2022 NCCRT Annual Meeting

FOLLOW UP TO ABNORMAL NON-COLONOSCOPY TESTING





Follow Up to Abnormal Non-Colonoscopy Testing



2

Francis R. Colangelo MD, MS-HQS, FACP *Director, Outcomes Office, Allegheny Health Network*



Molly McDonnell

Director of Advocacy Fight Colorectal Cancer



David Lieberman

Professor of Medicine Oregon Health and Science University



Elizabeth Ciemins

PhD, MPH, MA Vice President, Research & Analytics, AMGA



The Policy Landscape

Thursday, November 17, 11:00 AM



Follow-Up Colonoscopy: The Policy Landscape

Molly McDonnell Director of Advocacy Fight Colorectal Cancer

FIGHT COLORECTAL CANCER™

Patient Support

A cancer diagnosis is scary. We believe no one fights alone.

Whether you're a patient, caregiver, or friend, we're here for you.

Policy Change

The key to changing cancer is through advocacy, policy and research.

From day one the focus of Fight CRC has been to get the voices of advocates heard.

Research Endeavors

It takes thought leaders, experts, and advocates working together to move research forward.

We're focused on funding promising, highimpact research.

Catalyst State-by-State Advocacy Program

Fight CRC's Catalyst Program aims to accelerate progress toward turning aspirational colorectal cancer screening goals into reality by increasing access and reducing barriers to colorectal cancer screening. Specifically,

- Remove patient cost-sharing for followup colonoscopies following a positive non-invasive CRC screening test for insured populations.
- Ensure coverage for insured populations to include 45-49 years old, as is now recommended through American Cancer Society & USPSTF guidelines.



and Virginia.

Catalyst Advisory Council



TERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION





Strategic Partners & Sponsors







Gastroenterological

EXACT **SCIENCES**

Genentech

Bristol Myers Squibb



State Follow-Up Policy Landscape





Follow-Up Colonoscopy Policy Efforts





ACA Compliant Plans
 Medicare
 Medicaid Expansion Population
 Traditional Medicaid Population

Scheme Grandfathered Plans

Follow-Up Colonoscopy Coverage



Looking Ahead: Implementation

Over the past two years we've seen incredible policy wins, now it's our job to ensure that patients actually benefit.



Looking Ahead: State Work



Advancing **legislation to remove patient cost-sharing** for colonoscopy following a positive non-invasive screening test.



Introducing and advancing legislation to **remove out-ofpocket costs for colonoscopy** following a positive noninvasive screening test.



Fight CRC will be awarding a limited number of smaller grants in 2023 for states interested in building capacity for policy work around colorectal cancer screening.

Looking Ahead: Federal Work

Expand the CDC Colorectal Cancer Control Program

Build on Existing Success

Increase funding for the CDC's Colorectal Cancer Control Program so it can expand to all 50 states

Leverage Successful Models

Provide eligibility for treatment through Medicaid for those diagnosed through the CRCCP as the Breast & Cervical Cancer Prevention & Treatment Act did

Thank You!

molly@fightcrc.org www.fightcrc.org



Thank You!





Closing the Screening Continuum: Updates from the American **Gastroenterological Association**

Thursday, November 17, 11:00 AM





AGA CRC Screening Initiative

David Lieberman Professor of Medicine; Division of Gastroenterology Oregon Health and Science University



AGA Screening Initiative Task Force



Continuum of CRC screening



Closing Financial Barriers to Screening







Phase II Screening Initiative Improving Adherence



Vision, hopes, dreams

 Table 4. Estimated Impact of Increasing Population-Wide Colorectal Cancer Screening Uptake in the United States, Based on Mean Results From 4 Established Screening Models

Total CRC screening uptake in the population		Colonoscopy uptake (absolute (absolute rate), ^a %		CRC cases averted, % CRC deaths averted, %			
65% ^b	65%	55	10	47	47%	53	53%
75%		55	20	53		61	
75%	+	65	10	55		61	
85%	85%	55	30	60	60%	68	68%
85%		65	20	61		69	
85%		75	10	62		70	
2.							

^aAssuming that those taking up screening do so with full participation over time with screening, follow-up, and surveillance. ^bApproximate current prevalence of screening among age-eligible individuals aged 45–75 years.

Challenges to Screening

- Education/awareness
- Access to initial screening
- Adherence when screening offered
- Disparities
- Barriers
 - Socio-economic
 - Access to health care
 - Transportation if colonoscopy needed
 - Time away from work
 - Childcare and elder care responsibilities
 - Disparities



Successful Screening Models

Successful programs

- <u>Kaiser, California</u> achieved >80% adherence with subsequent reduction in CRC incidence, mortality and elimination of disparities (Doubeni, 2022)
- <u>C-5 in NYC</u> achieved high levels of adherence in diverse populations



Lessons from successful programs

- Create access
- Develop effective education/communication
- Provide navigation



What is navigation?

