



NATIONAL  
QUALITY FORUM

# CDP Redesign: Scientific Methods Panel's Fall 2018 Update

*October 23-24, 2018*

# Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) Charge

- Conduct **evaluation of complex measures** for the criterion of Scientific Acceptability, with a focus on reliability and validity analyses and results
- Serve in an **advisory capacity** to NQF on methodologic issues, including those related to measure testing, risk adjustment, and measurement approaches

# The Evaluation Process

# Course Corrections through Spring 2018

- Provided more information needed for evaluation
  - *Summary of previous evaluation (for maintenance measures)*
  - *Feasibility Scorecard (for eCQMs)*
  - *Full measure specifications*
- Slightly revised the evaluation form for Spring 2018 cycle
  - *Re-ordered and re-numbered questions; revised directions*
- Provided additional guidance for evaluation
  - *For risk-adjusted measures: Inclusion (or not) of certain factors in the risk-adjustment approach should not be a reason for rejecting a measure*
  - *For all measures: Incomplete or ambiguous specifications are grounds for rejecting a measure—but recall option to get clarifications, although this must be done early on*
- Changed evaluation process slightly
  - *Allowed 3 independent evaluators to talk with each other*
  - *Conducted some staff-led discussions with evaluators to discuss issues*

# May 2018 In-Person Meeting: Panel Recommendations to Improve Process

- For the process
  - ▣ *Learning from each other is a key “ask”*
  - ▣ *Consensus from a larger group would be better*
  - ▣ *However, impossible to evaluate up to 50 measures in a 2-3 day in-person meeting*
  - ▣ *Regardless, agreement that we need earlier resolution*
  - ▣ *Wanted more info from us about final ratings, points of disagreement*
  
- For the evaluation form: Revise evaluation form to include some check-boxes, but be mostly free-form

# New Process Effective Fall 2018 Cycle

- A subgroup of panel members independently evaluate each measure, then meet as a group to discuss and vote on reliability and validity
  - ▣ *Number and size of the subgroups will depend on the number of complex measures submitted for endorsement*
  - ▣ *During subgroup conference calls, a consent calendar approach will be used*
  - ▣ *The majority recommendations from the subgroup vote will serve as the overall assessment of reliability and validity*
  - ▣ *Subgroup conference calls are public; however, only Scientific Methods Panel Members can speak*

# New Process Effective Fall 2018 Cycle

- NQF staff will compile the subgroup's ratings, evaluation, and commentary on reliability and validity and provide it to NQF's standing committees
  - ▣ *Measures where Scientific Methods Panel ratings are LOW or INSUFFICIENT do not go to the Standing Committees*
    - » Information is provided back to developers to inform revision of submission in a future cycle
  - ▣ *For other measures, the ratings and evaluation summary are meant to inform Standing Committees' endorsement decision*
    - » Standing Committees can overturn the Scientific Methods Panel ratings of HIGH or MODERATE

# Performance Metrics

Metrics	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018
Total number of complex measures submitted for evaluation by the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP)	8 (7 new)	21 (9 new)	38 (20 new)
<i>Unanimous “pass”</i>	2	4	TBD
<i>Unanimous “did not pass”</i>	1	4	TBD
<i>Split decision: co-chairs arbitrated</i>	5 (63%)	13 (62%)	n/a
Total number of complex measures that received “low” or “insufficient” ratings from the SMP (i.e., did not go to SC)	4 (50%)	13 (62%)	TBD
Percent of time the standing committees were in agreement with the Scientific Methods Panel’s recommendations	75%	100%	TBD
Percent of time the Scientific Methods Panel’s recommendations were overturned by standing committees	25%	0%	TBD
Average turnover rate of SMP membership	0%	0%	0%



# Advisory Functions

# Discussions on Monthly Calls

- July 2018
  - ▣ *Proposed process updates*
  - ▣ *White paper discussion (mostly process)*
  - ▣ *Reliability analysis for measures based on multi-item scales*
- August 2018
  - ▣ *New process roll-out*
  - ▣ *Identifying methods to analyze signal-to-noise (for reliability)*
- September 2018
  - ▣ *New process reminders and Q&A*
  - ▣ *Issues for Fall 2018 evaluations: considering social risk; composite measures; instrument-based measures that use item banks; cost measures*

# Initial Set of Three “White Papers” Planned

- Perspective article – Draft outline completed
  - ▣ *Overview of NQF measure endorsement process, rationale for SMP creation, role of the SMP, preview of upcoming papers*
  - ▣ *Goal: to complete draft by end of year*
- Outcome measures and risk adjustment – Two drafts completed
  - ▣ *Scientific acceptability of data elements (including data quality, reliability, validity); scientific acceptability of measure results (reliability, validity); risk adjustment (why needed, model development, validity of the model)*
  - ▣ *Goal: to complete draft by end of year*
- Patient-reported outcome based performance measures (PRO-PMs) – Will begin next year

# Next Steps for the Panel

# Next Steps

- More focus on the Methods “Toolkit”
  - ▣ *Definitions of important terms*
  - ▣ *Descriptions of methods for demonstrating reliability and validity*
  - ▣ *Guidance on best methods for different measure types*
  - ▣ *“Thresholds” or acceptable results (or maybe rules of thumb)*
- Panel members continue working on journal articles

# Discussion Questions

# CSAC Discussion Questions

- Do you have any feedback on the overall implementation of the SMP to date?
- Do you have any input regarding potential changes to the MP process?
- What do you think about the consent calendar approach?
- We haven't been able to incorporate developer feedback (to the Methods Panel) as part of the process. Any ideas how on how we could accomplish this given the time limitations? Ex: Survey/ focus group discussion?