



# Consensus Standards Approval Committee Discussion Guide

---

*FALL 2021 EVALUATION CYCLE*

*July 26, 2022*

*This report is funded by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services under contract HHSM-500-2017-00060I  
Task Order HHSM-500-T0001.*

## Table of Contents

Background.....	3
Measures Under Review.....	4
Consent Calendar .....	5
Standing Committee Summaries.....	6
Geriatrics and Palliative Care.....	6
Surgery .....	7
Primary Care and Chronic Illness.....	8
Patient Safety .....	11

## Background

The [Consensus Standards Approval Committee \(CSAC\)](#) is an advisory committee whose members are appointed by the National Quality Forum's (NQF) Board of Directors. The CSAC reviews measure endorsement recommendations from multistakeholder NQF Standing Committees, which are convened in topical areas to review and recommend submitted standards (i.e., measures) for endorsement. The CSAC activities related to measure endorsement occur within the larger context of NQF's [Consensus Development Process \(CDP\)](#).

The CSAC reviews the submitted measures based on a set of [criteria](#), which focus on the strategic importance of measures within the portfolio, cross-cutting issues concerning measure properties, and consensus development process concerns. The CSAC may uphold a Standing Committee's recommendation(s) or send the measure(s) back to a Standing Committee for reconsideration.

This discussion guide contains details of the measure evaluation proceedings for, and the subsequent Standing Committee endorsement recommendations made during the fall 2021 review cycle. Measures that did not have any CDP concerns, as noted in key considerations criteria on page 4 of this discussion guide, will not be discussed during the CSAC meeting. Measures that did not meet these criteria are pulled for CSAC discussion.

This discussion guide also contains summaries and links to the respective CDP draft technical reports and public comments received for the Standing Committee deliberations. The CSAC utilizes this document during measure evaluation meetings to facilitate conversations between the CSAC, Standing Committee co-chairs, and NQF staff. For this cycle, the CSAC will consider 13 measures for endorsement consideration. Of these measures, five require CSAC discussion and vote. Eight are included within the consent calendar, as they meet all of the key considerations criteria. No measures were pulled from the consent calendar by CSAC members in advance of the CSAC meeting for further discussion. During the CSAC meeting, if there are no objections to accepting the Standing Committee's endorsement recommendations for the measures on the consent calendar (i.e., that were not pulled for discussion), then the recommendations are accepted by the CSAC.

After the CSAC reviews measures, NQF staff will publish the voting results, endorsement decisions, and the meeting summary on the [NQF website](#). After a measure has been formally endorsed by the CSAC, it enters a 30-day appeals period. Any party may request an appeal of a CSAC decision, except in the case where a Standing Committee does not recommend a measure for endorsement and the CSAC concurs. CSAC decisions to endorse a measure with reserve status or approve a measure for trial use are not appealable.

## Measures Under Review

The CSAC will review the endorsement recommendations from the respective Standing Committees for the fall 2021 NQF measures during its July 26, 2022, meeting and determine whether to uphold the Standing Committee recommendations proposed.

The measure review procedures for CSAC are two-fold. First, the CSAC will review a [consent calendar](#) of measures, which indicates measures that will not be discussed during the meeting. Measures will not be discussed if they **meet all of** the following key considerations criteria:

1. Received 80 percent or greater passing votes for overall suitability for endorsement.
2. No process concern(s) identified that may have affected the endorsement decision of a measure.
3. No reconsideration request was received for either the Standing Committee's or the CSAC's adjudication.
4. The Standing Committee accepted the Scientific Methods Panel's (SMP) ratings (i.e., did not overturn the SMP's decision), if applicable.
5. No new information received through public comment that was not available or discussed during the Standing Committee's measure evaluation meeting, which is conflicting to the Standing Committee's recommendation(s).
6. The measure was not pulled for discussion by a CSAC member.
7. No additional concerns identified that require CSAC discussion (*Note: These concerns should reside within the purview of the CSAC, based on the [CSAC decision making rationale](#)*).

During the CSAC meeting, the CSAC will be asked if there are any objections to accepting the Standing Committee's endorsement recommendations for the measures on the consent calendar (i.e., that were not pulled for discussion). If no objections, the recommendations are accepted by CSAC and no voting on endorsement is needed (regardless of meeting type—conference call or in-person).

Following the consent calendar review, the CSAC will proceed to review and vote on the measures that require discussion, as they do not meet all of the key considerations criteria noted above. For these measures, the respective NQF team and Standing Committee co-chairs will present the respective Standing Committee deliberations and recommendations for each measure. The CSAC will have an opportunity to ask clarifying questions and then will move to vote on each measure individually. CSAC members will vote on acceptance of the Standing Committee's recommendation. The choices for each measure voted on include:

- Uphold the Standing Committee's recommendation to endorse/not endorse the measure
- Do not uphold the recommendation; instead, return it to the Standing Committee for reconsideration

## Consent Calendar

CDP Topic Area	Consent Calendar Measures (Maintenance/New)	Measures for Discussion (Maintenance/New) [Criterion Not Met]
<u><a href="#">Geriatrics and Palliative Care</a></u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3665</b> Ambulatory Palliative Care Patients Experiences of Feeling Heard and Understood (New)</li> <li>• <b>NQF #3666</b> Ambulatory Palliative Care Patients' Experience of Receiving Desired Help for Pain (New)</li> <li>• <b>NQF #3645</b> Hospice Visits in the Last Days of Life (New)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<u><a href="#">Surgery</a></u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3639</b> Measure Clinician-Level and Clinician Group-Level Total Hip Arthroplasty and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA and TKA) Patient-Reported Outcome-Based Performance Measure (PRO-PM) (New)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<u><a href="#">Primary Care and Chronic Illness</a></u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3332</b> Psychosocial Screening Using the Pediatric Symptom Checklist-Tool (PSC-Tool) (Maintenance)</li> <li>• <b>NQF #3661</b> Mismatch Repair (MMR) or Microsatellite Instability (MSI) Biomarker Testing Status in Colorectal Carcinoma, Gastroesophageal, or Small Bowel Carcinoma (New)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3667</b> Days at Home for Patients with Complex, Chronic Conditions (New) [1]</li> </ul>
<u><a href="#">Patient Safety</a></u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #0689</b> Percent of Residents Who Lose Too Much Weight (Long Stay) (Maintenance)</li> <li>• <b>NQF #3636</b> Quarterly Reporting of COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage among Healthcare Personnel (New)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3633e</b> Excessive Radiation Dose or Inadequate Image Quality for Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) in Adults (Clinician Level) (New) [1,2]</li> <li>• <b>NQF #3662e</b> Excessive Radiation Dose or Inadequate Image Quality for Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) in Adults (Clinician Group Level) (New) [2]</li> <li>• <b>NQF #3663e</b> Excessive Radiation Dose or Inadequate Image Quality for Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) in Adults (Facility Level) (New) [2]</li> <li>• <b>NQF #0097*</b> Medication Reconciliation Post-Discharge (National Committee for Quality Assurance) (Maintenance) [1,2]</li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>

\*NQF #0097 was originally evaluated in fall 2020, but it was not evaluated at the fall 2020 CSAC meeting due to a calculation error of the validity vote, which was discovered prior to the fall 2020 CSAC meeting

## Standing Committee Summaries

This section provides CDP project information, including links to the respective project webpages, draft reports, and information about comments received during the post-measure evaluation public comment period for all Standing Committees that reviewed measures during the fall 2021 cycle. This includes information for both consent calendar measures as well as measures that will be individually discussed and voted on by CSAC.

For measures that were not included in the consent calendar, additional information related to the key considerations criteria not met for these measures is presented in the tables below for each Standing Committee. The key considerations tables provide a high-level summary of any CDP concerns that require CSAC consideration and discussion.

### Geriatrics and Palliative Care

During this measure review cycle, the Geriatrics and Palliative Care Standing Committee evaluated three newly submitted measures undergoing review against [NQF's standard evaluation criteria](#). The Standing Committee recommended all three measures for endorsement, and all three measures are included in the consent calendar.

#### *Geriatrics and Palliative Care Fall 2021 Draft Report.*

The draft report presents the results of the Standing Committee evaluation of measures considered for endorsement under the CDP. The complete [draft report](#) and supplemental materials are available on the [project webpage](#).

#### *Comments and Their Disposition*

During the post-measure evaluation public comment period, NQF received 15 comments from seven organizations (including four NQF-member organizations) and individuals pertaining to the draft report and to the measures under review. The Standing Committee reviewed all the submitted comments (general and measure specific) and developer responses.

A [post-comment memo](#), which includes the themes identified, responses to the public and member comments, and results of NQF-member expressions of support or non-support is posted to the Geriatrics and Palliative Care [project webpage](#) for CSAC review.

#### *CSAC Action Required*

Since all fall 2021 measures reviewed by the Geriatrics and Palliative Care Standing Committee are included in the consent calendar, no additional CSAC action is required. However, should a measure be removed from the consent calendar during the CSAC meeting, NQF staff will present verbal information about the measure during the allotted time reserved at the end of the meeting.

## Surgery

During this measure review cycle, the Surgery Standing Committee evaluated one newly submitted measure against [NQF's standard evaluation criteria](#). The Standing Committee recommended the measure for endorsement. The measure is included in the consent calendar.

### *Surgery Fall 2021 Draft Report*

The [draft report](#) presents the results of the Standing Committee evaluation of the measure considered for endorsement under the CDP. The complete draft report and supplemental materials are available on the [project webpage](#).

### *Comments and Their Disposition*

During the post-measure evaluation public comment period, NQF received two comments from two organizations (which were from NQF-member organizations) pertaining to the draft report and to the measures under review. The Standing Committee reviewed all the submitted comments (general and measure specific) and developer responses.

A [post comment memo](#), which includes the themes identified, responses to the public and member comments, and results of NQF-member expressions of support or non-support is posted to the Surgery [project webpage](#) for CSAC review.

### *CSAC Action Required*

Since the measure reviewed by the Standing Committee is included in the consent calendar, no additional CSAC action is required. However, should the measure be removed from the consent calendar during the CSAC meeting, NQF staff will present verbal information about the measure during the allotted time reserved at the end of the meeting.

## Primary Care and Chronic Illness

During this measure review cycle, the Primary Care and Chronic Illness Standing Committee evaluated two newly submitted measures and one measure undergoing maintenance review against [NQF's standard evaluation criteria](#). The Standing Committee recommended two measures for endorsement and did not recommend one measure for endorsement. The two measures recommended for endorsement are included in the consent calendar.

### *Primary Care and Chronic Illness Fall 2021 Draft Report.*

The draft report presents the results of the Standing Committee evaluation of measures considered for endorsement under the CDP. The complete [draft report](#) and supplemental materials are available on the [project webpage](#).

### *Comments and Their Disposition*

During the post-measure evaluation public comment period, NQF received 11 comments from seven organizations (including five NQF-member organizations) and individuals pertaining to the draft report and to the measures under review. The Standing Committee reviewed all of the submitted comments (general and measure specific) and developer responses.

A [post-comment memo](#), which includes the themes identified, responses to the public and member comments, and results of NQF-member expressions of support or non-support is posted to the Primary Care and Chronic Illness [project webpage](#) for CSAC review.

### *CSAC Action Required*

After approval of the consent calendar and pursuant to the CDP, the CSAC is asked to consider the Standing Committee endorsement recommendation of one candidate consensus measure, as it does not meet all of the key considerations criteria.

Below is the measure that requires CSAC discussion and voting. The key considerations criteria not met for the measure are described in further detail in the table below. The CSAC should review and discuss this measure for endorsement considerations.

### *Measures Not Recommended for Endorsement*

- **NQF #3667 Days at Home for Patients with Complex, Chronic Conditions (Yale New Haven Health Services Corporation – Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluate [CORE]/Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services [CMS]) [New]**
  - The Primary Care and Chronic Illness Standing Committee did not vote on overall suitability for endorsement as the measure did not pass on validity, a must pass criterion.
  - Validity: **H-0; M-3; L-7; I-8** (denominator = 18)



The checklist table below lists the Standing Committee key considerations for the CSAC's review and discussion of the measures submitted for endorsement consideration.

Key Consideration Criteria	Yes/No	Notes
1. Received less than 80 percent passing votes for overall suitability for endorsement.	Yes	<b>Not Recommended for Endorsement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3667</b> Days at Home for Patients With Complex, Chronic Conditions (Yale CORE): Not Recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Risk adjusted models have no standardized approach to address social determinants of health factors.</li> <li>○ Construct validity testing found that the correlation between the measure and the other measures was weak (correlations ranged between -0.549 and +0.048).</li> <li>○ Exclusions, specifically with low outliers and how the developer attributed them to an unintended consequence of the measure's construct as the measure itself attempts to balance days at home with other unintended consequences.</li> <li>○ The Scientific Methods Panel rating for Validity: Consensus Not Reached (Total Votes-10; H-0; M-4; L-5; I-1).</li> <li>○ The Standing Committee did not pass the measure on validity. Total Votes-18; H-0; M-3; L-7; I-8 (3/18 – 16.7 percent, No Pass)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2. Were there any process concerns raised during the CDP project? If so, briefly explain.	No	None
3. Did the Standing Committee or CSAC receive a request for reconsideration? If so, briefly explain.	No	None
4. Did the Standing Committee overturn any of the Scientific Methods Panel's ratings of Scientific Acceptability? If so, state the measure and why the measure was overturned.	No	None

Key Consideration Criteria	Yes/No	Notes
5. Was there any new information received through public comment that was not available or discussed during the Standing Committee's measure evaluation meeting, which is conflicting to the Standing Committee's recommendation(s)? If so, note the measure and briefly explain.	No	None
6. Were any measures pulled for discussion by a CSAC member? If so, briefly explain the rationale.	No	None
7. Are there additional concerns that require CSAC discussion? If so, briefly explain.	No	None
<i>Additional Consideration Not Included in Consent Calendar Criteria:</i>	-	-
Were there any consensus not reached measures voted on during post-comment meeting? If so, what was the measure, the criterion, and the final Standing Committee recommendation.	No	None

Cells marked by a dash (-) are intentionally left blank.

## Patient Safety

During this measure review cycle, the Patient Safety Standing Committee evaluated four newly submitted measures and one measure undergoing maintenance review against [NQF's standard evaluation criteria](#). The Standing Committee recommended all five measures for endorsement, of which two measures are included in the consent calendar.

In addition, on June 28, 2022, the Patient Safety Standing Committee voted to recommend NQF #0097 *Medication Reconciliation Post-Discharge*, a maintenance measure, for endorsement. This measure was originally reviewed during the fall 2020 cycle, but not included in the [June 2021 CSAC meeting](#). The measure was removed from CSAC review at that time due to a calculation error of the validity vote (a must-pass criterion). The error was identified prior to the June 2021 CSAC review, in which the measure was stated as “passing validity”, when in fact, the Standing Committee did not reach consensus on the measure (consensus not reached). The vote tally was as follows: Total Votes-23; High-0; Moderate-13; Low-8; Insufficient-2 (57 percent passing votes). The criterion should have undergone a revote during the fall 2020 Patient Safety post-comment meeting; however, the voting error had not been discovered at that time. Once discovered, it was not possible to reconvene the Standing Committee prior to the June 2021 CSAC. The Patient Safety team and co-chairs recommended, and the CSAC agreed, that the measure retain endorsement until the Patient Safety Standing Committee could re-vote on validity and the overall suitability for endorsement, which took place on June 28, 2022.

### *Patient Safety Fall 2021 Draft Report.*

The [draft report](#) presents the results of the Standing Committee evaluation of measures considered for endorsement under the CDP. The complete draft report and supplemental materials are available on the [project webpage](#). Information on NQF #0097 is available in the final [Patient Safety, Fall 2020 Cycle: CDP Report](#) (see pages 10 and 11 for a narrative summary of the measure evaluation and Appendix A, pages 38-41, for voting results and Committee rationale for NQF #0097).

### *Comments and Their Disposition*

During the post-measure evaluation public comment period, NQF received eight comments from three member organizations pertaining to the fall 2021 draft report and to the measures under review. The Standing Committee reviewed all of the submitted comments (general and measure specific) and developer responses.

A [post-comment memo](#), which includes the themes identified, responses to the public and member comments, and results of NQF-member expressions of support or non-support is posted to the Patient Safety [project webpage](#) for CSAC review. For information on comments and member expressions of support of #0097 please see the [fall 2020 post-comment memo](#).

### *CSAC Action Required*

After approval of the consent calendar and pursuant to the CDP, the CSAC is asked to consider the Standing Committee endorsement recommendations of four candidate consensus measures, as they do not meet all of the key considerations criteria.

Below is the list of measures that require CSAC discussion and voting. The key considerations criteria not met for these measures are described in further detail in the table below. The CSAC should review and discuss these measures for endorsement consideration.

### *Measures Recommended for Endorsement*

- **NQF #3633e** Excessive Radiation Dose or Inadequate Image Quality for Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) in Adults (Clinician Level) (Alara Imaging/University of California, San Francisco [UCSF]) [New]
  - Overall Suitability for Endorsement: **Y-15; N-4** (denominator = 19)
- **NQF #3662e** Excessive Radiation Dose or Inadequate Image Quality for Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) in Adults (Clinician Group Level) (Alara Imaging/UCSF) [New]
  - Overall Suitability for Endorsement: **Y-15; N-3** (denominator = 18)
- **NQF #3663e** Excessive Radiation Dose or Inadequate Image Quality for Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) in Adults (Facility Level) (Alara Imaging/UCSF) [New]
  - Overall Suitability for Endorsement: **Y-15; N-2** (denominator = 17)
- **NQF #0097** Medication Reconciliation Post-Discharge (National Committee for Quality Assurance) [Maintenance]
  - Overall Suitability for Endorsement: **Y-12; N-4** (denominator = 16)

The checklist table below lists the key considerations of the measures submitted for endorsement consideration that require the CSAC's review and discussion.

Key Consideration Criteria	Yes/No	Notes
1. Received less than 80 percent passing votes for overall suitability for endorsement.	Yes	<b>Recommended for Endorsement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3633e</b> Excessive Radiation Dose or Inadequate Image Quality for Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) in Adults (Clinician Level)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall Suitability for Endorsement: <b>Y-15; N-4</b> (denominator = 19) 78.9 percent passing votes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>NQF #0097</b> Medication Reconciliation Post-Discharge (National Committee for Quality Assurance)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall Suitability for Endorsement: <b>Y-12; N-4</b> (denominator = 16) 75 percent passing votes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Key Consideration Criteria	Yes/No	Notes
<p>2. Were there any process concerns raised during the CDP project? If so, briefly explain.</p>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #3633e, NQF #3662e, and NQF #3663e</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ During the post-comment meeting, a comment was received from a specialty society, which opposed the recommendation for endorsement of NQF #3633e, NQF #3662e, and NQF #3663e.</li> <li>○ While the review process was followed, several Standing Committee members had concerns that their review may not have been thorough due to lack of expertise among the Standing Committee members.</li> <li>○ The Standing Committee chose to vote on the following options: 1) the Standing Committee could agree that the measures met all NQF criteria and vote to stand by the recommendation to endorse these measures; 2) the Standing Committee could re-vote on the measures' endorsement or a specific criteria, based on a credible rationale that criteria were not met; and 3) the Standing Committee could vote to postpone further review and NQF could create a technical expert panel to provide additional expert feedback to the Standing Committee.</li> <li>○ The majority of the Standing Committee <b>present (11 of 14 [78.6 percent])</b> voted to uphold its recommendation to endorse these measures; therefore, no subsequent votes were held and the Standing Committee's recommendation to endorse all three measures stands.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Key Consideration Criteria	Yes/No	Notes
2. Were there any process concerns raised during the CDP project? If so, briefly explain (cont'd).	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>NQF #0097 (fall 2020 measure)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This measure underwent a maintenance review by the Patient Safety Standing Committee in fall 2020. During the initial evaluation meeting, the Committee vote on evidence was announced as consensus not reached. After the meeting it was determined that the Committee did not pass the measure on evidence (<b>H-0; M-8; L-4; I-11</b>; denominator =23) 34.7% passing. Due to the discrepancy, NQF staff and the committee co-chairs decided that the Committee would revote on evidence during the post comment call.</li> <li>○ At the fall 2020 cycle post-comment call on June 4, 2021, the Committee discussed comments received and revoted to pass the measure on evidence (<b>H-0; M-11; L-3; I-3</b>; denominator=17) and to recommend the measure for endorsement (<b>Y-19; N-4</b>; denominator = 23).</li> <li>○ In addition, during initial evaluation meeting, the measure was incorrectly stated to have passed on validity when in fact, it was consensus not reached. This error was discovered prior to the fall 2020 CSAC meeting, when it was too late to be rectified during that cycle.</li> <li>○ Therefore, measure #0097 was discussed on June 28, 2022, during the spring 2022 cycle measure evaluation meeting. The Patient Safety Standing Committee reviewed comments received and revoted to pass the measure on validity (<b>H-1; M-11; L-3; I-1</b>; denominator = 16) and on overall suitability for endorsement (<b>Y-12; N-4</b>; denominator = 16).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3. Did the Standing Committee or CSAC receive a request for reconsideration? If so, briefly explain.	No	None
4. Did the Standing Committee overturn any of the Scientific Methods Panel's ratings of Scientific Acceptability? If so, state the measure and why the measure was overturned.	No	None

Key Consideration Criteria	Yes/No	Notes
5. Was there any new information received through public comment that was not available or discussed during the Standing Committee's measure evaluation meeting, which is conflicting to the Standing Committee's recommendation(s)? If so, note the measure and briefly explain.	No	None
6. Were any measures pulled for discussion by a CSAC member? If so, briefly explain the rationale.	No	None
7. Are there additional concerns that require CSAC discussion? If so, briefly explain.	No	None
<i>Additional Consideration Not Included in Consent Calendar Criteria:</i>	-	-
Were there any consensus not reached measures voted on during post-comment meeting? If so, what was the measure, the criterion, and the final Standing Committee recommendation.	No	None

Cells marked by a dash (-) are intentionally left blank.