



Measure Information

This document contains the information submitted by measure developers/stewards, but is organized according to NQF's measure evaluation criteria and process. The item numbers refer to those in the submission form but may be in a slightly different order here. In general, the item numbers also reference the related criteria (e.g., item 1b.1 relates to subcriterion 1b).

Brief Measure Information

NQF #: 1388

Corresponding Measures:

De.2. Measure Title: Annual Dental Visit (ADV)

Co.1.1. Measure Steward: National Committee for Quality Assurance

De.3. Brief Description of Measure: Percentage of patients 2-21 years of age who had at least one dental visit during the measurement year. This measure applies only if dental care is a covered benefit in the organization's Medicaid contract.

1b.1. Developer Rationale: The disease burden of dental disease, particularly for children with low socioeconomic status, is high, and the damage caused by dental caries is irreversible. Receiving an annual visit would provide access to preventive care, anticipatory guidance and early treatment if necessary. This access, in turn, would greatly improve the oral health of poor children.

S.4. Numerator Statement: Patients who had one or more dental visits with a dental practitioner during the measurement year.

S.7. Denominator Statement: Patients 2–21 years of age as of the end of the measurement year (e.g., December 31). Report six age stratifications and a total rate: 2-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years, 11-14 years, 15-18 years, 19-21 years, and Total.

S.10. Denominator Exclusions: None

De.1. Measure Type: Process

S.23. Data Source: Claims, Electronic Health Records

S.26. Level of Analysis: Health Plan, Integrated Delivery System

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Aug 15, 2011 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Aug 15, 2011

IF this measure is included in a composite, NQF Composite#/title:

IF this measure is paired/grouped, NQF#/title:

De.4. IF PAIRED/GROUPED, what is the reason this measure must be reported with other measures to appropriately interpret results? None

1. Evidence, Performance Gap, Priority – Importance to Measure and Report

Extent to which the specific measure focus is evidence-based, important to making significant gains in healthcare quality, and improving health outcomes for a specific high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall less-than-optimal performance. **Measures must be judged to meet all subcriteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form
[1388_Evidence_MSF5.0_Data-635278481497691428.doc](#)

1b. Performance Gap

Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating:

- considerable variation, or overall less-than-optimal performance, in the quality of care across providers; and/or
- disparities in care across population groups.

1b.1. Briefly explain the rationale for this measure (e.g., the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)

The disease burden of dental disease, particularly for children with low socioeconomic status, is high, and the damage caused by dental caries is irreversible. Receiving an annual visit would provide access to preventive care, anticipatory guidance and early treatment if necessary. This access, in turn, would greatly improve the oral health of poor children.

1b.2. Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis. *(This is required for endorsement maintenance. Include mean, std dev, min, max, interquartile range, scores by decile. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included). This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.*

Tooth decay is preventable, and early diagnosis is important for successful treatment of periodontal diseases. While the overall trend in oral health has improved over the last 30 years, there remains a significant proportion of the population who do not have optimal oral health care. In the year 2007, reports showed that only 77 percent of Americans age two years and older had a dental visit within the last year. For those in poverty, the rate was 47 percent (CDC, 2008). Other reports have estimated that about 75 percent of children aged three to four years have never seen their dentist (dela Cruz., 2004).

Medicaid's Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) program is intended to provide regular dental screenings and appropriate treatment. However, according to a report by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, only 20 percent of children under 21 years of age who were enrolled in Medicaid and eligible for EPSDT actually received preventive dental services.

NCQA's HEDIS measure has shown that performance among health plans is low. The rate was 43.55% in 2007.

1b.3. If no or limited performance data on the measure as specified is reported in 1b2, then provide a summary of data from the literature that indicates opportunity for improvement or overall less than optimal performance on the specific focus of measurement.

CDC: Health, United States, 2008.

dela Cruz. G.G. MD, MPH, et al. Dental Screening and Referral of Young Children by Pediatric Primary Care Providers. Pediatrics November 2004. Vol. 114 No

1b.4. Provide disparities data from the measure as specified (current and over time) by population group, e.g., by race/ethnicity, gender, age, insurance status, socioeconomic status, and/or disability. *(This is required for endorsement maintenance. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities include.) This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.*

The most advanced oral health disease is found primarily among children living in poverty, some racial/ethnic minority populations, disabled children, and children with HIV infection. (CDC, 2004) Low income children are twice as likely to have tooth decay untreated, (CDC, 2007) and have half the number of dental visits compared with higher income children.

