

# NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

TO: Composites Technical Expert Panel

FR: Karen Pace, Senior Director  
Karen Johnson, Senior Director  
Elisa Munthali, Senior Project Manager

SU: Composite Measure Evaluation Guidance —Post-Comment Call to Discuss Public and Member Comments and TEP comments

DA: December 31, 2012

The Composites Technical Expert Panel will meet via conference call on Thursday, January 3, 2013. The purpose of this call is to:

- Review and discuss comments received during the public and member comment period.
- Provide input on responses to comments.
- Review and discuss TEP feedback on draft report.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

## **Expert Panel Action:**

1. Review this briefing memo.
2. Review the comments received and the proposed responses (see Excel and Word files included with the call materials).
3. Review the latest version of the report. This is the posted report that includes redline changes that were sent to the TEP on 12/14 as well as additional changes.
4. Be prepared to provide feedback and input on proposed comment responses and on issues identified through previous TEP feedback.

## **Please use the following information to access the conference call line and online webinar:**

**Date/Time:** Thursday, January 3, 2013, 1:00-3:00 pm ET

**Expert Panel dial-in #:** 888-799-5160

**Audience dial-in #:** 866-393-9767

**Confirmation Code** (for both dial-in #s): 71807376

**Webinar:** <http://nqf.commpartners.com/se/Rd/Mt.aspx?130723>

*The expert panel phone lines will be open. Please place your phone on mute when not speaking. Do not put your phone on hold during the call.*

# NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

NQF received comments on the draft report from five NQF member organizations and three members of the public. Where possible, NQF staff has proposed draft responses for the TEP to consider. Although all comments and proposed responses are subject to discussion, we will not necessarily discuss each comment and response on the post-comment call. Instead, we will spend the majority of the time considering the major themes and/or the most significant issues that require TEP discussion and resolution.

We have included all of the comments that we received in the Excel spreadsheet that is included with the call materials. This comment table contains the commenter's name, as well as the comment, topic area, and draft responses for the TEP's consideration. Please refer to this comment table to view the individual comments received and the proposed responses to each. Note that some specific questions to the TEP are highlighted in yellow.

## MAJOR THEMES AND ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

The major themes and issues for discussion are listed below. However, we ask the TEP to identify any additional areas for discussion from the draft report and/or the comment table.

1. Definition of composite and clearly identifying what types of measures should be classified as composite performance measures that require additional analyses and evaluation.
2. Composite criterion 1d – Definition of quality construct; rationale for composite performance measures and decisionmaking context; what is acceptable
3. Reliability testing
4. Validity testing
5. Composite criterion 2d – expectations for empirical analyses

### ***Theme 1: Definition of composite and clearly identifying what types of measures should be classified as composite performance measures that require additional analyses and evaluation.***

The TEP made suggestions for rewriting the paragraph describing a composite performance measure. Commenters questioned how we were going to resolve the problem that measures have not been consistently classified as composite performance measures. One commenter cautioned classifying measures computed with shrinkage estimators as composites. One commenter provided several references for any-or-none endpoints. Because composite performance measures are evaluated against some additional criteria that require additional analyses, it is important that they be consistently identified and specific guidance is needed for NQF staff, steering committees, and developers.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Approve definition of composite performance measure and rewritten paragraph on p.4
- Identify the types of measures that should or should not be classified as composite performance measures that require additional analyses and evaluation (particularly measures of any-or-none complications and shrinkage estimator). The key question is whether the measure should be subject to the additional criteria (1d and 2d) that have been identified for composite performance measures. See initial draft suggestions on p.5. (NOTE:

# NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

References on composite endpoints have been posted on SharePoint; the Ferreira-Gonzalez - J Clin Epi 2007 article is a good review article and actually references most of the others).

## ***Theme 2: Composite criterion 1d – Definition of quality construct; Rationale for composite performance measures and decisionmaking context; what is acceptable***

The CSAC asked for a definition of quality construct. The TEP suggested rewriting the discussion regarding the decisionmaking context as part of the rationale. One TEP member questioned whether the rationale was required as part of the criterion 1d. Commenters asked for clarification of the relationship between decisionmaking context for the rationale and NQF endorsement for broad accountability applications.

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Approve definition of quality construct on p.9, lines 18-23
- Approve rewritten paragraph on decisionmaking context on p.10.
- Is decisionmaking context influence on composite measure construction unique to composites? (See p.10, lines 24-27.) Does the TEP want to make any recommendation to NQF regarding endorsement?
- Approve composite criterion 1d and guidance in table on p.14. Is being clear and logical the only evaluation to be made?

## ***Theme 3: Reliability testing***

One TEP member raised a question regarding reliability discussion in relation to all-or-none measures (p.11, line 10, comment KP10). TEP and commenter raised a question about requiring reliability of components if will be disaggregated for use in an accountability application.

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Approve discussion of reliability on p.10-11. Does requirement for signal-to-noise reliability apply equally to all-or-none composites?
- Approve **guidance** for 2a2 – remove language about reliability of component measure if disaggregated in accountability applications on p.15.
- Add note to guidance for 4.Usability and Use (on p. 17) that NQF endorsement applies only to the composite performance measure as a whole, not to the individual component measures. If the component measures are intended to also be used/reported, they need to be NQF-endorsed individually.

## ***Theme 4: Validity testing***

TEP member and commenter raised questions regarding feasibility of validity testing. The draft guidance indicates validity of the composite as a whole should be demonstrated, but if not feasible, then validity of the components would be accepted with expectation of validity testing by first endorsement maintenance. TEP and commenter raised a question about requiring validity of components if will be disaggregated for use in an accountability application (this question was also raised regarding requiring reliability of components).

# NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

## **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Approve **guidance** for 2b2 – remove language about validity of component measure if disaggregated in accountability applications on p.15.

## ***Theme 5: Composite criterion 2d – expectations for empirical analyses***

The TEP raised a question whether analyses regarding aggregation and weighting is needed. CSAC asked for examples. Developers and NQF steering committees will benefit from having specific examples.

## **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Approve composite criterion 2d on p.16.
- Provide specific examples of analyses that would be acceptable for the 3 elements of criterion 2d. See initial draft on p.16.

## **ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION ON COMMENTS/RESPONSES**

Please identify any comments and draft responses that require discussion and resolution by the TEP. Some additional questions for the TEP are highlighted in yellow in the Excel file (see ID #38 and #6) . In the interest of using the call to discuss the substantive issues, we ask that you send us edits via email.

## **DISCUSSION OF ADDITIONAL ISSUES ON DRAFT REPORT**

Please identify any further issues in the draft report that require discussion and resolution by the TEP. In the interest of using the call to discuss the substantive issues, we ask that you send us edits via email.