

CSAC Workgroup – Revising the CSAC’s Rationale for Decision Making

Role of CSAC:

- Review and approve candidate consensus standards following public and member comment and voting by the NQF membership.
- Serve in an advisory capacity to the Board of Directors and NQF management on ongoing enhancements to the CDP and emerging issues in performance measurement.

Goal of the Workgroup: To ensure the revised rationale reflects the role of the CSAC and also aligns with the decision-making criteria of the Consensus Development Process (CDP) and the Measure Applications Process (MAP).

Overview of the Workgroup’s discussion:

- Over-arching role of CSAC is not to re-adjudicate decisions made by the Standing Committees, but to determine if there is consistency in the rationale used by Standing Committees when recommending measures.
- There should be transparent communication between CSAC and the Standing Committees. If the CSAC votes to overturn the Standing Committee’s decision, the CSAC should communicate voting results and the logic behind the vote, e.g., reasons why the CSAC did not uphold the Standing Committee’s decision.
- While serving in an advisory capacity to the Board of Directors and NQF, CSAC will consider policy implications regarding endorsement decisions.

Current - CSAC Criteria for Decision-Making	Proposed Changes
<p>1.) <u>Strategic importance of the measure.</u> The CSAC will consider the value-add of a measure, such as the strategic importance to measure and report on a measure and assess whether a measure would add significant value to the overall NQF portfolio.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the language. CSAC members should consider strategic importance across all the measures in the NQF portfolio. When deliberating CSAC members should ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does the measure have potential to improve patient care and patient outcomes?• Does the measure add value to the NQF portfolio?• Has the Standing Committee considered related and competing measures to determine strategic importance?

Current - CSAC Criteria for Decision-Making	Proposed Changes
<p>2.) <u>Cross-cutting issues concerning measure properties.</u> The CSAC will consider issues such as harmonization with other applicable measures in the NQF portfolio as well as risk adjustment.</p>	<p>Language change recommended. Cross-cutting issues concerning measure properties. The CSAC will consider whether criteria concerning measure properties are consistently and appropriately applied across the entire portfolio.</p>
<p>3.) <u>Adequate consensus across stakeholders.</u> The CSAC will consider concerns raised by councils and may conclude that additional efforts should be made to address these concerns before making an endorsement decision on the measure.</p> <p>4.) <u>Consensus development process concerns.</u> The CSAC will consider process concerns raised during the CDP, such as insufficient attention to member comment or issues raised about committee composition.</p>	<p>Language change recommended. Combine 3 and 4. The CSAC will consider all concerns raised during the CDP by all stakeholders, such as sufficient attention to member and public comment. CSAC may conclude that additional efforts should be made to address these concerns before making an endorsement decision on the measure.</p>