Medicaid's Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) program is intended to provide regular dental screenings and appropriate treatment but has apparently played a limited role in improving access to dental care for poor children. According to a report by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services, only 20% of children under 21 years of age, who were enrolled in Medicaid and eligible for EPSDT, actually received preventive dental services.

1b.5. If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Children's Oral Health.

http://www.cdc.gov/OralHealth/publications/factsheets/sgr2000_fs3.htm. Updated October 2004.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Children's Oral Health. <http://www.cdc.gov/OralHealth/topics/child.htm>. Updated Oct 2007.

1c. High Priority (previously referred to as High Impact)

The measure addresses:

- a specific national health goal/priority identified by DHHS or the National Priorities Partnership convened by NQF; OR
- a demonstrated high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare (e.g., affects large numbers of patients and/or has a substantial impact for a smaller population; leading cause of morbidity/mortality; high resource use (current and/or future); severity of illness; and severity of patient/societal consequences of poor quality).

1c.1. Demonstrated high priority aspect of healthcare

Affects large numbers, A leading cause of morbidity/mortality, Severity of illness, Patient/societal consequences of poor quality

1c.2. If Other:

1c.3. Provide epidemiologic or resource use data that demonstrates the measure addresses a high priority aspect of healthcare.

List citations in 1c.4.

In the year 2000, only 66.2 percent of Americans 2 years of age and older reported having a dental visit within the last year. For those in poverty, the rate was 47 percent (CDC, 2002). The CDC estimates that in the United States approximately 40 percent of children have caries (tooth decay) by the time they enter kindergarten (AAP, 2003); more than 50 percent have caries by second grade and 80 percent have caries by the time they graduate high school.

According to the recently released Surgeon General's Report on Oral Health, dental and oral disease are silent diseases that affect poor Americans—especially children and the elderly. Dental caries is the most common chronic childhood disease—five times more common than asthma. There are striking disparities in dental disease by income. According to a recent GAO report, poor children had five times more untreated dental caries than children in higher-income families.

Professional care is necessary for maintaining oral health; 25 percent of oral diseases in children are substantial. More than 51 million school hours are lost each year to dental-related illness. Poor children suffer nearly 12 times more restricted-activity days than children from higher income families. Pain and suffering due to untreated diseases can lead to problems in eating, speaking and attending to learning. Additionally, because tooth decay and periodontal disease are progressive and cumulative, poor oral health and dental disease often continue from childhood into adulthood.

Expenditures for dental services made up 4.6 percent of the nation's health expenditures in 2001—\$65.5 billion out of \$1.4 trillion (Health Care Financing Administration). Of this spending, \$3.1 billion was provided by Medicaid. In 2004, the national and Medicaid dental expenditures are projected to increase to \$78.0 and \$4.4 billion, respectively. The figures underestimate the true cost, since data on craniofacial health are not available. Total expenditures for dental services have been increasing 5–6 percent a year since 1995.

1c.4. Citations for data demonstrating high priority provided in 1a.3

CDC: Health, United States, 2002.

American Academy of Pediatrics—Section on Pediatric Dentistry; Policy Statement: Oral Health Risk Assessment Timing and Establishment of the Dental Home. Pediatrics 2003: 111(5).

American Cancer Society: Cancer Facts and Figures 2003. http://www.cancer.org/docroot/STT/stt_0.asp

Dental Services Expenditures, Percent Distribution and Per Capita Amounts, by Source of Funds: Selected Calendar Years 1970–2008, Office of the Actuary, Health Care Financing Administration.

1c.5. If a PRO-PM (e.g. HRQoL/functional status, symptom/burden, experience with care, health-related behaviors), provide evidence that the target population values the measured PRO and finds it meaningful. (Describe how and from whom their input was obtained.)

2. Reliability and Validity—Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties

Extent to which the measure, as specified, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. **Measures must be judged to meet the subcriteria for both reliability and validity to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

2a.1. Specifications The measure is well defined and precisely specified so it can be implemented consistently within and across organizations and allows for comparability. eMeasures should be specified in the Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF) and the Quality Data Model (QDM).

