notifies FACT/submits CAP
*Within annual report*

CIBMTR publishes 1 year survival report

FACT identifies/notifies programs not meeting expected survival
*Within 2 weeks of report publication*

Program submits CAP to FACT
*Within 3 months of report publication*

FACT outcomes committee reviews CAP progress in inspectors report or annual report
*Within 2-12 months from CAP submission*

FACT outcomes committee gives recommendation to accreditation committee.
*Within 2 months from inspection or annual report*

Accreditation committee determines accreditation outcome and next step for CAP review
*Within 2 months from recommendation*

Outcomes committee reviews CAP progress and program outcomes until survival is within expected range

FACT outcomes committee reviews and approves CAP; requests additional information if necessary
*Within 6 months of report publication and within 3 months from self-reported low 1 year survival*
Other Considerations

- FACT will provide response to center for their CAP
  - Encourage centers to share FACT letter and CAP with payers (as applicable)
- Initiatives forthcoming that will provide education to centers on reviewing outcomes in response to center survival report, sharing best practices, and developing a good CAP
What has happened?

- Several payers have adapted their policies and processes in response to the recommendations over last 2 years
  - In some cases, centers may not have negative contractual consequences for first year of performance “below expected”
  - Enhanced dialog with centers to better understand their assessment, corrective action plans and progress
- Focused around FACT CAP
What should centers do?

• Thoroughly evaluate the outcomes and root causes
  – Usually, it is not just about the quality of data
• Develop mitigation steps and CAP in collaboration with FACT
  – FACT can help with processes and tools
• Pro-actively communicate with FACT and Payers
• Share the CAP with payers and set up a communication plan
• Implement the CAP, track progress and continue communicating
What are you noticing?

• Centers?
• Payers?
Thank you
Analytic Limitations

• A center may “underperform” based on statistical modeling by chance alone
  – 2.5% probability for 1 year
  – \( \approx 0.76\% \) probability for 2 sequential years

• Bad outcomes in a single year may have lasting effect over 3 years
Wrap up
Summary - Center Outcomes Forum - 2020

- Center specific survival analysis 2020 – brief summary
- Is Minimal Residual Disease for acute leukemia ready for use as a risk adjustment factor in the center specific analysis?
- Are there new approaches to account for social determinants of health beyond those currently assessed in risk adjustment model?
- Can CIBMTR adequately adjust for the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in the center specific analysis and if so, how?
- Center Specific Analysis research project proposals
- Update on consequences of public reporting
What is next?

- Summarize the recommendations and discussion and make available at cibmtr.org
- Please contribute your ideas
  - Contact any of the moderators, or
  - Consider joining one of the research proposals or submitting a proposal in the future
  - Suggestions for how CIBMTR can assist quality improvement efforts
  - Contact Douglas Rizzo
- Provide your feedback on this meeting
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