



NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM

CDP Redesign Update: Performance Metrics

Jean-Luc Tilly, Senior Data Analytics Manager
Alexis Morgan, Senior Managing Director

March 27, 2018

Background

- NQF hosted a Kaizen event on May 18-19, 2017 to explore opportunities for a more agile and efficient Consensus Development Process (CDP)
- NQF, in collaboration with CMS, sought to :
 - *Improve coordination among CMS, developers, and NQF to better facilitate timely evaluation of measures*
 - *Increase opportunities for submission and timely review of measures*
 - *Reduce cycle time of the CDP*
 - *Improve flow of information between the CDP and Measure Applications Partnership (MAP) processes*

Changes to the CDP

- All changes effective October 2017
- More frequent measure submission opportunities (Twice each year)
- New intent to submit process
- A newly-formed NQF Scientific Methods Panel to augment committees' review of reliability and validity
- Expanded and continuous commenting period—with support/non-support
- Change in the content and structure of the measure evaluation technical report
- Enhancements in stakeholder training and education

Performance Metrics

- Developed metrics as a baseline to further assess the efficiency of the redesigned CDP
- Metrics are specifically related to the overall process: Intent to Submit process, Scientific Methods Panel review, streamlined commenting, and NQF members' expression of support/not support
- Data are collected following each evaluation cycle

Performance Metrics

Performance Metrics: General

Percent of time a step within the Consensus Development Process was not completed within the predicated timeframe

Total number of measures withdrawn for endorsement consideration by the measure steward/developer

Total number of reconsideration requests submitted by measure stewards/developers

Performance Metrics: Intent to Submit

Total number of intent to submit forms received per topic area

Performance Metrics: Measure Submission

Total number of new measures submitted for endorsement consideration per topic area

Performance Metrics

Performance Metrics: Scientific Methods Panel

Total number of complex measures submitted for review by the Scientific Methods Panel

Total number of complex measures that received “low” or “insufficient” ratings from the Scientific Methods Panel

Percent of time the standing committees were in agreement with the Scientific Methods Panel’s recommendations

Percent of time the Scientific Methods Panel’s recommendations were overturned by standing committees

Average turnover rate for the Scientific Methods Panel

Percent of time the Scientific Methods Panel’s co-chairs arbitrated a 3-member Panel’s split decision

Performance Metrics

Performance Metrics: Continuous Public Commenting with NQF Member Expression of Support

Percent of time NQF members and the public commented prior to the standing committees' recommendations of the submitted measures

Percent of NQF member organizations that expressed support or not support of the submitted measures per topic area

Performance Metrics: Measure Endorsement

Total number of measures submitted (new and maintenance) and of those measures the total number that were endorsed per topic area

Performance Metrics: Measure Appeals

Total number of appeals received

Performance Metrics: Intent to Submit

Intent to Submit			
Fall 2017		Spring 2018	
Topic Area	Number of measures	Topic Area	Number of measures
All-Cause Admissions and Readmissions	1	All-Cause Admissions and Readmissions	4
Behavioral Health	5	Behavioral Health	10
Cancer	2	Cancer	7
Cardiovascular	5	Cardiovascular	9
Patient Experience and Function	7	Cost and Efficiency	5
Patient Safety	1	Geriatric and Palliative Care	5
Perinatal and Women's Health	1	Patient Experience and Function	12
Prevention and Population Health	8	Patient Safety	9
Surgery	7	Pediatric	1
		Perinatal and Women's Health	1
		Prevention and Population Health	8
		Primary Care and Chronic Illness	13
		Renal	4
		Surgery	13
TOTAL	37	TOTAL	101

Performance Metrics: Measure Submission

Fall 2017 Measure Submissions		
Topic Area	New Measures	Maintenance Measures
Behavioral Health and Substance Use	5	0
Cancer	2	0
Cardiovascular	1	4
Patient Experience and Function	6	2
Patient Safety	1	0
Perinatal and Women's Health	1	0
Prevention and Population Health	0	8
Surgery	3	1
TOTAL	19 12 - process 6 - outcome 1 - composite	15 10- process 5 - outcome

Performance Metrics: Methods Panel

Scientific Methods Panel <i>Measures submitted for review</i>			
Fall 2017		Spring 2018*	
Cardiovascular	1	Cardiovascular	1
Perinatal	1	All Cause Admission/Readmission	4
Surgery	4	Cost and Efficiency	1
Patient Experience and Function	2	Geriatric and End-of-life	3
		Surgery	2
		Patient Experience and Function	6
		Primary Care and Chronic Illness	2
		Renal	2
TOTAL	8	TOTAL	21

- Of the eight measures reviewed during the Fall 2017 cycle, four measures were rated as low/insufficient by the assigned panel members.
- Five of the eight measures (63%) were split-decision and arbitrated by the co-chairs.

CSAC Discussion Questions

- Are these the right metrics to adequately evaluate the redesigned CDP?
- What other aspects of the redesign should NQF assess? Are we missing anything?



CDP Redesign Update: Scientific Methods Panel

March 27, 2018

Background

- Charge of the Scientific Methods Panel
 - *Conduct evaluation of complex measures for the criterion of Scientific Acceptability*
 - *Serve in an advisory capacity to NQF on methodologic issues, including those related to measure testing, risk adjustment, and measurement approaches.*
- 24 Methods Panel members (seated September 2017)

Activities

- Reviewed 8 measures in the Fall 2017 cycle and 21 measures in the Spring 2018 cycle
- Completed five monthly calls. Discussions included:
 - *Overview of Measure Evaluation Criteria*
 - *Process Recommendations and Updates*
 - *Methods Topics:*
 - » “Split-Half Method” to assess reliability
 - » Definition of Reliability

Performance Metrics To Date

Metrics	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Total number of complex measures submitted for evaluation by the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP)	8	21
<i>Unanimous “pass”</i>	2	TBD
<i>Unanimous “did not pass”</i>	1	TBD
<i>Split decision: co-chairs arbitrated</i>	5	TBD
Total number of complex measures that received “low” or “insufficient” ratings from the SMP (i.e., did not go to SC)	4	TBD
Percent of time the standing committees were in agreement with the Scientific Methods Panel’s recommendations	75%	TBD
Percent of time the Scientific Methods Panel’s recommendations were overturned by standing committees	25%	TBD
Average turnover rate of SMP membership	0%	0%

Progress To Date

- Process changes/enhancements
 - *Staff review of MP evaluations needed (for now)*
 - *Minor revisions to evaluation form*
 - *For maintenance measures, staff will provide a summary of the last evaluation*
 - *Will allow informal discussions between evaluators (phone or e-mail) but still require separate evaluations*
 - *For risk-adjusted measures, inclusion (or not) of certain factors in the risk-adjustment approach should not be a reason for rejecting a measure*
 - *Concerns with discrimination, calibration, or overall method of adjustment are still grounds for rejecting a measure*
 - *Discussion Board implemented*
 - » For discussing methods topics, not specific measures

Progress To Date

- Beginning development of a methods resource “document”
 - *What is reliability and validity, why important for measurement*
 - *Terminology and definitions*
 - *Detailed treatment of appropriate methods to use in testing*

Next Steps

- Next monthly call: April 12, 3:00-4:00pm ET
- In-person meeting: May 16
- Contact information: methodspanel@qualityforum.org