- Education; answer questions
- Provide access to test
- Reminders to complete test
- Navigate to colonoscopy if non-invasive test is (+)
- Help with barriers such as
 - Transportation
 - Time off work
 - Child-care, elder care





CRC Screening Rates

American Cancer Society Goal: 80% by 2018



Levin et al; Gastroenterol 2018; DOI 10.1053/j.gastro.2018.07.017



CRC Mortality



Levin et al; Gastroenterol 2018; DOI 10.1053/j.gastro.2018.07.017



CRC Incidence- Late Stage CRC



Doubeni et al; NEJM 2022; 386:796-9



Piloting success



⊳aga

Proposed approach

Develop pilot framework

Screening continuum

Access and coverage

Navigators

Partner with health care stakeholders

Industry

- Non-invasive screening test
 companies
- Endoscopy companies

Payers

- Preventive benefits
- Health equity officers

Patient & provider diversity

- COCCI
- ABGH

Work with consumer-facing partners

Retail health

- Walmart, Amazon, Walgreens, CVS, etc.
- Provide key preventive health services
- Expand Flu/FIT model
- Identify high risk patients

Transportation Apps

- Uber/Lyft
- Collaborate on transportation
- Key barrier to care

Activate patients & providers



Patients

Grassroots campaign to reach black patients and underserved populations

Endoscopists

Work with pilot project coordinators and navigators to provide colonoscopy for positive non-invasive tests



It takes a village



Education + Access + Navigation = **1** Adherence









Thank You!





Work Toward a HEDIS Measure

Thursday, November 17, 11:00 AM



CRC follow-up screening measure

Elizabeth L. Ciemins, PhD, MPH, MA

National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable Meeting November 17, 2022



©2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

Presentation Outline

AMGA

- AMGA overview
- Measure specification
- Measure exploration
- Reliability testing
- Feasibility testing
- Face validity and qualitative insights
- Future directions

36
Copyright © 2022 AMGA. All rights reserved.

37

amga.org

AMGA: What we do





AMGA Research

Leveraging Evidence to Advance Practice





Integrating Evidence

Studying methods for integrating evidence-based practice into routine health care





Fostering Innovation

Discovering innovations originating in clinics that are responding to real-world challenges



Driving Change

Uncovering hidden meanings in data and the reasons driving behavior and process changes

More information at: <u>research@amga.org</u>

https://www.amga.org/performance-improvement/best-practices/research-analytics/

©2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

AMGA Membership





Copyright © 2022 AMGA. All rights reserved.





AMGA Analytics

Measure Development Project

[©]2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

Collaboration







©2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

Advisors



- Mary Barton, MD, Vice President, NCQA
- Frank Colangelo, MD, MS-HQS, FACP, Director, Outcomes Office, Allegheny Health Network; CQO, Premier Medical Associates, National Colorectal Cancer Roundtable
- Robert Smith, PhD, Sr. Vice President for Cancer Screening, American Cancer Society
- Richard Wender, MD, Chair Family Medicine and Community Health at University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine





To develop and test a <u>Colorectal Cancer (CRC) Screening Follow-Up Measure</u> that measures the receipt of timely follow-up with a colonoscopy after a positive stool-based screening test (fecal immunochemical test (FIT) or multitarget stool DNA test (mt-sDNA)) for colorectal cancer.

Current HEDIS Measure



Assesses adults 45–75 who had appropriate screening for CRC with any of the following tests:

- fecal immunochemical test (FIT) (annually);
- FIT + multi-target stool DNA (mt-sDNA) (past 3 years);
- computed tomographic colonography (past 5 years);
- flexible sigmoidoscopy (past 5 years); and
- colonoscopy (past 10 years).

Measure: Colorectal Cancer Screening Follow Up within 6 months after Positive Stool-based Test (SBT)





Index positive SBT (denominator)

Numerator compliant (measurement period)

Measure description



- The percentage of adults ages 45 through 75 who receive a diagnostic colonoscopy within 180 days following a positive stool-based screening test (SBT) for colorectal cancer (CRC) within the eligibility year.
- For the purposes of measure testing based on the available data (2016–2020), we will follow 2016 guidelines and test the quality measure among adults ages 50-75.



