

Composite- Minutes

Thursday, October 12, 2017

8:14 AM

Focus of the SCOPE of the Conceptual Model

Extending beyond the original scope of the use care

- External artifacts that at not
- API-Davide

SCOPE

- Bryn: HED or Clinical Reasoning
- Combining an artifact without content or not structure content
 - Identifier to associate the responses
 - Scrap the guidance based on the identifier
 - Great-we do not have that use case anywhere
 - Track the artifacts
 - Not the Structure of an Identifier
 - Presentation by xxxxx worked with Decananse and integration for CSD into their system
 - They were not interested in the CONTENT but interested in tracking multiple systems for evaluation.
 - DSS knowledge artifact or the modular identified.
 - CSD Provider-Drug Drug Interaction and it is XYZ
 - Registry of KNOWN MODULES and ways to relate that without describing the content of the artifact
 - Decision support from multiple sources and combing into the results to make sure they identify care gaps
 - Lorraine:
 - VA Authoring-Identifier has come up and how to we ID an identifier scheme
 - Bryn:
 - Share the behavior
 - ID Artifact to track responses to it in a more consistent environment
 - Very interested in taxonomy for describing the types of deviations from the guidelines that an artifact would have
 - Meta data-Artifact is derived from some other artifact or

reference

- ☐ Further-Davide has done work into his area on the met a data side
 - ☐ What kinds of deviations they make.
 - ☐ DESCRIBE THE ARTIFACTS-Just in describing the behavior and how to understand at a more semantic level how to combine from multiple sources.
- Emory:
 - Attestation of the source material and the logic
 - What do they want to do exactly?
 - ☐ Source
 - ☐ Influence what exactly?
- Bryn:
 - How they deviate?
 - What ways was the artifact used to drive?
 - We cannot say much currently about the deviated?
 - Can ID how they used part of the criteria and ignored others in this context.
 - Those types of deviations when you are deriving from a Quality Measure
 - ☐ All we can say is they is they deviated
 - ☐ Davide work captures more detail of this.
- Emory:
 - Interesting
 - Document author cannot simply refer
 - Validate from a governance perspective that the
 - CDS rule is their signature
 - ☐ Mayo has derived or derivative work
 - ☐ Clinical content has to be accurate
 - ◆ KNART project
 - ◇ Being able to document fully the exact line or lines within a referenced journal article that a rule is based on.
 - ◇ Not referenced like a Bibliography and the exact line with inclusion and exclusion criteria.
 - Sounds like the presentation:
 - ☐ Incorporate the derived work
 - ☐ Annotate this particular derived work

- This particular attestation statement
 - ◆ Derivative work
 - ◇ Attesting you have validate
 - ◇ Reference was valid
- Rebecca:
 - Claims
 - Provider
 - Quality Measure
 - Used the data used clinical decision support to see that if the metric was met or not met
 - Pulling data from multiple sources
 - Gap in how it was derived.
 - Tell the provider if the metric was met or they needed to act on it
 - Claims HER-Documentation and an error and it never occurred and they need to adjust the work.
 - They are not updating the guidelines and the quality measure are around Value Based Purchasing.
- Lorraine
 - Codify the guideline
- Bryn:
 - Quality measure space
 - Derived in some way
 - DS derived from the guideline as well or the Quality Measure or both
 - Sense
 - Characterizing the criteria
 - ◆ Numerator and added this constraint because it did not make sense for our institution
 - ◆ Deviation from the source material
- Robert Larry:
 - Awareness and effort going on right now
 - Pedigree of diploma (OMG)
 - Requirements of what that will look like?
 - ◆ How is an artifact?
 - ◇ Derived original source
 - ◇ Methods
 - ◇ Where did it come from
 - ◇ Chain of custody of the artifact

◇ Started last month to develop these requirements

- Emory
 - Providence issue
 - What is the characteristic of the data it is applied to?
- Robert:
 - This is the work we are doing (OMG)
 - Variable sources of data validity
 - Represent the confidence you have in the information being provided.
- Emory
 - What are the scope for the Conceptual Model
 - Initial
 - Clearly articulate -KNART representation of logic
 - Additional refinement -ECA-Should there be meta data be applied from data from this source or this type of source.
 - Evidence-In scope for discussion on where and how much of that meta data we want to refine.
 - Conversation at OMG.
- Lorraine:
 - Document the touch points
 - API for Knowledge bases that Davide is working on
- Scope, do we include the Measures in the Conceptual Model
 - Conceptual Model
 - Include
 - Incorporate these into the conceptual model

Emory:

- Do they break away measures from rules?
 - Rules to including calculations?

Bryn

- General agreement
- Measures in the program spaces HEDIS-all use a very specific measure structure that has well defined calculations in them.
- In the space in general, there are lots of vendors and tools and utilities that derive rules from those quality measures
 - Patient focused

- Inversion of the measure logic
- A measure is a query that you expect results from
- Rule is a description of behavior will happen
- That is the part that makes a measure a very different class. I want a report

Emory:

- Reconcile that measures and rules
- Consistent with the artifacts already exist
 - ECA Rules
 - Doc Templates
 - Order Set
- Conceptual model clearly distinguish between measures and rules

Lorraine:

- Measure Resource

Bryn:

- Measure Resource-meta data has been harmonized across the plan definition and all the knowledge artifacts meet the same meta data structure
- HQMS specification itself and provides clear descriptions of what a measure is and it's format representation-Calculations in specific-Normative spec-

Emory:

- Floyd to provide material
- Limit scope to new TSS-Rules and Measure and NOT address predictive models in first version.

Lorraine:

- What is out of scope?
- Relationship of BPMN and might be something we care about.
 - Value

Emory:

- Workflow based and need to indicate
- Include workflow semantics within the
- Workflow as an artifact -Caviert and workflow is very prescriptive and has limited degree's of freedom. Knowledge artifact is more generally more
- Case Management notation
- Conceptual Model Clinical Artifacts

- Conceptual Model Clinical Artifacts
 - When does the KA describe the behavior
 - When does the KA describe the
 - Acceptable courses of behavior
- Case Management Notation
 - Goal
 - Course of Action toward that goal we will leave you the provider alone

Robert:

- How do we start using the KNARTS.
- Problem with the process-some are simple
- Clinical pathways can be elaborate
- Does the KNART can it consist of a process and a decision and a data model to support

Emory:

- Clinical Decision support artifact
- Names of knowledge that are being combined
- Suicide
 - Clinical specifications
 - Independent form operational artifacts
 - Acceptable and legal expectations_operational
 - Regulatory_constraints the diagnostic workup
 - Sometimes we try to create a KNART for all of those things
 - What are we addressing?
 - MD preferences add to the mix
- Discussion what is a boundary of the CDS
- Modeled separately.
- Bias we need to do that?

SCOPE

- Providence question in scope-Data Source
- Workflows

Out of Scope

Predictive Models-Stage 2

I can no longer hear.

