Consensus Panel for Outcomes Measurement and Psychometrics: Advancing the Scientific Standards (COMPASS)

Stacie Hudgens, CEO & Strategic Lead, Quantitative Science

Clinical Outcomes Solutions

Tucson, Arizona

COMPASS PANEL HISTORY

- The COMPASS panel was developed in early 2015 as the Outcomes Psychometric Summit by Clinical Outcomes Solutions (COS) with the intent of bringing together a small panel of individuals to work collaboratively to address measurement issues around Clinical Outcomes Assessments (COAs)

- With sponsorship from COS, the Critical Path Institute (C-Path) and The University of Arizona, the first panel meeting was conducted in March 2015

- Critical issues for discussion were developed by the C-Path Communications Subcommittee

- In June 2015, this panel voted to change the name to the Consensus Panel for Outcomes Measurement and Psychometrics: Advancing the Scientific Standards (COMPASS)

Goals of the Panel & Attendees

- Goals:
  - To bring together measurement experts to tackle key psychometric and methodological issues facing the field of clinical outcome assessment
  - To strategically plan a collaborative path for achieving scientific consensus that will inform the selection or construction of clinical trial endpoint measures for medical product development and regulatory decision making

- Attendees:
  - Representation from Industry, US Regulatory (COA Staff & Biostats), Academia, and Consultancy

2016 Meeting

- Convened in Silver Spring, Maryland after the Seventh Annual PRO Consortium Workshop
  - April 29, 2016: Moving toward Consensus
- Activities to Date:
  - Published notes on COS website
  - Two (2) ISPOR presentations
  - C-Path PRO Consortium sponsored webinar on Meaningful Change

- 2016 TOPICS
- Meaningful change
  - Consensus discussions from 2015
  - Emerging methods and study designs
- Mixed Methods
  - Definition of mixed methods
  - Study designs
  - Statistical considerations
- Performance Outcome Tools/Measures
  - Content validity
  - Defining real-world relevance and defining meaningful change

Future Directions

- 2017 Meeting
- Scoring and Interpretation
  - Transformation of raw score scale to other score scales (e.g., 0-100) -- limitations and advantages
  - Summation or averaging for daily diary scores to form endpoints
  - Categorical or proportion-based endpoints, using response levels to derive scoring
  - Implications for missing data evaluation (derivation of scoring algorithms for various recall periods -- daily, weekly, etc..)
  - Interpretation of scores (cross-sectional, longitudinal): raw change, percentage change, and meaningful change
  - Forming a composite score (what is it, when is it appropriate and how)