NQF Kaizen 2017: Stream Charter

FINAL

STREAM 1 CHARTER: MEASURE PIPELINE AND SCHEDULING

Team Member Roles:
Executive Sponsor: Elisa Munthali
Facilitators: Andrew Lyzenga, LaWanda Burwell (CMS)
Core Team members: Wunmi Isijola, Melissa Marinelarena, Sophia Chan (CMS), Helen Dollar-Maples (CMS)

Business Case/Problem Statement

- There is a need for better alignment and coordination between the CMS measure development process and the NQF endorsement process.
    - Multiple agencies within HHS, in addition to CMS, are developing measures. These development schedules are evolving, yet are not transparent or coordinated.
    - New measure endorsement often delayed because of the lack of a suitable or timely endorsement project.
    - NQF endorsement projects are often scheduled based on timelines for development of new CMS measures, but these projects do not always align with the schedule for re-evaluation of currently- endorsed measures.
    - Measure developers need advance notice of available NQF projects to allocate staffing and other resources.

Goal Statement

- Align the NQF measure endorsement/maintenance schedule with the CMS measure development schedules to enable seamless flow of measures into the evaluation process.

Considerations

- NQF will need to facilitate a process to touch base with CMS (and HHS) staff and measure developers
    - The process will need to occur regularly and at least annually
- Transparency of the measure development timelines for CMS contracts (including potential delays) will be required
- What is the role of JIRA and the MAP measure concepts?
- Is there any flexibility in HHS contracting processes or arrangements to accommodate a more flexible schedule for endorsement reviews (e.g., rolling submission and review)?

Deliverables

- Develop a coordinated process where CMS/NQF can share development and endorsement/schedules on an ongoing basis

STREAM 2 CHARTER: STREAMLINING THE CONSENSUS DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (CDP)

Team Member Roles:
Executive Sponsor: Elisa Munthali
Facilitators: Ashlie Wilbon, Taroon Amin
Core Team members: Karen Johnson, Alexis Morgan

Business Case/Problem Statement

- The time between the start and the end of the CDP is too long
- Measure developers want to have the opportunity to submit completed measures more frequently than every three years

Goal Statement *with associated considerations*

- Reduce time between the start and the end of the CDP to five months
    - What do we expect from developers at the time of measure submission?
        - With more frequent opportunities for submission, could NQF be stricter with completeness and responsiveness guidelines and only pass measures to Committees that are "approved" for evaluation?
    - What technical assistance are teams providing to measure developers after they submit their measures before the Standing Committee's review the submission?
    - What technical assistance is ***required*** as part of the maintenance process?
    - Measure developers want the opportunity to solicit feedback on measures in development
        - What are the lessons learned from the two-stage pilot?
    - How much of the preliminary analysis of scientific acceptability can be completed before measure submission?
        - Could we have staff dedicated to technical assistance and completing PA's only?
    - Remove member voting
    - Consider reducing member commenting time
    - Can we have smaller more frequent "projects" or evaluation cycles?
        - Would need to set limits on the number of measures that are reviewed per cycle to ensure timeline stays at 5 months
        - Consider committee availability under this model and potential challenges with meeting quorum requirements.
        - Move to more webinar-based measure evaluation versus in person meetings?

    - Update the "report"
        - Infrastructure limitations to developing reports efficiently
        - Consider what is required by contract and whether those things have to be in a "report" (e.g., if we are required to show use in federal programs, will once or twice per year update on our website suffice?)
        - Consider what can be shifted to the website rather than the body of the report
    - Will our current approach to maintaining standing committees need to be changed as well?
        - Considerations of reasonable Standing Committee members' time expectations
    - Consider how we handle related measures in maintenance
        - New measures would need to be assessed as related and competing?
        - Scheduling the evaluation for competing measures
    - Think about whether/how much we take advantage of deferred endorsement (and whether this would negatively impact the timeline—probably need to start talking about "endorsement decision" rather than "endorsement" for this stream)
- Develop a CDP that can be deployed when measures are completed
    - Can large topic areas can run a CDP every year?
        - These topic areas could have a published schedule (assumption that Stream 1 will produce this as a deliverable)
        - Can additional submissions be accommodated throughout the year (i.e., quarterly) for a limited number of new measures?
    - How should smaller topic areas be run? (CDP 'off-cycle' and on-demand or regular schedule?
        - Both will use the same process with minor modifications, i.e. virtual SC meeting for 'off-cycle' projects, etc.
        - Team should consider if other process steps can be modified for an 'off-cycle' project

Data Analysis/Background Materials

- Endocrine pilot evaluation and lessons learned
- Consensus Taskforce (CTF) efforts
- OMB circulator requirements

Assumptions/Parameters:

- OMB circular requirements
- Maintain the integrity, quality, scientific soundness of the CDP
- Multi-stakeholder committees must remain an integral part of the process
- Future contracts should align with the recommendations

Deliverables

- Map the current CDP process and identify areas of waste
- Develop a new CDP process map

Key Output Indicators/ "Watch-It" Indicators

- Time between start and the end of the CDP
- Others?

Stream 3: MAP/CDP Integration

Team Member Roles:
Executive Sponsor: Elisa Munthali
Facilitators: Poonam Bal, Kate McQueston, John Bernot
Core Team members: Erin O'Rourke, Jean-Luc Tilly, Melissa Marinelarena

Business Case/Problem Statement

- NQF processes do not fully support integration and display of information between the MAP and CDP
    - Measure evaluation summaries for individual measures are located in project reports and are difficult for NQF staff, stakeholders, and Committees to locate and access

Goal Statement

- Identify opportunities to improve access to measure information, MAP Workgroup/Committee decisions, and measure uses in federal programs for the public and staff
- Facilitate processes for transfer of measure information between processes to reduce the measure submission burden for developers acting on MAP recommendations to obtain endorsement

Considerations

- In what ways should a new system be flexible? How should new systems be able to adjust to future changes?
- Do Committee members need additional information on the program structure or what measures are currently used?
- What information is needed from the endorsement review of current measures?
- How can we better collaborate with partners on current measure lists?
- How can we take a more longitudinal view of MAP's data?

- How can we incorporate updates from CMS/other stewards and developers? How can we get information from other stakeholders?
- MAP receives its information from on the MUCs from JIRA. Are there additional fields we should add to collect more information?
- What information is needed about the CDP review of endorsed measures?
- What information from the endorsement process should be included in the MAP PA?
- How could the discussion guide be more useful?
- What information is needed to track a particular measure over time (i.e. refine and resubmit and what has happened to it next)?
- What information would be important for a longitudinal view of MAP by program over time (i.e. presentation of measures reviewed in previous years) and how does that tie into CDP/QPS)?
- What information do the Standing Committees need from MAP?
- What information about MAP should be displayed in QPS?
- Is there information we should add to the preliminary analyses?
- What information is valuable in our reports? What could we remove?

Deliverables

- Map current processes and information flow in MAP and CDP processes
- Develop a new process map to demonstrate the ideal state of information storage and transfer between all NQF work