



**NATIONAL  
QUALITY FORUM**

Driving measurable health  
improvements together

# Scientific Methods Panel, Fall 2022 Measure Review Cycle

## Measure Evaluation Meeting

*October 25, 2022*

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

## Housekeeping Reminders

- This is a Zoom meeting with audio and video capabilities.
- Please mute your computer when not speaking.
- The system will allow you to mute/unmute yourself and turn your video on/off throughout the event.
- We encourage you to keep the video on throughout the event.
- We encourage you to use the following features:
  - ▣ Chat box: to message NQF staff or the group
  - ▣ Raise hand: to be called upon to speak
- We will conduct roll call once the meeting begins.

If you are experiencing technical issues, please contact the NQF project team at [methodspanel@qualityforum.org](mailto:methodspanel@qualityforum.org)



## Housekeeping Reminders - Continued

- Meeting breaks
- Voting Quorum
- Chat feature
- Raising hand
- Muting and unmuting
- If possible, do not speak on speaker phone
- Introduce yourself; we are transcribing the discussion
- Technical support

# Welcome, Introductions, and Disclosures of Interest

# Welcome

## NQF Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) Team

- Elizabeth Drye, MD, SM, Chief Scientific Officer
- Tricia Elliott, DHA, MBA, CPHQ, FNAHQ, Senior Managing Director
- Matthew Pickering, PharmD, Senior Director
- Poonam Bal, MHSA, Senior Director
- Mike DiVecchia, MBA, PMP, Director
- Hannah Ingber, MPH, Manager
- Gabby Kyle-Lion, MPH, Analyst



## Scientific Methods Panel Members

- **David Nerenz, PhD, Co-chair**
- **Christie Teigland, PhD, Co-chair**
- J. Matt Austin, PhD
- John Bott, MBA, MSSW
- Daniel Deutscher, PT, PhD
- Marybeth Farquhar, PhD, MSN, RN
- Jeffrey Geppert, EdM, JD
- Laurent Glance, MD
- Joseph Hyder, MD
- Sherrie Kaplan, PhD, MPH
- Joseph Kunisch, PhD, RN-BC, CPHQ
- Paul Kurlansky, MD
- Zhenqiu Lin, PhD
- Jack Needleman, PhD
- Eugene Nuccio, PhD (*Inactive*)
- Sean O'Brien, PhD
- Jennifer Perloff, PhD
- Patrick Romano, MD, MPH
- Sam Simon, PhD
- Alex Sox-Harris, PhD, MS
- Ronald Walters, MD, MBA, MHA, MS
- Terri Warholak, PhD, RPh, CPHQ, FAPhA
- Eric Weinhandl, PhD, MS
- Susan White, PhD, RHIA, CHDA

# Meeting Overview



## Agenda

- Welcome, Roll Call, and Disclosures of Interest
- Overview of Evaluation and Voting Process
- Fall 2022 Measure Evaluations
- Break – 45 minutes
- Fall 2022 Measure Evaluations (*continued*)
- Opportunity for NQF Member and Public Comment
- Next Steps
- Adjourn



## Meeting Ground Rules

- No rank in the room
- Remain engaged and actively participate
- Be prepared, having reviewed the measures beforehand
- Base evaluation and recommendations on the NQF measure evaluation criteria and guidance
- Keep comments concise and focused
- Be respectful and allow others to contribute
- Share your experiences
- Learn from others

# Meeting Materials

- Discussion Guide
  - ▣ A synopsis document of scientific acceptability content (i.e., reliability and validity) for all complex measures in a measure cycle evaluated by SMP members.
    - Each measure includes pertinent information from the submission, SMP reviewer feedback, related developer responses, and identification of measures that are pulled for SMP discussion during today's meeting.
    - Goal is to summarize and highlight priority information for SMP discussion, reduce developer burden from multiple submission materials requests, and target critical scientific acceptability questions/concerns.
  - ▣ Appendix B: Additional information provided by measure developers
- Background Materials
  - [2011 Testing Task Force Report](#)
  - [2021 NQF Measure Evaluation Criteria and Guidance](#)
  - [SMP Measure Evaluation Guidance](#)

