NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Scientific Methods Panel Bimonthly Webinar

Karen Johnson
Ashlie Wilbon

August 8, 2019

Welcome and Roll Call

NQF Staff

- Karen Johnson
- Ashlie Wilbon
- Andrew Lyzenga
- Michael Abrams
- Sam Stolpe
- Roara Michael
- Yetunde Ogungbemi

Scientific Methods Panel 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
- Paul Gerrard, BS, MD
- Laurent Glance, MD
- Sherrie Kaplan, PhD, MPH

Scientific Methods Panel Members (continued)

- Joseph Kunisch, PhD, RN-BC, CPHQ
- Paul Kurlansky, MD
- Zhenqiu Lin, PhD
- 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

Session Overview

- What to expect for the fall 2019 cycle
  - *New SMP members*
  - *Incoming measures*
- Process updates
  - *Increased developer engagement*
  - *SMP "gatekeeper" role*
- Follow up to June in-person meeting
  - *Review of SMP survey results*
  - *Discussion of key issues*

What to Expect for the Fall 2019 Evaluation Cycle

Expanding the SMP Membership

- 8 new members
  - *Expertise includes: measure development (including composites and PRO-PMs measures), risk adjustment, psychometrics, health services research, economics*
  - *Open for comment through August 14th*
- Orientation for new members: Two 2-hour webinars
  - *August 26 - Introduction to the SMP and its processes*
  - *August 28 - Evaluation Criteria Tutorial*
  - *All are welcome and encouraged to attend*
    - » Volunteers to attend and share experience and best practices?
- Any interest in serving informally as a "buddy"?

Fall 2019 Evaluation Cycle

- Approximately 25 measures coming to the SMP for evaluation
  - *8 are new measures, remainder are measures up for re-endorsement or measures that were previously rejected by the SMP*
  - *Composite measures (n=4); PRO-PMs (n=3); remainder outcomes or intermediate clinical outcomes*
  - *No cost or readmission measures*
- 5 subgroups of 5-6 people each
  - *Target is ~5 measures per subgroup*
- SMP evaluates measures between September 3-27
- In-person meeting scheduled for October 28-29

Process Updates

Key Improvements—
Developer Engagement with SMP

Current process	Improvements
• Developers can only respond verbally to questions/concerns during the subgroup calls (additional documentation after submission is not permitted)	• Developers will have 1 week to respond in writing to SMP preliminary analyses before final vote; can also respond to SMP questions during the meeting

Developer Engagement with the SMP

- NQF will provide developers the “raw” preliminary analyses (PAs)/comments from each subgroup member assigned to evaluate the measure
- Developers will have 5 business days to review the PAs and provide written responses to any concerns or issues raised in the PAs (if desired)
- NQF will append any written responses to meeting materials (for the SMP review) prior to the in-person evaluation meeting in October
- Final voting on the measure will take place at the in-person meeting
- Any changes to the submission or testing form will take place during post commenting period

Key Improvements—SMP Gatekeeper Role

Current process	Improvements
• Measures that pass R/V or are CNR and pass are forwarded to Committee for evaluation and final recommendation	• No Change
• Measures that do not pass the SMP do not go to Committee for review, discussion, or vote ➢ Short summary of rationale for not passing is provided to Committee	• Committee members will have the opportunity to pull a measure for discussion (with a rationale) ➢ Detailed SMP summary, specifications, and testing attachment will be provided to Committee ➢ Committee members can re-vote on eligible measures (as approved by NQF staff and Co-chairs)

Committee Consideration of Measures that Do Not Pass the SMP

- Any measure pulled by a Standing Committee member will be discussed
- Some measures may be eligible for vote by the Standing Committee
  - *Eligibility will be determined by NQF staff and committee co-chairs*
  - *Measures that failed the SMP due to the following will not be eligible for re-vote:* ***(approval of criteria still pending/subject to change)***
    - » Inappropriate methodology or testing approach applied to demonstrate reliability or validity
    - » Incorrect calculations or formulas used for testing
    - » Description of testing approach, results, or data is insufficient for SMP to apply the criteria
    - » Appropriate levels of testing not provided or otherwise did not meet NQF's minimum evaluation requirements

Committee Consideration of Measures that Do Not Pass the SMP

- For measures eligible for vote by the Committee:
  - *The full Committee must vote on whether to uphold the SMP's vote on R/V*
    - » Vote to uphold→ No further discussion of the measure
    - » CNR or vote to overturn SMP Vote→ SC discusses and votes on R/V

SMP Survey Results

Overview of Survey Results

- Sent out July 22nd
- Received a total of 12 responses (57%)
- For the most part, respondents agreed with various statements in the survey
  - *Suggests consensus among the respondents and understanding by NQF staff*
- One question (#12) had relatively less agreement

Question #12

Currently, for some types of measures, NQF does NOT require reliability testing of both data element AND the measure score. **NQF should change this and begin requiring developers to provide BOTH data element and score-level reliability testing.** However, along with this change, NQF should be flexible, and allow developers to **provide a rationale** for why they cannot conduct one level or another (corollary: if the rationale is accepted by the Methods Panel and/or Standing Committee, a measure could be endorsed with only one or the level of testing provided).

Results

- Strongly agree: 1
- Agree: 8
- Disagree: 2
- Strongly disagree: 1

Questions to Consider

- What are the pros/cons of requiring both data element and score-level reliability testing?
- If we required both, are there any downsides of allowing an "opt-out," assuming the rationale is acceptable?
- Do you recommend requiring both levels of testing, with a possible of an "opt-out"?
- What is the relationship between data element reliability and score-level reliability?
  - *Does the former drive the latter?*
- Are there other survey questions you would like to discuss?

Public and Member Comment

Next Steps

Important Dates

- Orientation Webinar 1 (Process): **August 26, 1-3 pm ET**
- Orientation Webinar 2 (Criteria): **August 28, 1-3 pm ET**
- Measure-specific disclosures of interest—Soon to come
- SMP review of measures: **Sept 3-27**
- SMP in-person meeting: **October 28-29**

- Have questions? Contact us at:
  - *Methodspanel@qualityforum.org*


THANK YOU

Adjourn