De.5. Subject/Topic Area (check all the areas that apply):

De.6. Non-Condition Specific (check all the areas that apply):

Primary Prevention

S.1. Measure-specific Web Page (Provide a URL link to a web page specific for this measure that contains current detailed specifications including code lists, risk model details, and supplemental materials. Do not enter a URL linking to a home page or to general information.)

S.2a. If this is an eMeasure, HQMF specifications must be attached. Attach the zipped output from the eMeasure authoring tool (MAT) - if the MAT was not used, contact staff. (Use the specification fields in this online form for the plain-language description of the specifications)

This is not an eMeasure Attachment:

S.2b. Data Dictionary, Code Table, or Value Sets (and risk model codes and coefficients when applicable) must be attached. (Excel or csv file in the suggested format preferred - if not, contact staff)

Attachment Attachment: 1388_ADV_Value_Sets.xlsx

S.3. For endorsement maintenance, please briefly describe any changes to the measure specifications since last endorsement date and explain the reasons.

S.4. Numerator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the measure focus or what is being measured about the target population, i.e., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome)

IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.

Patients who had one or more dental visits with a dental practitioner during the measurement year.

S.5. Time Period for Data (What is the time period in which data will be aggregated for the measure, e.g., 12 mo, 3 years, look back to August for flu vaccination? Note if there are different time periods for the numerator and denominator.)

The measurement year (12 month period).

S.6. Numerator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the observed outcome is identified/counted. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.

One or more dental visits with a dental practitioner during the measurement year.

See corresponding Excel document for the Dental Visits Value Set

S.7. Denominator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)

Patients 2–21 years of age as of the end of the measurement year (e.g., December 31). Report six age stratifications and a total rate: 2-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years, 11-14 years, 15-18 years, 19-21 years, and Total.

S.8. Target Population Category (Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):

Children

S.9. Denominator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

Ages: 2–21 years of age as of the end of the measurement year.

Report six age stratifications and a total rate:

2-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years, 11-14 years, 15-18 years, 19-21 years, and Total.

The total is the sum of the numerators divided by the sum of the denominators.

Note: Visits for many 1-year-olds will be counted because the specification includes children whose second birthday occurs during the measurement year.

S.10. Denominator Exclusions (Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)

None

S.11. Denominator Exclusion Details (All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

NA

S.12. Stratification Details/Variables (All information required to stratify the measure results including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format with at S.2b)

Stratified by age:

- 2–3-years
- 4–6-years
- 7–10-years
- 11–14-years
- 15–18-years
- 19–21-years

S.13. Risk Adjustment Type (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in S.12 and for statistical model in S.14-15)

No risk adjustment or risk stratification

If other:

S.14. Identify the statistical risk model method and variables (Name the statistical method - e.g., logistic regression and list all the risk factor variables. Note - risk model development and testing should be addressed with measure testing under Scientific Acceptability)

NA

S.15. Detailed risk model specifications (must be in attached data dictionary/code list Excel or csv file. Also indicate if available at measure-specific URL identified in S.1.)

Note: Risk model details (including coefficients, equations, codes with descriptors, definitions), should be provided on a separate worksheet in the suggested format in the Excel or csv file with data dictionary/code lists at S.2b.

S.15a. Detailed risk model specifications (if not provided in excel or csv file at S.2b)

S.16. Type of score:

Rate/proportion

If other:

S.17. Interpretation of Score (Classifies interpretation of score according to whether better quality is associated with a higher score, a lower score, a score falling within a defined interval, or a passing score)

Better quality = Higher score

S.18. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic (Describe the calculation of the measure score as an ordered sequence of steps including identifying the target population; exclusions; cases meeting the target process, condition, event, or outcome; aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)

Step 1: Determine the denominator

Children who turned the requisite age in the measurement year

Step 2: Determine the numerator

Children who had documentation of the screening or service during the measurement year

S.19. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic Diagram URL or Attachment (You also may provide a diagram of the Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic described above at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)

S.20. Sampling (If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)

IF a PRO-PM, identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.

No sampling

S.21. Survey/Patient-reported data (If measure is based on a survey, provide instructions for conducting the survey and guidance on minimum response rate.)