# Overview of Evaluation and Voting Process

## Overall Ratings

### ■ High (H)

- Accountable entity level testing is required
- A measure may be eligible for “HIGH,” but the sampling method/results may warrant a “MODERATE” rating

### ■ Moderate (M)

- The highest eligible rating if only patient/encounter level testing or face validity testing is conducted
- A measure may be eligible for “MODERATE,” but the sampling method/results may warrant a “LOW” rating

### ■ Low (L)

- Used primarily if testing results are not satisfactory or an inappropriate methodology was applied

### ■ Insufficient (I)

- Use when the reviewer does not have sufficient information to assign a “HIGH,” “MODERATE,” or “LOW” rating
  - *Examples: unclear specifications; unclear testing methodology, not conducting criteria required testing*

## Meeting Quorum and Achieving Consensus

- A meeting quorum is met with 66% of active SMP Members in attendance
- Achieving consensus is calculated from the percent of quorum members in attendance during a vote
- SMP scientific acceptability (i.e., reliability and validity criteria) evaluation results
  - Pass/Recommended: Greater than 60% “Yes” of quorum votes (i.e., high + moderate ratings)
  - Consensus not reached (CNR): 40-60% “Yes” of quorum votes (inclusive of 40% and 60%)
  - No pass/Not recommended: Less than 40% “Yes” of quorum votes

## Testing and Evaluation Reminders

- All testing must align with specifications
  - If multiple levels of analysis are specified, each must be tested separately
  - NQF's requirements permit passing some or all levels of analysis for a measure



## Differences in Testing Requirements by Measure Type

- For reliability and validity, ***EITHER*** patient/encounter level testing ***OR*** accountability entity level testing for new measures
  - ▣ Outcome, intermediate clinical outcome, cost/resource use, structure, and process measures at initial submission
- For reliability and validity, testing is required at ***BOTH*** patient/encounter and accountable entity levels
  - ▣ Instrument-based Measures at initial and maintenance submission
  - ▣ Composite measures at maintenance
- Empirical analyses supporting the composite construction
  - ▣ Composite measures at initial and maintenance submission
- If patient/encounter level validity testing is provided, we ***do not*** require additional patient/encounter level reliability testing
  - ▣ All measures





## Additional Reminders

- Consideration for risk-adjustment is required for all outcome, resource use, intermediate outcome, and some process measures
  - Inclusion (or exclusion) of certain factors in the risk-adjustment approach **should not** be a reason for **not** passing a measure
  - Concerns with discrimination, calibration, or overall method of adjustment **are** grounds for **not** passing a measure
  - In the absence of risk adjustment or stratification for outcome, resource use, intermediate outcome, and some process measures, a strong rationale/data for excluding must be provided
- For all measures
  - Incomplete or ambiguous specifications are grounds for not passing a measure with an insufficient rating

# Standing Committee Complex Measure Evaluation

- Standing Committees will evaluate and make recommendations for endorsement for:
  - ▣ Measures that pass SMP review
  - ▣ Measures where the SMP did not reach consensus (i.e., CNR)
- All measures reviewed by the SMP can be **discussed** by the Standing Committees
  - ▣ Measures that do not pass the SMP may be pulled by a Standing Committee member for further discussion.
  - ▣ Measures that do not pass the SMP, and are pulled for discussion by a Standing Committee, may be **eligible** for a revote.
    - Eligibility will be determined by NQF Staff and SMP co-chairs. Measures that did not pass the SMP due to the following will **not** be eligible for revote by the Standing Committee:
      - *Inappropriately applied methodology or testing approach 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*

## SMP Measure Discussion Process

Measures discussed by the SMP during the meeting are pre-determined after the SMP's preliminary analyses, which occurred prior to the SMP meeting. The process for SMP discussion during the meeting include the following steps:

