

CSAC Decision-making Criteria
Revised September 17, 2019

Role of CSAC:

- Review, approve and endorse candidate consensus standards following public and member comment
- Serve in an advisory capacity to the Board of Directors and NQF leadership on ongoing enhancements to the Consensus Development Process (CDP) and emerging issues in performance measurement

Overarching guidance

To ensure a consistent approach to endorsement decisions, the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) identified the following criteria to guide its decision-making. As a general principle, the CSAC should not re-adjudicate or overturn a Standing Committee’s endorsement recommendation, but rather determine if there is consistency in the rationale used by Standing Committees when recommending measures. The CSAC, however, may send a measure back to a Standing Committee for reconsideration if there are concerns with any of the rationale/criteria below. These concerns will be documented and communicated to the Standing Committee and the public.

Decision making criteria/rationale

Criteria	Notes/considerations
<p>1. Strategic importance of the measure: 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. To assess additive value and importance, the CSAC should consider NQF’s measure selection attributes including: outcome-focused, high opportunity for improvement, patient and caregiver focus, support integrated view of care, reasonable data collection burden, impact/prevalent condition.</p>	<p>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? <p>To inform the CSAC’s determination of “value-add” and “strategic importance”, the CSAC should consider these in relation to existing measures and through the lens of the 6 measure selection attributes that have been vetted by standing committees, the CSAC and other stakeholders.</p>

Criteria	Notes/considerations
<p>1. 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. Consensus development process concerns. 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 (e.g. returning a measure to the Standing Committee for reconsideration).</p>	