



NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM

Scientific Methods Panel Monthly Call Meeting

NQF Methods Panel Team

December 13, 2018

Welcome and Roll Call

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
- 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: Advice on Improving Submission Materials

Testing According to Specifications

- Often testing (particularly reliability testing at the score level) is limited to providers with a certain minimum sample size, even if the measure isn't specified with a minimum threshold
 - ▣ *Example: Signal-to-noise analysis conducted for the 572 providers (of the 632 in the original sample) who had at least 25 patients eligible for the measure*
- NQF testing requires that testing be done for measures as specified
- Do you agree this doesn't meet NQF's testing requirements?
- Would you be willing to rate as INSUFFICIENT?

Guidance on Describing Score-Level Validation Analysis

- Typically, a correlation analysis between the measure being evaluated and one or more other measures
 - ▣ *NOTE: It doesn't have to be a correlation analysis!*
- Sometimes text just says “we correlated this with that”, then results are presented, often with very little interpretation

Guidance on Describing Score-Level Validation Analysis

- Current (verbal) staff guidance:
 - ▣ *Provide narrative describing the hypothesized relationships*
 - ▣ *Discuss why you think comparing these measures would validate the measures*
 - ▣ *Specify the expected direction of the association*
 - ▣ *Specify the expected strength of the association*
 - ▣ *Describe the specific statistical tests used*
 - ▣ *Provide results*
 - ▣ *Provide an interpretation of the results (including how they related to hypothesis and whether they have helped to validate the measure)*
- Is this guidance reasonable?
- Is anything missing?
- What if this level of detail is not provided?

Where Do Power Calculations Come In?

- Where might we expect need for power calculations?
- Should guidance be something along the lines of “if you used them, tell us about it”?
- Or should we be more directive? (e.g., if you didn’t use them, tell us why not)
- Or, should we stay silent?

Member and Public Comment

Next Steps

- Monthly 1-hour calls
 - ▣ *Every 2nd Thursday of the month*
 - ▣ *Next call: January 10, 3 pm ET*
- Contact information: methodspanel@qualityforum.org

Adjourn