1. Staff will briefly introduce the measure
2. SMP member lead discussants will summarize key concerns
3. Other SMP subgroup members will be invited to comment
4. Developers will be given 2-3 minutes for an initial response, and may respond to SMP questions
5. Discussions will be opened to the full SMP
6. After discussions end, the SMP will move to vote on the relevant criterion (i.e., reliability, validity)



## SMP Voting Process

- Voting is conducted synchronously, virtually, and confidentially via Poll Everywhere
- Voting occurs following each criterion discussion
- SMP subgroup members only vote on measures they were assigned
- **Recused SMP members** ***cannot vote for measures where conflicts are identified***
- Subgroup voting results taken during the meeting are the official SMP vote
- Measures that are not pulled for discussion will pass in a consent calendar vote



# SMP Evaluation Process Questions?

# Voting Test

# Fall 2022 Cycle Overview



## Fall 2022 Evaluation Cycle Statistics

- 13 complex measures were assigned to the SMP
  - ▣ 1 outcome
  - ▣ 0 cost/resource use
  - ▣ 2 composite
  - ▣ 1 outcome: intermediate clinical outcome
  - ▣ 8 PRO-PM
  - ▣ 1 process
  - ▣ 0 structure
  - ▣ Of the complex measures, 8 were new measures
- 2 subgroups of 11 or 12 SMP members were each assigned 6 or 7 measures
- 2 measures were withdrawn (#2881, #2789) after SMP review, for a total of 11 measures remaining
- 7 measures passed both reliability, validity, AND composite construction
- 5 measures total slated for discussion
  - ▣ 4 measures due to receiving a CNR decision, or not passing on reliability, validity and/or composite construction
  - ▣ 1 measure pulled for discussion



## Fall 2022 Measures Slated for Discussion

- Subgroup 1
  - ▣ Renal
    - 3725 <sup>a</sup>
  - ▣ Geriatrics and Palliative Care
    - 3654 <sup>a/b</sup>
- Subgroup 2
  - ▣ Patient Experience and Function
    - 3721 <sup>a/b</sup>
    - 3720 <sup>a</sup>
    - 3718 <sup>c</sup>

- a) These measures will be re-voted on as consensus was not reached in the preliminary analysis done by the SMP.
- b) These measures will be discussed because the developer submitted a response to the SMP evaluation. A re-vote could occur if the SMP decides it is warranted.
- c) These measures were pulled for discussion by the SMP or NQF staff.

# Measures Under Review

# #3725 Home Dialysis Retention

- Subgroup 1
- Preliminary Voting Result:
  - ▣ Reliability: H-1, M-4, L-5, I-1; CNR
  - ▣ Validity: H-1, M-7, L-2, I-1; Pass
- Lead Discussant: Jack Needleman
- Measure Developer: Kidney Care Quality Alliance
- Measure Steward: Kidney Care Quality Alliance
- Discussion Guide page: 5
- Items to be Discussed:
  - ▣ Discuss and revote on reliability as it received a consensus not reached rating.
  - ▣ Votes of low and insufficient were due to the low volume units not obtaining adequate reliability using one-year of data, as the measure is specified, as well as concerns surrounding the calculation used for the reliability score.



## #3654 Hospice Care Index

- Subgroup 1
- Preliminary Voting Result:
  - ▣ Reliability: H-1, M-2, L-3, I-5; No Pass
  - ▣ Validity: H-0, M-3, L-2, I-6; No Pass
  - ▣ Composite: H-1, M-4, L-3, I-2; CNR
- Lead Discussant: Sam Simon
- Measure Developer: Abt Associates
- Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
- Discussion Guide page: 9
- Items to be Discussed:
  - ▣ Discuss the developer's response to the SMP's concerns.
  - ▣ Discuss and revote on the measure's composite construction as it received a consensus not reached rating due to the lack of information provided to assess the construction.

