

Revising the CSAC's Criteria for Decision-Making March 2016

Background

The work of the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) focuses on the approval of proposed consensus standards (i.e., measures) and the ongoing enhancement of NQF's Consensus Development Process. In the fall 2015, the CSAC began making revisions to the CSAC's Criteria for Decision-Making. That process was put on hold when the National Quality Forum (NQF) Board of Directors decided to make significant changes to NQF's ratification and appeals processes. (See the attached Summary of Proposed Changes to the Measure Ratification and Appeals Process.)

Under the current process, the CSAC determines whether to uphold the recommendations of the Standing Committees regarding endorsement of measures; the NQF Board of Directors (or the NQF Executive Committee) is responsible for ratifying all measures. The CSAC also reviews all appeals on measures recommended for endorsement. Under the revised ratification and appeals processes, the CSAC will make the final measure endorsement decision, without ratification by another body. Appeals will be heard by a newly created Appeals Board appointed by the NQF Board of Directors. Implementation of the revised processes will begin later in 2016.

Action Needed

The CSAC shall review and finalize its Criteria for Decision-Making that will be implemented at the same time as the revised ratification and appeals processes. CSAC's proposed revisions to the Criteria from last fall are found in a table on the next page.

Current - CSAC Criteria for Decision-Making	Proposed Changes (Fall 2015)
<p>1.) <u>Strategic importance of the measure.</u> The CSAC will consider the value-added 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 relating and competing measures to determine strategic importance?
<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>Language change recommended – Combine original recommendations #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>
<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>	

Consensus Standards Approval Committee

Roles and Responsibilities – [Revised March 2016](#)

The work of the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) focuses on the [approval-ratification](#) of proposed consensus standards and the ongoing enhancement of NQF's Consensus Development Process. The CSAC reviews the recommendations of Steering/Standing Committees regarding measure-specific endorsement and the results of NQF Member voting periods. The CSAC determines whether to [uphold-ratify](#) the recommendations of the Steering/Standing Committees; ~~–ratification decisions of the CSAC are final. The CSAC currently provides consultation and recommendations to the Board of Directors on endorsement decision appeals.~~ [\(CSAC does not review appeals on any measures; appeals are heard by a separate Appeals Board appointed by the NQF Board of Directors.\)](#) The CSAC also serves in an advisory capacity to the Board of Directors and NQF management on continuing enhancements to the Consensus Development Process and emerging issues in performance measurement.

Members of the CSAC are drawn from a diverse set of stakeholder perspectives and clinical disciplines, as well as individuals with expertise in measure development, implementation and public reporting. A majority of the CSAC members are consumers or purchasers. CSAC members serve as individuals, not as representatives of another organization.

Members should be capable of and committed to meeting the following responsibilities:

- All CSAC members are expected to actively participate in discussions and voting on measures.
- CSAC members must be willing to work collaboratively with other CSAC members, to respect differing views by not monopolizing discussions and to reach consensus on recommendations.
- CSAC member's input should not be limited to specific interests, though sharing of interests is expected. This input should be analytic and solution-oriented—not reactionary. CSAC members should consider the impact of decisions on all healthcare populations.
- CSAC members are expected to attend all scheduled in-person and web meetings. CSAC members agree to volunteer time and expertise as necessary to accomplish the work of the CSAC, including meeting preparation, attendance and active participation at meetings, and completion of assignments including voting on measures.
- CSAC members will disclose any conflict of interest with respect to a particular measure and recuse themselves from discussion and any voting associated with those measures.
- CSAC members shall respect the CSAC decision-making process by not making public statements about issues under consideration until the CSAC has completed its deliberations.

If a member is unable to participate on a call or attend a meeting, the member is expected to review the meeting transcript in order to vote on any measures before the CSAC. If a member repeatedly does not vote on measures brought before the CSAC, the CSAC Chair or Vice Chair will contact the member to discuss whether the member can continue meeting the expectations of CSAC membership.



NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM

Measure Ratification and Appeals Process - Summary of Proposed Changes - DRAFT

March 2016



	CURRENT	PROPOSED
Who ratifies measures?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) reviews the recommendations of Standing Committees on whether to endorse consensus standards (i.e., measures); the CSAC can grant or deny endorsementCSAC decisions are submitted to the Board of Directors for ratification; CSAC decisions can be affirmed or denied	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The CSAC will make the final measure endorsement decision, without ratification by another body
Who decides appeals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The CSAC reviews all appeals and makes recommendations to the Board of DirectorsThe Board of Directors decides whether to affirm or deny CSAC's decision on the appeal	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A newly created Appeals Board will adjudicate appeals to measure endorsement decisions; a measure appeal will go directly to the Appeals Board without a re-review by the CSACThe Appeals Board will consist of five people appointed by the NQF Board: two current NQF Board members and the balance will consist of former CSAC or Standing Committee members with a preference for former chairs of CSAC or Standing Committees
What are the grounds for an appeal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">If the endorsed standard directly and materially affects the appellant's interests in an adverse manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Procedural errors reasonably likely to affect the outcome of the original endorsement decision, such as a failure to follow NQF's Consensus Development Process (CDP); ORNew information or evidence, unavailable at the time the CSAC made its endorsement decision, that is reasonably likely to affect



	CURRENT	PROPOSED
		the outcome of the original endorsement decision.
Will the Board have the power to overrule the Appeals Board's decision?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No, the decision of the Appeals Board is final
Who can appeal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Any interested party	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Any interested party
What can be appealed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A decision by the Board to endorse a measure, which the Standing Committee recommended for endorsement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A decision to endorse a measureA decision by the CSAC not to endorse a measure which the Standing Committee recommended for endorsement
Who decides if the grounds for an appeal are met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">NQF staff reviews the appeal and makes a recommendation to the CSAC on whether the grounds for an appeal have been satisfied.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">NQF staff reviews the appeal and makes a recommendation to the Appeals Board on whether the grounds for an appeal have been satisfied.