

SEER Data Quality Profile Goals

Winnie Roshala, BA, CTR, Director, CRGC Data Quality

The SEER Program is viewed as the standard for quality among cancer registries around the world.

The SEER Data Quality Profile (DQP) is a tool which is generated annually for each SEER registry. This profile assesses the extent to which each registry provides data meeting certain contractual standards. For example, the DQP includes the percent of cases for which a specific data item is coded as unknown and compares that result to the desired goal.

Annual data are also subjected to trend analyses to identify areas needing improvement and to monitor outcomes from quality-oriented interventions. Each SEER registry is evaluated annually based on the DQP report. Registries with exceptional DQP results are recognized by SEER.

The table below reflects the preliminary results of the November 2014 SEER data submission from the Cancer Registry of Greater California (CRGC). With the exception of the completeness goal of 98%, CRGC met all the SEER data quality profile indicators. These results could not be possible without the detailed, diligent, technical work performed by CRGC registrars. Thank you all for your continued commitment and dedication to producing high quality data!

Cancer Registry of Greater California

Preliminary Summary from the November 2014 SEER data submission

Based on 2012 Data

Data Quality Marker	Criteria	Goal	Result	Met Goal
1. Death Certificate only	2012 cases only	< 1.5 % and > 0.0 %	0.44	✓
2. Cause of death missing for patients known to be dead	Deceased patients coded as 7797 or 7777 or blank; 2000-2012 cases	< 2.5%	1.62	✓
3. Unknown or ill-defined primary site	2006 cases coded C76 or C80; DCOs excluded	< 2.5%	1.83	✓
4. Non-specific histology	2006 cases coded 8000 or 8001; DCOs excluded	< 2.5%	2.15	✓
5. Unknown laterality	2006 cases coded as 3 or 9; DCOs excluded	< 6.0%	3.59	✓
6. Unknown historic stage	2006 cases mapped to 99 in historic stage. Pleura, brain, lymphoma, benign/borderline and	< 10.0%	3.62	✓
CRGC	CHATS	Page 1	December 2014	

	DCOs excluded			
7. Invalid or missing census tract	Invalid census tract in designated county or unknown county	< 2.0%	.30	✓
8. SEER estimated completeness	2012 Cases Only	≥ 98.0%	97.02	
9. Follow-up age < 20	Invasive cases, 2000-2011 followed into 2012	≥ 90*; ≥ 80**	95.36	✓
10. Follow-up age 20-64	Invasive cases, 2000-2011 followed into 2012	≥ 90*; ≥ 80**	96.78	✓
12. Follow-up age 65+	Invasive cases, 2000-2011 followed into 2012	≥ 95*; ≥ 90**	98.91	✓
13. Follow-up all in situs	In situ cases, 2000-2011 followed into 2012	≥ 90*; ≥ 80**	95.49	✓
TOTAL				12

* Contractual standard

**Minimum acceptable

