



Appendix 3: NAC Review Criteria and Guidelines

A National Advisory Council (NAC) reviews CHBRP's analyses for quality and objectivity before analyses are transmitted to the Legislature. This document provides the criteria and guidelines used for these reviews.

Purpose of the review: To help assure the accuracy, responsiveness, completeness, and clarity of CHBRP analyses of proposed health insurance benefit mandates undertaken for the California legislature.

Structure of bill analyses: The bill analyses are structured around specific issues mentioned in AB 1996, CHBRP's authorizing legislation, which asks the University of California to address the medical impacts of mandated services, as well as the estimated financial and public health impacts, of each bill. When a particular piece of legislation would mandate something other than the coverage of services (e.g., access to certain types of providers), CHBRP may decide to modify the structure of the written report and provide the Legislature with other information it deems more relevant to the bill's potential impacts.

Audience: CHBRP's primary audience is the California State Legislature and each report is submitted to the committee that requested it (either the Assembly Committee on Health or the Senate Committee on Insurance) as well as to the author(s) of the legislation analyzed. Other members and committees of the Legislature, as well as California state government agencies such as the Office of the Governor, the Departments of Managed Health Care and Insurance, and the California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS), may also be interested in CHBRP analyses. AB 1996 further requires CHBRP to make its written analyses available to the public on its website, www.chbrp.org. There may be additional interest in CHBRP reports both in California and nationally.

Review Criteria: CHBRP asks National Advisory Council reviewers to comment on the extent to which the report meets the criteria of: 1) accuracy and objectivity, 2) responsiveness to the legislative request, 3) completeness, and 4) clarity of presentation using the specific questions on the review form as a guide to the extent they are helpful.

National Advisory Council Review of CHBRP Draft Bill Analysis

Date: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Bill Number or Name of Draft Report: _____

Using as much space as you need, please comment in the boxes below on the extent to which the draft report meets each of the following criteria using the specific questions as a guide to the extent they are helpful. There is space at the bottom of the form for other general comments or mention of specific parts of the text about which you have comments. When possible please indicate whether your comment might fall into the following categories: 1) suggestions; 2) issues or items that you identify that you want to make sure the authors are aware of or are considering; 3) serious concerns that must be addressed.

Accuracy and Objectivity:

- Are conclusions adequately supported with objective evidence?
 - Does the analysis adequately discuss situations for which evidence does not exist and discuss the implications of this lack of evidence?
 - Does the analysis avoid perceptions of bias, for instance, by noting when cited studies are conducted by interested parties or by properly framing findings that may have resulted from biased research or reporting?
 - Are potentially politically-sensitive issues handled appropriately, using neutral language?
-

Responsiveness:

- Are the analyses, findings and conclusions relevant to the bill in question?
-
-

Completeness:

- Does the analysis adequately address each of the issues of medical, financial, and public health impacts specified in AB 1996? If not, does the text or appendices offer an explanation? ([Click here for a list of the issues requested of each of the CHBRP analyses in AP 1996](#))
 - To the best of your knowledge, does the report exclude any high-quality evidence that would alter the findings or conclusions of the report?
-
-

Clarity:

- Does the executive summary concisely and clearly summarize the findings described in the analysis?
 - Are the findings clearly and concisely stated in understandable language?
 - Is supporting evidence described in sufficient detail?
 - Upon first mention, are technical terms defined appropriately for an interested lay audience?
 - Is the organization of the report easy to follow and appropriate for the topic?
-
-

Other Comments:
