

November 1, 2003

Terms of Reference



IPDAS Steering Committee

Purpose: To provide leadership for building international consensus on the minimum criteria for quality appraisal of the development, evaluation, and feasibility of use in practice of patient decision aids for health decisions.

Membership:

Annette O'Connor CA, co-chair
Alex Barratt AU
Angela Coulter UK
Hilary Llewellyn-Thomas CA/US
Dawn Stacey CA
Tim Whelan CA

Glyn Elwyn UK, co-chair
Michael Barry US
Margaret Holmes-Rovner US
Nora Moumjid FR
Richard Thomson UK

Goals:

To oversee the consensus process.

To participate in one of three working groups:

- a) Quality Criteria Evidence Group – led by A O'Connor CA & H Llewellyn-Thomas US/CA
- b) Stakeholder Identification Group – led by A Coulter UK
- c) Delphi Methods Group– led by G Elwyn UK

To determine a lead for each of the individual criterion panels.

To review/approve background summary documents from the working groups.

To review/approve final consensus statements and papers.

To oversee the publication process.

Frequency of meetings: approximately monthly from October 2003 to April 2004 (emails or conference calls).

Methods Advisors (* confirmed):

Stephen Campbell, National Primary Care Group UK;
Paul Shekelle, RAND, US*;
Richard Grol, AGREE

IPDAS Working Groups

	Quality Criteria Evidence	Stakeholder Identification	Delphi Methods
Purpose	To develop documents for consensus process participants to make informed choices during the voting and to provide background documents for inclusion in the final consensus report.	To identify key stakeholders to participate in the consensus building process.	To develop and implement the methods, based on a Delphi process, for obtaining consensus on the quality criteria for developing and evaluating patient decision aids.
Lead(s) Membership	Annette O'Connor CA & Hilary Llewellyn-Thomas CA/US - see attached	Angela Coulter UK - see attached	Glyn Elwyn UK - see attached
Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To develop a set of quality criteria relevant to the development, evaluation, and/or feasibility of use in practice that are likely to enhance validity of patient decision aids. b) To draft brief background summary documents on the individual criterion for submission to the steering committee. c) To construct draft set of questionnaire items related to minimum quality criteria for eliciting participant responses d) To facilitate wider consultation on drafted items. e) To participate in development of formal Delphi questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To develop a policy for inclusion/exclusion of stakeholders b) To identify types of stakeholder groups to include in the voting process (e.g. patients/public, developers, researchers, payers, academics) c) To list potential individuals or organizations with international representation. d) To translate the consensus process and knowledge about decision aids to the general public to engage them in the process. e) To translate the outcomes of the final consensus product(s) to all stakeholder groups (e.g. critical appraisal checklist) f) To identify other opportunities to involve stakeholders, patients/public in particular) in the consensus process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To draft process for online brainstorming session to expand criteria with input from the various stakeholder groups. b) To develop a questionnaire format (with suggestions for drafting items for voting) to guide criterion construction. c) To establish the process for voting including the cut-off points. d) To determine the composition of the voting panels. e) To propose the analysis of results from voting. f) To seek advice from the methods advisory panel on contentious issues

	Quality Criteria Evidence	Stakeholder Identification	Delphi Methods
Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist in the preparation or respond to documents being developed. Review key documents in preparation for voting on quality criteria. Communicate using the Internet, email, and/or conference calls. 		
Reporting	To the Steering Committee		
Deadline	<p>Summary documents: Draft of definition & rationale by December 15th, 2003; Draft of evidence & summary by January 31, 2004.</p>	<p>Policy and list of participants: Draft December 15th, 2003; Final January 31, 2004.</p>	<p>Methods document Draft December 15th, 2003; Final January 31, 2004.</p>
Document Templates	<p>General guidelines for brief background summary documents on the individual criterion: Length: ~2 pages (1000 words) Format: point form for easy review prior to voting</p> <p>Headings: DRAFT criteria for voting posed as questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of criterion (conceptual & operational) and examples Rationale/theory Evidence related to decision aids <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RCT's - Other evaluative studies - Published opinions - Common usage – from Cochrane Global Inventory (Ottawa group to provide) Summary paragraph References 	<p>- to be developed</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Aim Brief background Production of Core document that guides participants (by Quality Criteria Evidence Group) – guidance and reading for panel members, then lists of 'quality criteria' Specification of 'Quality Criteria' formats: short descriptive phrases containing one issue that can be given a score on a 9 point scale Specification of communications materials (Logo, flyer, invitation to participate, burden etc) Specification of voting panel. Descriptions of agreed number stakeholder groups (definitions), the number of people in each stakeholder group and how to achieve international balance or representativeness across stakeholder groups (where feasible). Specification of recruitment method: targeted invitations, and replacement policy

Quality Criteria Evidence	Stakeholder Identification	Delphi Methods
		<p>(implementation of this issue by stakeholder group).</p> <p>h) Overall process: voting on criteria - which characteristics? usefulness, feasibility - number of voting issues per round.</p> <p>i) Implementation of methods: preparation of electronic templates, recording of databases of panelists, monitoring sent emails, generation of reminders, agreement of reminder cut offs.</p> <p>j) Handling returned electronic questionnaires - checking quality, validating replies.</p> <p>k) Data cleaning, analysis and feedback for 2nd round. Agreeing weighting strategies/and any sub group analyses.</p> <p>l) Handling returned electronic questionnaires - checking quality, validating replies</p> <p>m) Data cleaning, analysis and feedback for 2nd round. Agreeing weighting strategies/and any sub group analyses.</p>