



CDP Improvements – Fall 2019

Karen Johnson

July 17, 2019

Overview of Presentation

- Context for Improvement Activities
- Changes to Intent to Submit Process
 - ▣ *Effective August 1*
- Changes to the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) Process
- Submission Reminders and Updated Guidance
- Other Improvement Activities
- Measure Developer Resources

Context for Improvement Activities

2017 Redesign of the CDP

- Motivation for the redesign
 - ▣ *Stakeholder concern about NQF's agility*
 - » Time from measure submission to measure endorsement
 - » Timeliness of measure evaluation/wait time for available projects
- Approach
 - ▣ *Kaizen event on May 18-19, 2017, using LEAN tools*
- Participants
 - ▣ *>40 attendees + NQF staff/consultants*
 - ▣ *Public and private sector stakeholders*
 - » CMS and other federal agencies
 - » NQF standing committee members
 - » Measure developers

Some Major Elements of the Redesign

- Scheduling/frequency: Two evaluation cycles per year
 - ▣ *Topic area consolidation (from 22 to 15)*
- Intent to Submit process
 - ▣ *Meant to help facilitate planning of evaluations*
 - ▣ *Required for implementation of the SMP*
- Scientific Methods Panel (SMP)
 - ▣ *Reduce standing committee (SC) burden*
 - ▣ *Promote consistency in evaluation of reliability and validity*
 - ▣ *Encourage greater participation in SCs by consumers, patients, and purchasers*

Internal Process Improvement Efforts

- Specific Areas Targeted for Improvement
 - ▣ *Overall efficiency of activities within the ITS period*
 - ▣ *Transparency of the SMP evaluation process*
 - ▣ *Opportunities for developers to respond to SMP comments for consideration within the same evaluation cycle*
 - ▣ *SMP “gatekeeper” of complex measures (failed measures not reviewed by the standing committee)*
- Approach
 - ▣ *Stakeholder surveys and other stakeholder feedback*
 - ▣ *Address problem statements*
 - ▣ *Process mapping*
 - ▣ *Eliminate waste*

Changes to the Intent to Submit Process

Key Improvements—Measure Intake

Current process	Improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff identifies measures that do not meet minimum criteria for endorsement review and notifies developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No change
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff identifies minor edits needed by developer prior to sending to SMP<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Developers have 48 hours to update submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff will no longer perform this review

NQF Measure Intake Assessment

NQF will remove measures from the evaluation cycle for the following issues:

- Testing not performed at requisite levels (data element and/or measure score)
 - ▣ *Varies based on measure type*
- Administrative claims measures not specified and/or tested using ICD-10 codes
- Nonresponse to submission form items

Changes to the SMP Process

Key Improvements — SMP Structure and Transparency

Current process	Improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SMP currently includes 22 members	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SMP membership to be expanded to ~30 individuals
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SMP is convened over a series of 8 conference calls divided amongst 4 subgroups	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SMP to meet in person 2 times per year*
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Subgroup meeting agenda posted publicly	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All SMP meeting materials will be posted publicly
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No public commenting during conference calls	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allow opportunity for public commenting at SMP meeting

**Pending approval*

Key Improvements— Developer Engagement with SMP

Current process	Improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Developers can only respond verbally to questions/concerns during the subgroup calls (additional documentation after submission is not permitted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Developers will have 1 week to respond in writing to SMP preliminary analyses before final vote; can also respond to SMP questions during the meeting

Developer Engagement with the SMP

- NQF will provide developers the “raw” preliminary analyses (PAs) comments from each subgroup member assigned to evaluate the measure
- Developers will have 5 business days to review the PAs and provide written responses to any concerns or issues raised in the PAs (if desired)
- NQF will append any written responses to meeting materials (for the SMP review) prior to the in-person evaluation meeting
- Final voting on the measure will take place at the in-person meeting
- Any changes to the submission or testing form will take place during post commenting period

Key Improvements—SMP Gatekeeper Role

Current process	Improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measures that pass R/V or are CNR and pass are forwarded to Committee for evaluation and final recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No Change
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measures that do not pass the SMP do not go to Committee for review, discussion, or vote<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Short summary of rationale for not passing is provided to Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Committee members will have the opportunity to pull a measure for discussion (with a rationale)<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Detailed SMP summary, specifications, and testing attachment will be provided to Committee➤ Committee members can re-vote on eligible measures (as approved by NQF staff and Co-chairs)

Committee Consideration of Measures that Do Not Pass the SMP

- Any measure pulled by a Standing Committee member will be discussed
- Some measures may be eligible for vote by the Standing Committee
 - ▣ *Eligibility will be determined by NQF Staff and committee co-chairs*
 - ▣ *Measures that failed the SMP due to the following will not be eligible for re-vote:*
 - » Inappropriate methodology or testing approach applied to demonstrate reliability or validity
 - » Incorrect calculations or formulas used for testing
 - » Description of testing approach, results, or data is insufficient for SMP to apply the criteria
 - » Appropriate levels of testing not provided or otherwise did not meet NQF's minimum evaluation requirements

Committee Consideration of Measures that Do Not Pass the SMP

- For measures eligible for vote by the Committee:
 - ▣ *The full Committee must vote on whether to uphold the SMP's vote on R/V*
 - » Vote to Uphold → No further discussion of the measure
 - » CNR or Vote to overturn SMP Vote → SC discusses and votes on R/V

- Maintenance Measures
 - ▣ *Committee must vote to remove endorsement*
 - » Regardless of whether it is pulled for discussion by an SC member

