Scientific Methods Panel Monthly Call Meeting

Karen Johnson, MS
Poonam Bal, MHSA
May Nacion, MPH
Miranda Kuwahara, MPH

December 7, 2017

Welcome, Roll Call, and Review of Meeting Objectives

Scientific Methods Panel Members

Co-Chairs	David Cella, PhD
	Karen Joynt Maddox, MD, MPH

Panel Members

J. Matt Austin, PhD	Paul Kurlansky, MD
Bijan Borah, MSc, PhD	Zhenqiu Lin, PhD
John Bott, MBA, MSSW	Jack Needleman, PhD
Lacy Fabian, PhD	David Nerenz, PhD
Marybeth Farquhar, PhD, MSN, RN	Eugene Nuccio, PhD
Jeffrey Geppert, EdM, JD	Jennifer Perloff, PhD
Paul Gerrard, BS, MD	Sam Simon, PhD
Laurent Glance, MD	Michael Stoto, PhD
Stephen Horner, RN, BSN, MBA	Christie Teigland, PhD
Sherrie Kaplan, PhD, MPH	Ronald Walters, MD, MBA, MHA, MS
Joseph Kunisch, PhD, RN-BC, CPHQ	Susan White, PhD, RHIA, CHDA

Meeting Objectives

Discussion and Lessons Learned from Cycle 1

Methodologic Issues and Future Topics for Discussion

Lessons Learned

Measure Evaluation Process

- Very tight timeline for Cycle 1
- Responsiveness of staff and panel members is key
  - **(Thank you!!)**
- Greater emphasis on additional resources for panel members
  - *Guidance documents*
  - *Methods Panel Staff*
  - *Clarification from developers*

Measure Evaluation Process Discussion

- Which aspects of the process worked well?

- What changes could improve the process?

- How can the interactions between staff and the Panel be improved?

Current Evaluation Criteria

- Emphasis on referencing NQF's Measure Evaluation Criteria document and the "key points" document

- Familiarity with NQF Evaluation Criteria
  - *Empirical analysis is expected*
    - » Face validity of the measure score is allowed for new measures, but <u>not</u> for maintenance measures unless there is justification

  - *Testing: **either** data element level **OR** measure score level – doesn't have to be both (except for certain types of measures)*
    - » If data element validity testing provided, we **<u>do not</u>** require additional reliability testing

Current Evaluation Criteria, cont.

- Differences in Testing Requirements by Measure Type
  - *Composite measures*
    - » Require reliability testing of the composite measure score
      - *Can also show reliability testing of the components, but this is not sufficient to pass the criterion*
    - » Empirical analyses support the composite construction approach
      - *How this is addressed by the developer will depend on the type of composite*
  - *Instrument-based measures*
    - » For reliability and validity, require testing at **both** the data element level (i.e., of the instrument) AND the measure score level (i.e., testing of the actual performance measure)
  - *eMeasures (eCQMs):*
    - » Testing from 2 EHR systems required
    - » Reliability testing not required **if** based on data from structured data fields. Unstructured fields require <u>both</u> reliability and validity testing

Evaluation Criteria Discussion

- Are there any other items that came up during your evaluation that have not been mentioned?

- Was the rationale behind the criteria clear or did it become clear after communication with staff?

- How can familiarity with criteria be improved?

Preliminary Analysis Form

- Missing measure number and title
- Difficulties with flow logic
- More clarity on specific questions/language in the form
    - *Why asking about validity in the reliability section?*
    - *Other reliability testing – what does '"other" refer to*
    - *Threats to validity: "How can I answer 'Question 1: have all threats to validity been assessed' if Questions 2-6 specify the specific threats"*
    - *Risk-adjustment (very seldom would the "N/A" option be appropriate for complex measures)*
- Considerations in restructuring the evaluation form
    - *Space/place for comments (that may seemingly feel like they don't fit)*

Evaluation Form Discussion

- Are there any other items that came up during your evaluation that have not been mentioned?

- Was the form useful? Did the flow logic make sense? Would you prefer more or less structure?

Questions?

Methodologic Issues and Future Topics

Methodologic Issues and Future Topics

- Agreement on adequate methods for testing
- Determining thresholds for reliability
- Requiring validity testing of the data elements
- Uncoupling assessment of specifications from reliability testing
- What should we expect of eMeasures and how they are tested?

Questions?

Member and Public Comment

Next Steps

- Monthly 1 hour Calls
  - *Every 2nd Thursday of the month*
  - *Next call: January 11, 3 pm ET*

- Discussion Board on SharePoint
  - *No discussion of specific measures*
  - *High-level methodologic issues only*

- Contact Information: methodspanel@qualityforum.org