**Break**

**Will resume at 2:00 PM EST**



NATIONAL  
QUALITY FORUM

# #3721 Patient-Reported Overall Physical Health Following Chemotherapy Among Adults with Breast Cancer

- Subgroup 2
- Preliminary Voting Result:
  - ▣ Reliability: H-0, M-2, L-8, I-0; No Pass
  - ▣ Validity:V: H-1, M-4, L-3, I-2; CNR
- Lead Discussant: Zhenqiu Lin
- Measure Developer: Purchaser Business Group on Health
- Measure Steward: Purchaser Business Group on Health
- Discussion Guide page: 13
- Items to be Discussed:
  - ▣ Discuss the developer's response to the SMP's concerns.
  - ▣ Discuss and revote on validity as it received a consensus not reached rating. Votes of low and insufficient were due to concerns with the face validity testing, the lack of demonstration of meaningful differences, and missing response rates.
  - ▣ This measure is grouped with #3720 and #3718. The SMP should discuss whether all testing results are different enough to warrant different votes on the three measures.



## #3720 Patient-Reported Fatigue Following Chemotherapy Among Adults with Breast Cancer

- Subgroup 2
- Preliminary Voting Result:
  - ▣ Reliability: H-0, M-9, L-1, I-0; Pass
  - ▣ Validity: H-1, M-5, L-2, I-2; CNR
- Lead Discussant: Paul Kurlansky
- Measure Developer: Purchaser Business Group on Health
- Measure Steward: Purchaser Business Group on Health
- Discussion Guide page: 17
- Items to be Discussed:
  - ▣ The SMP should discuss and revote on the reliability criterion.
  - ▣ Discuss and revote on validity as it received a consensus not reached rating. Votes of low and insufficient were due to concerns with the face validity testing, the lack of demonstration of meaningful differences, and missing response rates.
  - ▣ This measure is grouped with #3721 and #3718. The SMP should discuss whether testing results (especially reliability testing results) are different enough to warrant different votes on the three measures.



## #3718 Patient-Reported Pain Interference Following Chemotherapy Among Adults with Breast Cancer

- Subgroup 2
- Preliminary Voting Result:
  - ▣ Reliability: H-0, M-9, L-1, I-0; Pass
  - ▣ Validity: H-2, M-5, L-1, I-2; Pass
- Lead Discussant: Daniel Deutscher
- Measure Developer: Purchaser Business Group on Health
- Measure Steward: Purchaser Business Group on Health
- Discussion Guide page: 20
- Items to be Discussed:
  - ▣ This measure is grouped with #3720 and #3721. The SMP should discuss whether all testing results are different enough to warrant different votes on the three measures.



# **NQF Public and Member Comment**

## Thank you for your participation!

As we come to the end of 2022, we want to recognize and thank those SMP members who will be terming off at the end of the year. We thank you for your invaluable contribution to the work of the Panel and your commitment to and support of NQF's work!

- Eric Weinhandl
- John Bott
- Joe Hyder
- Joe Kunisch
- Terri Warholak

# Next Steps

## Next Steps and Reminders

- Full measure submission deadlines: November 1, 8, and 15
- NQF staff will summarize the relevant measure information and discussions of the SMP and provide these to the various Standing Committees
  - Standing Committees will evaluate measures in February 2023
- Next Intent to Submit deadline (spring 2023): January 5



## Project Contact Info

- Email: [MethodsPanel@qualityforum.org](mailto:MethodsPanel@qualityforum.org)
- NQF phone: 202-783-1300
- Project page:  
[https://www.qualityforum.org/Measuring\\_Performance/Scientific  
Methods\\_Panel.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Measuring_Performance/Scientific_Methods_Panel.aspx)
- SharePoint site:  
[https://share.qualityforum.org/portfolio/ScientificMethodsPanel/Sit  
ePages/Home.aspx](https://share.qualityforum.org/portfolio/ScientificMethodsPanel/SitePages/Home.aspx)

# Questions?

# THANK YOU.

**NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM**

<https://www.qualityforum.org>