IF a PRO-PM, specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.

S.22. Missing data (specify how missing data are handled, e.g., imputation, delete case.)

Required for Composites and PRO-PMs.

S.23. Data Source (Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).

If other, please describe in S.24.

Claims, Electronic Health Records

S.24. Data Source or Collection Instrument (Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.)

IF a PRO-PM, identify the specific PROM(s); and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.

Administrative data

S.25. Data Source or Collection Instrument (available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)

S.26. Level of Analysis (Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

Health Plan, Integrated Delivery System

S.27. Care Setting (Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

Outpatient Services

If other:

S.28. COMPOSITE Performance Measure - Additional Specifications (Use this section as needed for aggregation and weighting rules, or calculation of individual performance measures if not individually endorsed.)

2a. Reliability – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

2b. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

1388_MeasureTesting_MS5.0_Data-635278481497691428.doc

3. Feasibility

Extent to which the specifications including measure logic, require data that are readily available or could be captured without undue burden and can be implemented for performance measurement.

3a. Byproduct of Care Processes

For clinical measures, the required data elements are routinely generated and used during care delivery (e.g., blood pressure, lab test, diagnosis, medication order).

3a.1. Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes.

generated by and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care, e.g., blood pressure, lab value, medical condition, Coded by someone other than person obtaining original information (e.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims)

If other:

3b. Electronic Sources

The required data elements are available in electronic health records or other electronic sources. If the required data are not in electronic health records or existing electronic sources, a credible, near-term path to electronic collection is specified.

3b.1. To what extent are the specified data elements available electronically in defined fields? (*i.e., data elements that are needed to compute the performance measure score are in defined, computer-readable fields*)

No

3b.2. If ALL the data elements needed to compute the performance measure score are not from electronic sources, specify a credible, near-term path to electronic capture, OR provide a rationale for using other than electronic sources.

NCQA may eventually specify this measure for electronic health records.

3b.3. If this is an eMeasure, provide a summary of the feasibility assessment in an attached file or make available at a measure-specific URL.

Attachment:

3c. Data Collection Strategy

Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, costs associated with fees/licensing of proprietary measures) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use). For eMeasures, a feasibility assessment addresses the data elements and measure logic and demonstrates the eMeasure can be implemented or feasibility concerns can be adequately addressed.

3c.1. Describe what you have learned/modified as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure regarding data collection, availability of data, missing data, timing and frequency of data collection, sampling, patient confidentiality, time and cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues.

IF a PRO-PM, consider implications for both individuals providing PROM data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured.

Based on data analysis over the years, we specified the measure to assess whether children received a dental care visits; we specify multiple age bands in order to enable assessment at various stages of a child's development. HEDIS results show that these data elements are available in administrative data sources.

3c.2. Describe any fees, licensing, or other requirements to use any aspect of the measure as specified (*e.g., value/code set, risk model, programming code, algorithm*).

4. Usability and Use

Extent to which potential audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) are using or could use performance results for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4a. Accountability and Transparency

Performance results are used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement and are publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement (or the data on performance results are available). If not in use at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible plan for implementation within the specified timeframes is provided.

4.1. Current and Planned Use

NQF-endorsed measures are expected to be used in at least one accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement in addition to performance improvement.

Planned	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
Public Reporting	
Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)	

4a.1. For each CURRENT use, checked above, provide:

- Name of program and sponsor
- Purpose
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included

4a.2. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application (e.g., payment program, certification, licensing) what are the reasons? (e.g., Do policies or actions of the developer/steward or accountable entities restrict access to performance results or impede implementation?)

4a.3. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application, provide a credible plan for implementation within the expected timeframes -- any accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement. (Credible plan includes the specific program, purpose, intended audience, and timeline for implementing the measure within the specified timeframes. A plan for accountability applications addresses mechanisms for data aggregation and reporting.)

4b. Improvement

Progress toward achieving the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations is demonstrated. If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible rationale describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4b.1. Progress on Improvement. (Not required for initial endorsement unless available.)