AMGA Analytics

Measure testing population

[©]2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

Description of data



- Data for this study was obtained from the Optum Labs Data Warehouse, a database* of de-identified healthcare claims, clinical, demographic and other data elements
- De-identified EHR data (including outbound billing claims) sourced from 38 health care organizations (HCOs)
 - May not include treatment, i.e., colonoscopy, performed outside the contributing HCO (8.6% difference in sub-analysis)

*Study data were accessed using techniques compliant with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) and, because this study involved analysis of pre-existing, de-identified data, it was exempt from Institutional Review Board approval

Exclusion criteria



- Age <50 years
- History of malignant CRC diagnosis, total colectomy, or hospice care*
- To isolate "screening" population by eliminating presumed diagnostic SBT:
 - Hospitalization or ER visit within 14 days of a positive test
 - Diagnostic SBT per CPT code within 3 days prior to positive test result

Attrition table for exclusion criteria



- All patients ages 45-75 with a positive SBT (213,812) 2016 - 2020Excluded patients ages 45-49 criteria (n = 200, 389)-6.3% analytic cohort Excluded patients with prior: CRC Dx, total colectomy, or hospice care (n = 190, 529)-4.9% year Excluded patients with inpatient or ER visit within 14 days prior to or following positive SBT (n = 119, 357) -37.4% Excluded patients with Dx CPT code (82271 or 82272) within 3 days of positive SBT (n = 114,729) -3.9%
 - Approximately 46% of the initial cohort did not meet the inclusion
 - 114,729 patients comprised the
 - 20,581 patients in 2018 eligibility

Patients in 2018

measurementyear

(n = 20,581)

©2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

Patient characteristics, measurement year, 2018

AMGA

Table 1. Patient characteristics, 2018 (n = 20,581)

Index age (Mean, (SD))	63.6 (7.1)	Insurance type (%)	
Sex, Male (%)	10,009 (48.6)	Commercial	13,138 (63.8)
Race (%)		Medicaid	1,056 (5.1)
African American	1,492 (7.2)	Medicare	4,733 (23.0)
Asian	307 (1.5)	Other or Unknown	1,654 (8.0)
Caucasian	17,705 (86.0)	RUCA (%)	
Other/Unknown	1,077 (5.2)	Metro UA	2,069 (10.1)
Ethnicity (%)		Large UC	165 (0.8)
Hispanic	644 (3.4)	Small UC	86 (0.4)
Not Hispanic	18,612 (90.4)	Rural	45 (0.2)
Unknown	1,325 (6.4)	Unknown	18,216 (88.5)
Education (%)		Smoking status (%)	
High School Diploma or less	1,932 (9.4)	Neversmoked	6,692 (32.5)
Associates or Bachelors	3,858 (18.7)	Not currently smoking	1,235 (6.0)
Higher than Bachelors	712 (3.5)	Previously smoked	6,019 (29.2)
Unknown	14,079 (68.4)	Current smoker	3,763 (18.3)
Household income (%)		Unknown	2,872 (14.0)
<\$40,000	1,156 (5.6)	Charlson index (%)	
\$40,000-\$74,999	1,482 (7.2)	0	11,423 (55.5)
\$75,000-\$124,999	1,595 (7.7)	1-2	5,900 (28.7)
\$125,000-\$199,999	606 (2.9)	3-4	1,687 (8.2)
\$200,000+	263 (1.3)	5+	778 (3.8)
Unknown	15,479 (75.2)	Unknown	792 (3.9)

AMGA Analytics

AMGA

Measure performance: percentage of patients with positive SBT who received a colonoscopy within 180 days

Measure performance, 2018 (n=38 HCOs)



Measure: percentage of patients with positive SBT who received a colonoscopy within 180 days



HCO size and performance, 2018

Median: 48%, Range: 13% - 67%







Performance over time, by HCO





Performance over time, by race





Performance over time, by ethnicity





Performance over time, by age







Measure evaluation

[©]2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

Evaluation

AMGA

- Sensitivity analysis
- Reliability testing
- Feasibility testing
- Face validity

Sensitivity Analysis



Absolute difference in follow-up colonoscopy rates between 90 vs 180 days (2018) (n=38)



- 90-day follow-up:
 - Mean: 36%
 - Median: 40%
 - Min: 8%
 - Max: 54%

180-day follow up:

- Mean: 44%
- Median: 48%
- Min: 13%
- Max: 67%

Reliability testing

- Signal-to-noise testing
 - Methods
 - Beta-binomial model
 - By healthcare organization, race, measurement year
 - Formula

