

## SEER Data Quality Profile Award for CRGC

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

The SEER Program is viewed as the standard for data 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 SEER 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. In March, CRGC received a SEER Second Place award for meeting 13 out of the 14 Data Quality Indicators, from our November 2015 data submission, based on 2013 data! SEER presented six first place registry awardees, having achieved 14 out of 14 Data Quality Indicators and five second place registry awardees.

The table below reflects the CRGC results from the November 2015 SEER data submission, based on 2013 data. With the exception of the percent complete as of February 2016, excluding prostate, (goal of 95%), CRGC met all the SEER data quality profile indicators. These results could not be possible without the diligent, accurate, detailed, technical work performed by CRGC registrars. This prestigious SEER award represents and reflects your continued commitment and dedication to producing high quality data! Thank you all and congratulations!

### Cancer Registry of Greater California

#### Summary from the November 2015 SEER data submission (Based on 2013 Data)

**Total number of scored markers: 14**

**Total number of goals met: 13**

CRGC	CHATS	Page 1	April 2016
------	-------	--------	------------

Data Quality Marker	Criteria	Goal	Result	Met Goal
1. Death Certificate only	2013 cases only	< 1.5 % and > 0.0 %	0.59	✓
2. Cause of death missing for patients known to be dead	Deceased patients coded as 7797 or 7777 or blank; 2000-2013 cases	< 2.5%	1.86	✓
3. Unknown or ill-defined primary site	2013 cases coded C76 or C80; DCOs excluded	< 2.5%	1.83	✓
4. Non-specific histology	2013 cases coded 8000 or 8001; DCOs excluded	< 2.5%	0.41	✓
5. Unknown laterality	2013 cases coded as 3 or 9; DCOs excluded	< 6.0%	3.40	✓
6. Unknown historic stage	2013 cases mapped to 99 in historic stage. Pleura, brain, lymphoma, KS, misc, benign/borderline and DCOs excluded	< 10.0%	3.97	✓
7. Invalid or missing census tract	Invalid census tract in designated county or unknown census tract for 2013 cases	< 2.0%	0.51	✓
8. SEER estimated completeness, 2013 data, excluding Prostate	From Data Quality report prepared by IMS, Last 10 Dx Years used if available	≥ 98.0%	99.17	✓
9. Percent Complete as of February 2016, excluding Prostate	From Data Quality Report prepared by IMS, 2014 Cases, Last 10 Dx Years used if available	≥ 95.0%	86.55%	
10. 1 year reporting delay	Difference between number of cases reported for 2012 in November 2014 and November 2015 data submissions	<2.5%	1.27%	✓
11. Follow-up age < 20	Invasive cases, 2000-2012 followed into 2013	≥ 90*; ≥ 80**	92.76	✓
12. Follow-up age 20-64	Invasive cases, 2000-2012 followed into 2013	≥ 90*; ≥ 80**	96.16	✓
13. Follow-up age 65+	Invasive cases, 2000-2012 followed into 2013	≥ 95*; ≥ 90**	98.80	✓
14. Follow-up all in situ	In situ cases, 2000-2012 followed into 2013	≥ 90*; ≥ 80**	93.79	✓
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>13</b>

\* Contractual standard

\*\*Minimum acceptable