

# Lessons Learned and Course Corrections

---

## Challenge #1: Reaching Consensus on Measures

Reaching consensus on measures has been difficult in both cycles. The lack of consensus has been observed in the following three ways:

- Disagreement on information provided: In the spring cycle, there were several measures where reviewers did not agree on what was provided (such as whether data element or measure score testing results were provided). This often resulted in staff requesting that reviewers discuss the issues first through email, and if agreement could not be reached through email, setting up “resolution calls” amongst the Panel evaluators.
- Disagreement on the quality of information (e.g., whether methods were appropriate or results were adequate): In the fall and spring cycles, a majority of the evaluated measures had to be sent to the co-chairs for additional evaluation.
- Disagreement between co-chairs: Co-chairs had to do their own evaluation of many measures, and when they disagreed, staff had to initiate email exchanges and “resolution calls.”

The lack of consensus has caused the following issues:

- Excessive burden on reviewers, co-chairs, and staff
- A constantly shifting timeline, along with the inability of the Methods Panel team to provide concrete dates to project staff or developers
- Increased staff time/focus on the evaluation process at the expense of time/focus for methodological issues
- Less time for developers to revise submission prior to deadline for next cycle
- Confusion amongst standing committees about ratings and rationale

Changes already incorporated into the process:

- Allowing reviewers to talk amongst themselves about the measures before submitting evaluations
- Setting up “resolution calls” in an effort to facilitate consensus between evaluators
- Allowing co-chairs to review the initial three evaluation reviews before conducting their own evaluation

## Proposed Solutions

- Eliminate the e-mail interaction step and proceed directly to resolution calls once staff has determined that consensus has not been reached either on the information provided or on the quality of the information provided. Ideally this would result in earlier determination about the need for co-chair evaluation as well as a reduction in the number of measures that need co-chair evaluation.

- Allow co-chairs to discuss the areas of disagreement amongst reviewers and make a final determination, rather than doing independent evaluations.
- Incorporate “workgroup” calls into the process, where subsets of measures would be discussed among subsets of the Panel along with individual evaluation by Panel members.
- Allow a subset of Panel members to evaluate a subset of measures during webinars; the subgroup would provide the ratings. Panel members would no longer have to fill out the formal evaluation form; instead, staff would summarize the discussion and provide this summary to standing committees.
- Allow all Panel members to evaluate all measures during an in-person meeting and provide ratings. Panel members would no longer have to fill out the formal evaluation form.
- Reduce Methods Panel review period from four weeks to two weeks in order to provide more time for resolving issues.

## Challenge #2: Difficulty Using the Preliminary Analysis Form

While some improvement was seen in the spring 2018 cycle, Panel members are still having difficulties with the evaluation form, as follow:

- The rationale for responding a certain way or skipping certain questions does not always make sense to Panel members.
- The form does not encourage provision of information about the methods/results of testing when the measure passes the criteria.
- Disparate styles by Panel members when filling out the form makes it harder to understand the rationale for the final ratings.

## Proposed Solutions

- Keep the current structure of the form, but eliminate skip logic and allow reviewers to respond to all questions they feel are appropriate (i.e., incorporating a N/A option for the questions currently skipped)
- Keep the current structure of the form, but request a rationale for pivotal questions
- Keep the current structure of the form, but require a summary of the rationale for the rating of each subcriterion
- Eliminate the current form and instead allow a free-text analysis by Panel members
- Eliminate the current form, and instead incorporate a semistructured written form that would be mostly free text (similar to the structure of the preliminary analysis before the change)
- Require staff to create summaries of measure reviews based on Panel reviews