Between-group variance

Between-group variance + group-specific or sampling/measurement error

- Good reliability:
 - 90% for individuals
 - 70-80% for groups





Reliability testing: Results



RELIABILITY				
Race (mean)	98%		Year (mean)	99%
Black	98%		2016	99.2%
Asian	95%		2017	99.3%
White	99%		2018	99.4%
Other	98%		2019	99.4%
Ethnicity (mean)	98%		2020	99.2%
Hispanic	97%		HCO (mean)	96%*
Non-Hisp.	99.8%			Range: 88–99%

*<u>Interpretation</u>: 96% of variance in the measure was due to betweensystem differences

Feasibility testing



- Three health systems conducted feasibility assessment
 - Evaluated data elements
 - Data Availability data readily available in a structured format
 - Data Accuracy data element >90% accurate under normal conditions
 - Data Standards data element coded using nationally accepted terminology standard, e.g., CPT, HCPC, LOINC, etc.
 - Workflow data captured during the routine course of care; how is workflow impacted?

Feasibility testing: data elements



#	Data Element	
1	Patient age	
2	Date and result of CRC screening SBT	
3	Encounter: Identification of prior CRC diagnosis	
4	Encounter: Identification of prior total colectomy	
5	Encounter: Initiation of hospice or palliative care within 12 months of positive	
6	Encounter: Identification of inpatient visit within 14 days of positive SBT	
7	Encounter: Identification of ER visit within 14 days of positive SBT	
8	Follow-up colonoscopy date	
9	Race	
10	Ethnicity	

Feasibility testing: partial results



	EHR #1	Allscripts Touchworks version 20.1.2		
Data Element	DATA AVAILABILITY	DATA ACCURACY	DATA STANDARDS	WORKFLOW
Patient age	1	1	1	1
Date and result of CRC screening SBT	1	1	1	1
Encounter: Identification of prior CRC diagnosis	1	1	1	1
Encounter: Identification of prior total colectomy	1	1	1	1
Encounter: Initiation of hospice or palliative care within 12 months of positive SBT	1	0	1	1
Encounter: Identification of inpatient visit within 14 days of positive SBT	0	0	0	0
Encounter: Identification of ER visit within 14 days of positive SBT	0	0	0	0
Follow-up colonoscopy date	1	1	1	1
Race	1	1	1	1
Ethnicity	1	1	1	1
SUMMARY				
Data Elements Scoring 0 within Domain	2	3	2	2
Total data elements	10	10	10	10
% of data elements requiring review within domain	20%	30%	20%	20%

Feasibility testing: partial results



F	Encounter: Initiation of hospice or palliative	data can be entered with a date and ICD-10 code but this is not
Э	care within 12 months of positive SBT	captured >90% of the time
C	Encounter: Identification of inpatient visit	inpatient stays are on different EHRs from different orgs; CCDAs are
0	within 14 days of positive SBT	received but are not structured/searchable data
7	Encounter: Identification of ER visit within 14	ER visits are on different EHRs from different orgs; CCDAs are received
/	days of positive SBT	but are not structured/searchable data



AMGA Analytics

AMGA

Face Validity and Qualitative Insights

[©]2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.

Qualitative Theme 1



Lack of knowledge about failure to follow-up All providers expressed surprise at the low follow-up rates.

"Until we had this conversation, I assumed [the follow-up rate] was 100%."

Qualitative Theme 2



Patient hesitancy around colonoscopy

- Not all patients are willing to have a follow-up colonoscopy even after a positive test.
- Discomfort with the colonoscopy preparation and procedure as a main concern of patients.
- Cost: follow-up colonoscopies after a SBT may be billed at a higher rate, or not covered (prior to 2021 change).
 "Something as simple as the prep [for a colonoscopy] makes a big difference to patients. That's the biggest thing that patients don't

want to go through"

Qualitative Theme 3



Trust and communication

Potential need for follow-up is regularly discussed at the time of ordering stool-based tests. Discussions with patients are the biggest facilitator to completing follow-up.

"As a provider, they trust you and your recommendations"

Facilitators and barriers



Facilitators of follow-up

- Integration with EHR
- Transparent reporting
- Ease of referral
- Dedicated staff
- Anticipatory guidance

Barriers to follow-up

- Lack of integrated gastroenterology
- Breakdown in communication of results, follow-up scheduling
- No typical "process"

"I think sharing data is excellent, I wish we were doing more"



measure submitted by health systems:

Reliable

Summary

- Feasible
 - May need to simplify exclusion criteria by removing inpatient and ED visit with SBT requirement

The CRC follow up measure meets the criteria for a quality performance

Face validity





AMGA Analytics

Questions & Discussion

[©]2022 AMGA Analytics. All rights reserved.



Thank You!





Q&A











nccrt.org #NCCRT2022 @NCCRTnews #80inEveryCommunity