Updating the Usability and Use Criterion

NQF Staff Update

Karen Johnson
Elisa Munthali

June 6, 2019

Overview of Presentation

- Background

- TEP Scope of Work, Tentative Timeline, and Proposed Composition

- Discussion

Background

Use as Must-Pass for Maintenance Measures

- **2012** Usability and Use Task Force

- **2015** "Vetting" of measures by those being measured and others—a new subcriterion under Usability and Use *[this subcriterion later renamed to "feedback"]*

- **2017** Differentiated between Use and Usability and changed Use to <u>must-pass</u> for maintenance measures

Criterion #4: Usability and Use

Extent to which potential audiences are using or could use performance results for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

Use (4a) Must-pass for maintenance measures

4a1: Accountability and Transparency: Performance results are used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement and are publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement

4a2: Feedback by those being measured or others: Those being measured have been given results and assistance in interpreting results; those being measured and others have been given opportunity for feedback; the feedback has been considered by developers

Usability (4b)

4b1: Improvement: Progress toward achieving the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations is demonstrated.

4b2: Benefits outweigh the harms: The benefits of the performance measure in facilitating progress toward achieving high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations (if such evidence exists)

Some Findings To Date

- A few developers have decided not to submit for re-endorsement due to must-pass criterion

- Few measures have failed to obtain endorsement due to this requirement
  - *Fall 2017 cycle and spring 2018 cycle relatively light in terms of submissions*

- Some measures recommended as suitable for endorsement even without passing this criterion
  - *Justification and/or plan accepted, even though this is not technically an option*

April 2019 CSAC Discussion

- Does it still make sense for Use to be must-pass for maintenance measures?

- If so, should timelines be modified?
  - *Used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement*
  - *Publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement*

- Should there be an option for justification and/or plan?
  - *If so, would this apply to use in accountability programs? To public reporting? What about the feedback requirement?*

CSAC Guidance To Date

- Need better definition of transparency
- Substitute an "OR" in subcriterion 4a1 rather than continuing to use the "AND", or in some other way making 4a1 less stringent
- Add improvement as an option for 4a1 (i.e., not limit to accountability uses)
- Provide more specific guidance about how to demonstrate improvement
- Refine the wording of subcriterion 4b2, and reconsider the language of 4b2 more broadly, (i.e., keep the concepts of improvement and benefits, even though these don't sound like "usability")
- Solicit additional input beyond CSAC and staff
- Form technical expert panel (TEP) to explore these recommendations further

TEP Scope, Tentative Timeline, and Proposed Composition

TEP Scope of Work

With collaboration from NQF,

- Clarify definition of transparency (include examples)

- Provide more specific guidance on how to demonstrate improvement

- Refine the wording of subcriterion 4b2, and reconsider the language of 4b2 more broadly, (i.e., keep the concepts of improvement and benefits, even though these don't sound like "usability")

TEP Tentative Timeline

- June 2019: NQF to invite TEP members

- July 2019: Initiate TEP meetings

- October/November 2019: Present recommendations to CSAC

- *December 2019: Post recommendations for public comment*

- *April 2020/Spring 2020 Review Cycle: Implement changes*

TEP Proposed Composition

8-10 members of TEP to include:

- CSAC members
- Members of 2012 Use and Usability Task Force
- Standing committee members
- Feedback Loop Committee members
- Measure developers

Discussion

Discussion Questions

- Is the scope of the work appropriate?

- Do you have any additional guidance for the TEP?

- Do you have suggestions for TEP membership (other stakeholder perspectives or specific people)?