NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Scientific Methods Panel Monthly Call Meeting

NQF Methods Panel Team

April 11, 2019

Welcome and Roll Call

Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) Members

- David Cella, PhD, (Co-Chair)
- David Nerenz, PhD (Co-Chair)
- J. Matt Austin, PhD
- Bijan Borah, MSc, PhD
- John Bott, MBA, MSSW
- Lacy Fabian, PhD
- Marybeth Farquhar, PhD, MSN, RN
- Jeffrey Geppert, EdM, JD
- Laurent Glance, MD
- Sherrie Kaplan, PhD, MPH
- Joseph Kunisch, PhD, RN-BC, CPHQ

Scientific Methods Panel Members (continued)

- Paul Kurlansky, MD
- Zhenqiu Lin, PhD
- Karen Joynt Maddox, MD, MPH
- Jack Needleman, PhD
- Eugene Nuccio, PhD
- Jennifer Perloff, PhD
- Sam Simon, PhD
- Michael Stoto, PhD
- Christie Teigland, PhD
- Ronald Walters, MD, MBA, MHA, MS
- Susan White, PhD, RHIA, CHDA

Methodologic Issues: Reliability testing of instrument-based measures based on single items

Current Testing Requirements

- PRO-PM submission requirements are rigorous
- Developers are required to demonstrate:
  - » Provider performance scores are reliable and valid
  - » Underlying instrument is reliable and valid
- NQF requires at time of submission
  - » Data element and score-level reliability testing
  - » Data element and score-level validity testing

Issues to Consider

- Multi-item surveys often have separate domains that are used as the basis for separate performance measures
- Measure developers frequently submit Cronbach's alpha analyses of internal consistency as a data element reliability test
  - » Not appropriate for measures based on a single item from the instrument
  - » Sometimes this is the only test submitted (i.e., reliability is not demonstrated for measures based on a single item)

Issues to Consider

- In recent cycle, an SMP subgroup did not enforce NQF's current requirement for demonstrating reliability of a single item
- Based on this decision, NQF will, ***for the time being***, relax this requirement for all instrument-based measures based on single items (to be consistent)

Questions to Consider

- Is NQF's current requirement for demonstrating the reliability of single items too stringent?
  - *If showing internal consistency alone is sufficient for data element reliability, this would imply that all single-item measures are intrinsically reliable, by virtue of being consistent*
  - *A test-retest approach is sometimes used—but this may be problematic in some cases (e.g., repeated queries of very sick patients, family members of decedents, etc.).*
    - » The interval between test-retest can be tricky, as one may expect attitudes to change over time (e.g., satisfaction with care)
  - *Are there alternative ways to test reliability of single items?*
  - *Should we continue to expect this testing, but allow a justification for not doing so?*
  - *Going forward, is Cronbach's alpha/ internal consistency sufficient?*

Member and Public Comment

Next Steps

- Monthly 1-hour calls
  - *Every 2nd Thursday of the month*
  - *Next call: May 9, 2019 at 3 pm ET*
- In-person meeting scheduled for June 11, 2019
- Contact information: methodspanel@qualityforum.org

Adjourn