Submission Reminders and Updated Guidance

Submission Reminders

- **All** measures must be submitted **in full** by the measure submission deadline (regardless of SMP evaluation decision)
- Now enforcing ICD-10 testing requirements
 - *NQF may relax this requirement on a case-by-case basis, but this must be approved prior to submission*
- Testing must align with specifications
 - *Not a new requirement, but NQF is more rigorously upholding this requirement, particularly for level of analysis and minimum sample sizes*
- eCQMs: Demonstration of data element validity now required

Submission Reminders

- Extensions for measures going to the SMP
 - ▣ Cannot be granted
 - » If you need an extension, contact the NQF maintenance team and arrange for submission in a subsequent cycle
- Maintenance measures that failed the SMP in fall 2017, spring 2018, fall 2018, spring 2019:
 - ▣ *Had 3-cycle grace period to maintain endorsement and resubmit*
 - ▣ *Measures will need to be re-submitted within this grace period in order to maintain endorsement*
- Complex maintenance measures are evaluated by the SMP if testing has changed since last submission
 - ▣ *If no changes, NQF staff evaluate R/V*

Updated Guidance—Reliability Testing

- If reporting results from a signal-to-noise analysis
 - *Typically should provide more than just one overall statistic*
 - *Information according to sample size preferred*

Example

Sample size	Mean	SD	Min	10th %ile	25 th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	90th %ile	Max
10+									
20+									
50+									
100+									
200+									

Updated Guidance—Validity Testing

If presenting score-level validation, the following is now expected

- Narrative describing the hypothesized relationships
- Narrative describing why you think examining these relationships (e.g., correlating measures) would validate your measure
- Expected direction of the association
- Expected strength of the association
- Specific statistical tests used (more detail is better)
- Results
- Interpretation of those results (including how they related to hypothesis and whether they have helped to validate the measure)

Other Improvement Activities

Tentative Changes

- Reserve Status
 - ▣ *Recommendation: Regularize review of reserve status measures*
 - » To be reviewed on a 3-year maintenance cycle like all endorsed measures
- Ad hoc reviews
 - ▣ *Recommendation: Rename to “Early Maintenance”*
 - » Ad hocs now considered an early maintenance evaluation
 - » Same criteria for requesting an ad hoc
- Annual Update
 - ▣ *Recommendation: Eliminate this process*

Measure Developer Resources

Technical Assistance and Resources

- NQF staff will provide technical assistance during the submission process—just ask!
 - ▣ *Staff will provide feedback on a draft submission before the submission deadline*
- Resources on the [Submitting Standards webpage](#)
 - ▣ *Measure Developer Guidebook – updated annually*
 - » Explains the NQF process and expectations for developers
 - ▣ *Evaluation algorithms for evidence, reliability and validity*
 - » Found in the Criteria and Guidance document
 - » You should have a good idea what the Committee evaluation is likely to be using the algorithms for these criteria
 - ▣ *What Good Looks Like – examples of good submissions*

Bookmark this page!

http://www.qualityforum.org/Measuring_Performance/Submitting_Standards.aspx

The screenshot displays the National Quality Forum website. At the top left is the NQF logo, a circular arrangement of colorful dots. To its right is the text 'NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM'. A search bar is located in the top right corner. Below the logo and search bar is a navigation menu with links for 'About Us', 'News', and 'NQF Work'. A secondary navigation bar contains tabs for 'Setting Priorities', 'Topics', 'News & Resources', 'Events', 'Membership', 'Measuring Performance', and 'NQF Marketplace'. The 'Measuring Performance' tab is active. On the left side, a vertical menu lists various topics, with 'Submitting Standards' highlighted. The main content area features the title 'Submitting Standards' and a sub-header '+ / - Text Size | Print | Email | Share'. The text explains that NQF endorses performance measures as voluntary consensus standards using the Consensus Development Process (CDP). It details the evaluation criteria used by NQF, such as Importance to Measure and Report, Scientific Acceptability, Feasibility, Usability, and requirements for Related and Competing Measures. It also provides information on how to submit standards, including the need for an Intent to Submit. On the right side, there are sections for 'Related Information' and 'NQF Resources'. The 'Related Information' section lists links for 'Approval for Trial Use', 'Electronic Quality Measures', 'Health Information Technology', 'Measure Submission Help', and 'Patient-Reported Outcomes'. The 'NQF Resources' section lists several documents, including the 'NEW! CDP Resource Library', 'Solicitation of Measures and Concepts (PDF)', 'Measure Submission Deadlines (PDF)', 'NQF Glossary (PDF)', 'Standing Committee Policy (PDF)', and 'Standing Committee Guidebook (PDF)'.

Submitting Standards Webpage Resources

- Criteria and Guidance Document
- Measure Developer Guidebook – updated annually
 - ▣ *Explains the NQF process and expectations for developers*
- Evaluation algorithms for evidence, reliability and validity
 - ▣ *Lays out the logic that committees will use for rating Evidence, Reliability, and Validity subcriteria*
- What Good Looks Like: examples of good submissions
- Blank copies of submission forms
- Resource libraries
 - ▣ *Recordings of SMP and Developer Webinar meetings*
 - ▣ *On-demand educational recordings*
 - ▣ *Tips for developers*

Important Dates

- Intent to Submit Deadline: **August 1**
- SMP in-person meeting: **October 28-29**
- Full Measure Submission Deadline: **November 1-15**

- Have questions? Contact us at:
 - measuremaintenance@qualityforum.org

Questions?

THANK YOU