



Measure Feedback Loop Committee Web Meeting 3 and 4

The National Quality Forum (NQF) convened public web meetings for the Measure Feedback Loop Committee on April 30 and May 7, 2019.

Web Meeting 3

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Web Meeting Objectives

Ashlie Wilbon, NQF Senior Director, welcomed participants to the web meeting. Navya Kumar, Project Analyst, reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives. The goal of the meeting was to discuss NQF process and evaluation criteria along with other updates on the findings of the sources of information for measure feedback to inform the use and usability report. Madison Jung, Project Manager, provided an overview of the project scope, timeline, and deliverables.

Overview of NQF Process and Evaluation Criteria

Jean-Luc Tilly, Project Manager, Data Analytics, provided an overview of the NQF CDP process including the timeline for the two cycles of endorsement and the evaluation criteria for endorsement. Mr. Tilly highlighted the five major evaluation criteria that measures are evaluated for by the project Standing Committees. He then went into detail on the criteria specifically related to feedback: Importance to Measure and Report, Feasibility, and Usability and Use. Mr. Tilly discussed how the measure submission form, public comment period, decisions and rationale from the MAP process, and the NQF Feedback Tool influence the Standing Committee's evaluation of Usability and Use. The Standing Committee wanted to clarify that the Usability and Use section is not a must-pass criterion. Currently only the Use section is must-pass for maintenance measures. The Committee also wanted to define the stakeholders. For this project, the Environmental Scan report definition of four different stakeholder groups will be used: patients, measure developers, those being measured (i.e., providers), and measure implementers (i.e., administrators).

Review of CDP Use and Usability Criteria and Submission Form

Ms. Wilbon provided historical context behind the Usability and Use criteria, highlighting the principles and recommendations from prior Usability reports. Co-chairs, Dr. Edison Machado and Ms. Rose Baez, facilitated the Committee's discussion.

The Committee discussed the ability for measure developers to influence the Use criterion. The Committee noted that in many cases developers may not know whether the measures they have published are in use in smaller regional or state programs, as when these measures are published there are typically liberal licensing requirements. However, the Committee made a distinction between knowing how measures were being used versus the measure developer's responsibility to capture the intended use of the measure as part of its submission, including the preferred data source and level of analysis.

The Committee agreed that there are certain allowable justifications for not meeting the Use requirements in an accountability application at three years after endorsement, and in public

reporting after six years. The Committee underscored the importance of “closing the loop” or ensuring that Standing Committees reviewing a measure have access to all feedback that has been submitted on a performance measure in between maintenance of endorsement reviews. The Committee noted the considerable challenge developers face in collecting feedback from those being measured and others. The Committee noted the difficulties involved in tracking commenting and improvement activities. Committee members suggested reaching out to EHR vendors and specialty societies to partner with. While many of these organizations do have key personnel that are engaged in NQF’s work, often their engagement is limited to their specific stakeholder interests (i.e., hospital associations interested in exclusively hospital-level measures).

Public Comment

One member of the public commented. The commenter noted that the existing structure of the feedback loop would be strengthened by responding directly to commenters with justifications for whether a request for an ad-hoc review of measure was justified.

Web Meeting 4

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Web Meeting Objectives

Ashlie Wilbon, NQF Senior Director, welcomed participants to the web meeting and reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives. Ms. Jung provided a brief review of the topics reviewed during web meeting 3.

Feedback Received through Other NQF Processes

Mr. Tilly reviewed the feedback received through the various NQF processes that are part of the CDP evaluation, including MAP recommendations, CDP public comments, and the NQF Measure Feedback Tool. The Committee discussed the challenges associated with gathering feedback through these sources and identified several areas where additional sources could be used. Co-chairs, Dr. Machado and Ms. Baez, facilitated the Committee’s discussion.

Challenges and Gaps

Throughout web meeting 3 and 4, the Committee noted several challenges and provided several recommendations for solutions and aspects that a measure feedback loop should account for as follows.

- **Ease of use and opportunities to submit.** The Committee noted that although NQF has several different methods to provide feedback on performance measures, barriers to access limit use, particularly by those stakeholders less familiar with the field of performance measurement. For example, NQF-sponsored commenting features require authentication, and this deters comment submitters. The Committee recommended that NQF partner with organizations implementing performance measures, including registries, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and others, to add direct links to the NQF Feedback Tool or other feedback mechanisms that would be directly incorporated into the CDP measure evaluation. However, the Committee acknowledged that this recommendation is challenging to implement.

- **Close the feedback loop.** When measure end-users submit feedback, it is necessary to verify that their comments are received. These confirmations encourage commenting by acknowledging that the feedback has been received and it will be acted upon. Feedback submissions should clarify whether the feedback has been passed on to a developer, or to a Standing Committee reviewing the measure.
- **Targeted outreach to key stakeholders.** The Committee emphasized that it is imperative to promote opportunities for stakeholders to offer feedback on performance measures. There is a need to increase the promotion of opportunities to comment on performance measures beyond the audiences that typically interact with NQF.
- **Classifying feedback.** The Committee noted that comments and other submitted feedback were generally entered as free text, with no opportunity to classify the feedback or pair it with other feedback that may have similar themes. In addition, the Committee emphasized the importance of attributing the feedback to a specific stakeholder group or perspective. In order to address the feedback appropriately, it is necessary to know the context and perspective of the stakeholder submitting it.

Public Comment

Ms. Kumar opened the web meeting to allow for public comment. No public comments were offered.

Next Steps

The Committee's recommendations and feedback will inform the use and usability draft report. This report will be posted for NQF member and public comment from May 29 to June 11, 2019. The final use and usability report will be posted on July 3, 2019.