Performance results on this measure (current and over time) should be provided in 1b.2 and 1b.4. Discuss:

- Progress (trends in performance results, number and percentage of people receiving high-quality healthcare)
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included

4b.2. If no improvement was demonstrated, what are the reasons? If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, provide a credible rationale that describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4c. Unintended Consequences

The benefits of the performance measure in facilitating progress toward achieving high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations (if such evidence exists).

4c.1. Were any unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations identified during testing; OR has evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations been reported since implementation? If so, identify the negative unintended consequences and describe how benefits outweigh them or actions taken to mitigate them.

All measures that are used in NCQA programs are audited.

5. Comparison to Related or Competing Measures

If a measure meets the above criteria and there are endorsed or new related measures (either the same measure focus or the same target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and the same target population), the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure.

5. Relation to Other NQF-endorsed Measures

Are there related measures (conceptually, either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (conceptually both the same measure focus and same target population)? If yes, list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures.

Yes

5.1a. List of related or competing measures (selected from NQF-endorsed measures)

5.1b. If related or competing measures are not NQF endorsed please indicate measure title and steward.

5a. Harmonization

The measure specifications are harmonized with related measures;

OR

The differences in specifications are justified

5a.1. If this measure conceptually addresses EITHER the same measure focus OR the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):

Are the measure specifications completely harmonized?

5a.2. If the measure specifications are not completely harmonized, identify the differences, rationale, and impact on interpretability and data collection burden.

5b. Competing Measures

The measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., is a more valid or efficient way to measure);

OR

Multiple measures are justified.

5b.1. If this measure conceptually addresses both the same measure focus and the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):

Describe why this measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., a more valid or efficient way to measure quality); OR provide a rationale for the additive value of endorsing an additional measure. (Provide analyses when possible.)

Appendix

A.1 Supplemental materials may be provided in an appendix. All supplemental materials (such as data collection instrument or methodology reports) should be organized in one file with a table of contents or bookmarks. If material pertains to a specific submission form number, that should be indicated. Requested information should be provided in the submission form and required attachments. There is no guarantee that supplemental materials will be reviewed.

Attachment:

Contact Information

Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner): [National Committee for Quality Assurance](#)

Co.2 Point of Contact: [Bob, Rehm, \[nqf@ncqa.org\]\(mailto:nqf@ncqa.org\), 202-955-1728-](#)

Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: [National Committee for Quality Assurance](#)

Co.4 Point of Contact: [Jill Marie, Farrell, \[farrell@ncqa.org\]\(mailto:farrell@ncqa.org\), 202-955-1785-](#)

Additional Information

Ad.1 Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development

Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.

Over the years, the following expert panel has contributed to many of the measures in the HEDIS set that apply to women and children.

David Archer, MD
 Eastern Virginia Medical School
 Grant P. Bagley, MD, JD
 Arnold & Porter
 Thomas J. Benedetti, MD
 University of Washington Medical Center
 Denis Dougherty
 Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)
 Christopher B. Forrest, MD, PhD
 The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia
 Shirley Girouard, PhD, RN
 Southern Connecticut State University
 Bill Heuston, MD
 Medical University of South Carolina
 Mary Kay Holleran
 Highmark Caring Foundation
 Charles Homer MD, MPH
 National Initiative for Children's Healthcare Quality
 Marilyn C. Jones, MD
 Children's Hospital
 Milton Kotelchuck, PhD, MPH
 Boston University School of Public Health Mark Mandell, MD
 Partners Community Health Care, Inc.
 Dorothy Mann, PhD, MPH
 Consultant
 Robert H. Pantell, MD
 University of California, San Francisco
 Lee Partridge
 Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)
 Mark Pearlman, MD
 University of Michigan Health Systems
 Robin S. Richman, MD
 Harvard Vanguard Medical Associates
 Michael G. Ross, MD, MPH
 University of California, Los Angeles
 Medical Center
 Maureen Shannon, CNM, FNP, MS
 University of California, San Francisco
 Jeff Susman, MD
 University of Cincinnati
 Lynne S. Wilcox, MD, MPH
 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance

Ad.2 Year the measure was first released: 1997

Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision: 07, 2010

Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? Annual

Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? 07, 2011

Ad.6 Copyright statement: © 1997 by the National Committee for Quality Assurance

1100 13th Street, NW, Suite 1000

Washington, DC 20005

Ad.7 Disclaimers:

Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: