



**Consensus Task Force
November 13th In-Person Meeting
Preliminary Actions and Recommendations**

Following the November 13, 2012, Task Force meeting, a preliminary list of actions or recommendations derived from the discussions have been developed and approved by the Task Force. At its November 29, 2012 meeting, the NQF Board of Directors approved the Consensus Task Force's preliminary list.

These recommendations have been divided into two categories:

- 1) those actions that do not require changes to the Consensus Development Process (CDP) and could be defined and implemented by NQF staff in the next three months and
- 2) those actions that require additional work to provide proposals or multiple options for consideration by the Task Force in January and may require CDP revisions.

Information on which concern the action is intended to respond as well as preliminary items to be explored or implemented are provided under each

Preliminary Prioritization of Task Force Discussion

Actions that can be implemented in the next 3 months and do not require CDP revisions

Steering Committee
<p>In response to discussion regarding the consistency of Steering Committee selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review steering committee composition and process for seating members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transparent criteria for SC selection: number of members desired, expertise being sought (balance of interest) ○ Terms and COI policy for standing committees • Begin roll out of standing committees as funding allows <p>In response to discussion regarding process questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education of NQF membership and public on the CDP • Develop a guidebook that is published to the NQF website for easy access by the membership and public <p>In response to discussion regarding the transparency of Steering Committee selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop metrics on Steering Committee composition • Develop criteria/checklist for transparency, which would be posted to the project page (number of nominations received, expertise desired, councils who submitted, etc.)
<p>In response to discussion regarding the consistency of the Steering Committee review of the measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the role and responsibility of the facilitator for the Steering Committee meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Define who should receive training as the facilitator (staff, SC chairs, outside facilitator) ○ Look at ANSI materials/training for facilitators • Implement within next 6 months
Member Engagement
<p>In response to discussion seeking clarity in how to engage in the CDP projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDP-specific communications to be sent out to the membership and the public <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Publicly shared timelines for upcoming projects ○ Explore expanding CDP projects on the NQF web site-increase accessibility from the home page ○ Increase Council awareness and discussions on CDP projects • Develop broader strategy on member engagement across NQF for implementation within next 3 months
Comment Period
<p>In response to discussion seeking clarity in how comments are adjudicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore ways to further allow granularity in comments against criteria, seeking comments on the measures specific to the measure evaluation criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ need to determine how quickly could implement-change the commenting field or have staff sort the comments by criteria • Look at how comments are adjudicated and presented to ensure that comments are easily attributable to the organizations that have made them

- Provide the table of comments and responses directly back to those who commented
- Provide information regarding the SC call to discuss comments directly back to those who commented

Actions that require additional work to provide proposals or multiple options for consideration by the Task Force in January and may require CDP revisions

Achieving Consensus/Balance of Interest

In response to discussions regarding what constitutes consensus:

- Determine criteria for what constitutes consensus (what voting threshold at what step of the process, etc.)
- Develop several scenarios on what would occur when consensus is not reached (per what is determined above) throughout each of the steps of the process (SC review, member vote, CSAC, Board) and/or overall
- Several models for member voting (reconsider length of voting, representative voting, etc.)
- Complete process mapping to explore including:
 - iterations to achieve consensus (possibly including decision logic for measure pathways),
 - development of feedback loops,
 - incorporation of the information from the 2-stage pilot, and
 - seeking input by the CSAC or other consumer/purchaser groups TBD earlier in development process.

To do this, consideration will be given to:

- the potential impact on funding and frequency of projects/timelines
- the limitations or factors outside of NQF's control

Comment period

In response to discussion regarding how comments can best be addressed:

- Consider allowing members to comment before the Steering Committee meeting as well as during the formal 30-day public and member comment period
- Explore other ways to address/handle comments (e.g., ANSI process)

Broader process/communication effort

In response to discussion regarding improved communication and transparency:

- Setting timelines and expectations of when changes to the CDP process will occur and what they will be
- Further develop evaluation of process