



MAP Coordinating Committee Strategic Web Meeting

The National Quality Forum (NQF) convened a public web meeting for the MAP Coordinating Committee on September 8, 2020.

Welcome and Review of Web Meeting Objectives

Samuel Stolpe, NQF Senior Director, began by welcoming participants to the web meeting. Committee Co-chairs, Charles N. Kahn III and Misty Roberts, provided opening remarks and reviewed the following meeting objectives:

- Review MAP implementation results
- Review and discuss MAP voting process and representation
- Review and discuss measure selection criteria
- Review and discuss Preliminary Analysis Algorithm
- Review and discuss MAP decision Categories

CMS Opening Remarks

Dr. Michelle Schreiber, Deputy Director for Quality and Safety – Center for Clinical Standards and Quality, Centers of Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), provided opening remarks. Dr. Schreiber provided a brief overview of Meaningful Measures 2.0, a CMS initiative and urged the committee members to keep the domains of the initiative in mind as they discuss changes to the 2020-2021 MAP pre-rulemaking cycle. The seven specific domains include person centered care, patient safety, chronic conditions, seamless communication, affordability, and efficiency.

MAP Implementation Results

To inform the audience on how CMS has implemented recent MAP recommendations, Sam Stolpe provided an overview for the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 MAP Cycles. This included the number of measures categorized as follows, as well as the number of measures finalized and not finalized into rulemaking:

- Support for Rulemaking
- Conditional Support for Rulemaking
- Refine and Resubmit Prior to Rulemaking (2017-2018)
- Do Not Support for Rulemaking with Potential for Mitigation (2018-2019)
- Do Not Support for Rulemaking

MAP Voting Process & Representation

Sam Stolpe reviewed MAP representation, key voting principles, and voting procedures. Related to representation, the 2014 MAP governance rules associated with co-chairs were reviewed, specifically that it is expected for co-chairs to represent themselves and not their organization. NQF proposed various options including allowing ex officio, nonvoting, representatives from the organization (with vote staying with the co-chair), no co-chairs and NQF facilitating discussions, more turnover in co-chair

roles, and shortening co-chair terms to one year. Charles Khan, Committee co-chair facilitated the discussion. Charles Kahn expressed the opinion that this presents challenges in capturing stakeholder views as they relate to the organization of which the co-chairs may belong. Several options were discussed to address these concerns and Charles Kahn expressed support of ex-officio options. Committee member Koryn Rubin voiced support of continuity of co-chairs and confusion of the policy change mentioned by co-chair, Charles Kahn. NQF Senior Director, Samuel Stolpe, reinforced this is not a new policy change and that there is NQF documentation dating back to 2014 reinforcing the requirement of Committee co-chairs to represent themselves and not their organization. Committee member Ronald Walters voiced support of continuity of co-chairs, noting that it takes more than one year to achieve a detailed level of understanding of the Committee's work, also commenting the responsibility of the co-chairs to act as facilitators and remain a neutral party during discussions. Several Committee members commented in support of the standing MAP governance rules that have been in place since 2014. No decision was made to progress with any of the presented options and the Committee elected to table the discussion in order to move on to additional items, noting that this proposal would not be revisited during the current MAP cycle.

Sam Stolpe then provided a brief overview of the key voting principles. Committee member Amir Qaseem challenged the scientific credibility of the current quorum definition, suggesting a higher quorum percentage than the current 60% requirement is necessary. Co-chair Charles Khan disagreed, suggesting that a higher level of consensus would not be feasible and that voting must be based on Committee members who are present, which is how the current process was developed and has been previously discussed to a great extent. Committee member Ronald Walters voiced support with Charles Kahn while also reminding the Committee that CMS receives the voting results and is aware of the number of votes cast. Michelle Schreiber confirmed that CMS pays close attention not only to MAP decision categories but also to the number of votes, viewing categories with narrow voting margins differently than those with very strong support for the voting category. Another Committee member voiced concern with the current criteria, stating that a significant percentage of Committee members could feel as though they are not being provided with adequate opportunity to voice any concerns or disagreements. Based on Committee feedback, Co-chair Charles Kahn suggested the Committee consider updating the current MAP guideline language to reflect a change that specifically provides adequate processes to voice concerns prior to a vote rather than change the percentage of approval required to pass a vote. Although Amir Qaseem stated he could not support the current criteria, he was unable to immediately provide any proposed alternative, but rather suggested the need for NQF to harmonize voting criteria across the organization.

After further discussion, the Committee did not put forward a formalized proposal related to changing the quorum criteria but agreed upon the need to ensure language is included in voting procedures that will allow for adequate opportunity for Committee members to express any disagreements or concerns with Committee decisions and voting results.

Measure Selection Criteria

Sam Stolpe provided a brief overview of the MAP Measure Selection Criteria (MSC) which serve as general guidance rather than absolute rules. Misty Roberts, Coordinating Committee co-chair guided a discussion on any proposed changes to the MSC. A federal liaison proposed a more granular and focused criteria that aligns with CMS's Meaningful Measures 2.0. Specifically, the committee discussed amending MSC number 4 from "program measures set include an appropriate mix of measure types" to "program measures set include an appropriate mix of measure types with an emphasis on outcome, patient

reported outcome, and digital measures.” A motion was made to amend the language which was seconded. No objections were raised and upon unanimous consent, the change was approved.

Preliminary Analysis Algorithm

The Committee was unable to discuss the preliminary analysis algorithm due to time constraints. NQF staff suggested that they will send out a survey to the committee members to get their input on whether changes should occur to the algorithm to which the Committee agreed.

MAP Decision Categories

The Committee was unable to discuss these categories due to time constraints. As above, NQF suggested that they will send out a survey to the Committee members to seek feedback on whether changes should occur to these categories to which the Committee agreed.

Public Comment

Sam Stolpe opened the web meeting to allow for public comment. No public comments were offered.

Next Steps

Carolee Lantigua, NQF Manager, presented next steps including a high-level overview of the MAP Timeline. NQF will host a series of setting specific orientation web meetings in September and will begin drafting the preliminary analysis in October. The All MAP Orientation will be on September 17th, followed up by a one-day virtual Workgroup Review meeting on December 17th, and the Coordinating Committee Review will be on January 19th.

Prior to the December workgroup meetings, NQF will send a survey to capture Committee feedback on whether the threshold for consensus is appropriate, proposed changes to amending step two of the MAP voting process, and whether there are any proposed changes to the Preliminary Analysis Algorithm or the decision categories.