



ACCORDS

ADULT AND CHILD CENTER FOR OUTCOMES
RESEARCH AND DELIVERY SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL COLORADO

Prevention Research Center for Family and Child Health

ACCORDS (Adult and Child Center Outcomes Research and Delivery Science) University of Colorado School of Medicine
Children's Hospital Colorado Mailstop F443
1890 North Revere Court Aurora, CO 80045

Nurse-Family Partnership® (NFP) International

Guidance Document – Conducting Your Annual Review Meeting (Phase 2-4 Countries) | June 2024

This document provides guidance to National Leaders for the conduct of their country/provincial annual review meeting.

Background

As part of the license agreement with the Regents of the University of Colorado/CU Denver, each country/province is required to prepare and submit an annual report. The annual report forms the basis of the annual review of NFP implementation and fidelity in licensed partner countries and for discussing quality improvement plans.

The annual report includes both:

- Reporting and analysis of data collected by NFP teams and the national leaders of the program.
- Reflections on progress, strengths, challenges and emergent outcome indicators, by the country/province's leadership team

By using analysed quantitative data, and the experiences of NFP clinicians, educators and policy leads, the annual report creates an opportunity for each country/province's leadership team to reflect on progress and develop quality Improvement plans for the following year. A discussion on the content of the report is undertaken through the annual review meeting.

During the annual review meeting the report will be discussed and reflected upon with NFP expert colleagues from another implementing country/province to enable further insight and critical analysis. This review process enables examination of the quality of NFP implementation and fidelity in licensed partner countries and recognition of quality improvement, learning and progress in participating countries/provinces.

Countries will undertake their Annual Review meeting with peer reviewers from a partner country/province who will act as 'critical friends' to deepen critical reflection, provide additional insight and so add value to the review process. The review needs to be conducted in such a way as to maximise the potential for learning on the parts of both the presenting and the reviewing participants.

Principles for the conduct of the annual review

The annual review is undertaken in a spirit which aligns with a core set of NFP principles:

- **Collaboration:** The peer reviewers and the country/province's leads work together to understand local contextual factors and appreciate progress, jointly agreeing priorities and improvement plans for the following year.

- **Transparency and accountability:** Open and honest sharing of data reports and interpretation to enable creative and innovative reflection and opportunities for development. Accountability will be evidenced through appreciation of all contributions and respectful challenge of the information provided.
- **Client centred:** ensuring that the client’s experiences are represented either by presenting client feedback or a case study as part of the report, or by clients providing direct input to the process (e.g., video testimony).
- **Culture of Learning:** The review will promote and encourage lively discussion, clarification of learning and will often involve the development of new questions to be explored, for both the presenting and the reviewing country.
- **Future focused:** The review will be respectful of the progress that has been made and the ways in which challenges have previously been managed but will be explicit about any changes in practices recommended for the future.

Support for the process

- The reviewing country/province will identify internal leads with NFP expertise who will act as ‘critical friends’ within the annual review process and they will arrange peer review meeting with other country, as well as share their details with the Global Director and country license holder.
- The Global Director will be available to discuss any challenges and answer any questions as they arise and attend the peer review meeting if necessary.

The Annual Review Process

Prior to the meeting

- It is expected that the country/province being reviewed complete the appropriate phase annual report template in a timely way.
- The country being reviewed may wish to also provide a brief written introduction to any particular system or local adaptation issues that they feel will be pertinent for the reviewing country to understand as context for the meeting.
- The Annual Report will be sent to the reviewing country/province at least two weeks before the meeting date.
- The reviewing country experts will meet to discuss the report, paying particular attention to understanding and reflecting on the meaning of the data reports presented. They should send any areas they wish to discuss to the license holder of the reporting country/province at least one week before the meeting.
- Notes should be kept at the meeting by peer reviewing country, agreed by both countries and distributed to attendees following the meeting. of the report content and for reflection on the process and key learning points to share with the GCGG.

The meeting

- The meeting will be 1.5 hours minimum.

- Focus for all parties will be on applying the principles during the meeting.
- The meeting can be recorded with consent from reporting country/province.

Attendees

- **The reporting country/province** should include the Strategic Lead, Clinical Lead, Data Analytical Lead, Quality Improvement leads and can also include Site Representation (usually a site Supervisor) and other stakeholders as identified by Lead presenter.
- **The reviewing country/province** should include at least 1-2 of their NFP Leads, with expertise in the areas covered by the report.

During the meeting

The reporting country/province will take the peer reviewers through their report or present its key features, providing clarification and context where necessary, and paying attention to the issues identified in the agenda.

The peer reviewer's role is to facilitate and to support high quality analysis of the information shared within the report. This will include, highlighting strengths, identifying themes, asking good curious questions, raising areas that may need more attention etc. Clarity of feedback is important in this role as well as constructive exploration of ways in which challenges could potentially be resolved. Using the NFP communication style of a strength-based approach and promoting in-depth reflection will support the process of critical, supportive questioning and commentary.

It is expected that the peer reviewers will gain valuable learning for their own NFP QI work from this role, but it is important that the focus remains primarily on the reporting country/province's needs and learning.

The peer reviewer will play a significant part in evaluating what feedback will be useful to share with the GCGG and where further consideration of specific issues by this Guidance Group is needed. A trusting relationship is also imperative for the effectiveness of this review process and working within the principles of the process provides a framework for the development of this.

The template in the appendix should be used to provide feedback to the GCGG. Please email the completed form to Anna Lindberg (anna.lindberg@cuanschutz.edu).

Storing and Sharing Your Annual Report

The Annual report, and the record of the meeting (see appendix) will be distributed to members of the GCGG so that good practice and learning can be shared. If there are any areas of challenge, the GCGG will explore these and work to resolve them on a case-by-case basis. It is unlikely that through this process alone, disputes around adherence to the NFP licence and (or) quality of implementation will emerge. In the unlikely event that there are concerns, both parties i.e., reviewers and reporting countries/provinces will liaise directly with the Global

Director for further discussion and review. Overall decision making regarding the NFP licence is retained jointly by the PRC Director and University Colorado, Denver.

Feedback

This new peer review process for both annual reviews continues to be work in progress. We would welcome any feedback on this guidance and the operationalisation of the peer annual reporting process.

Appendix: RECORD OF MEETING FOR GLOBAL COLLABORATIVE GUIDANCE GROUP

Date of Annual Review meeting:

Attendees from reporting country:

Attendees from reviewing country:

Reviewing country confirmation:

We confirm that the annual report was fully completed.

Yes No

If no, please indicate which areas were missing and how this was addressed in the meeting:

Key learning points arising from the meeting:

| | |
|----|--|
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |