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# Working Group Membership

Group Lead: Russell Gruen

Commissioners: Sarah Greenberg, Russell Gruen, Thaim Kamara, Chris Lavy, Andy Leather, Richard Sullivan, Iain Wilson

Facilitator: Sarah Greenberg

Review Lead: Rebecca Maine

Research Assistants: Meera Kotagal, John Rose, Eric Nagengast

# Terms of Reference Topics Overview

1. Overview of Metrics & Indicators
2. Key Conditions/Procedures
3. Data Issues
4. IT Infrastructure
5. Research
6. Recommendations

# Introduction

Information management plays an integral role in providing quality care in any setting. The efforts of this working group will focus on understanding and assessing data sources, data measurement and data collection platforms; optimizing research practices; and identifying recommendations for metrics focused on access, safety, and quality. This working group is also responsible for creating metrics for topics deemed most important within the other working groups and will therefore work closely with the additional working groups to do this.

# Outputs

1. *Written.* By Monday 10th May 2014, the working group will submit a four to five thousand word output document encapsulating the terms of reference within the framework of current state, barriers to implementation and solutions. The working group output documents will be the substance of the final commission report, and will include:
	1. At least 2 tables and 2 figures to be used in the commission report.
	2. Focused recommendations to key stakeholders
2. *Presentation.* During the second commissioners meeting, each working group will present on their topic to the larger commission group. This will be a 15-minute presentation with an hour for commentary and review.
3. *Metrics.* Each working group will provide areas of metrics focus for the Information Working Group to transform into metrics for The Commission.

# Key Stakeholders

1. Governments (Ministries of Health & Finance in LMICs)
2. WHO
3. Multilateral/Bilateral Organizations (World Bank, USAID)
4. Foundations
5. Educational
6. Academic & Professional Entities
7. Industry

Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Jan 7* | Background documents received by Commissioners |
| *Jan 17-18* | First working group session during the January Commission meeting in Boston. By the end of the meeting, the working groups will have determined: * + Content: The body of the work which needs to be done
	+ Process: The work plan for the coming months
 |
| *Jan 19 – May 10* | Area of Metrics focus communicated with Information Working GroupEach working group will (e-)meet several additional times between January and May |
| *May 10* | Each working group will submit their Output Document, including tables, figures, and recommendations to be distributed to the commissioners for review |
| *May 23-24* | Each working group will present their findings to the whole Commission group during the second Commission meeting in Sierra Leone |

Working Group Outline

1. **Overview of Metrics & Indicators**

What is currently being measured in the dimensions below, strengths and weaknesses with current measurement, and how to improve upon current measures/practices.

* 1. Access
	2. Safety
	3. Impact
	4. Quality (Structures/Processes/Outcomes)
	5. Other Dimensions
1. **Key conditions/procedures**

What conditions are key to monitor?

* 1. Emergency vs non-emergency
	2. Those that must be locally-available vs those that can be provided by visiting teams
1. **Data Issues**
	1. Content
		1. What information is important and useful to collect/measure
		2. What information is currently being collected/measured
		3. Where are the gaps
	2. Barriers to data collection
	3. Methods of data collection/registries
	4. Data topics: access, quality, safety, outcomes, others?
	5. Levels of measurement: country versus hospital level data versus international (eg SOSAS, PIPES, WHO situational analysis tool, etc)
2. **IT infrastructure**
	1. Current practices and platforms
	2. Gaps
	3. Challenges to development and implementation of IT infrastructure
	4. Recommendations: applicability, utility (which tools provide value added)
3. **Research**
	1. Conduct: how should research projects be structured and integrated
	2. Content: types of research, focus of research (project generation and direction)
	3. Regulation, IRBs, Consequences
	4. Players and Roles (countries, individuals, colleges, journals)
4. **Recommendations**
	1. Meaningful/recommended metrics to assess/monitor surgical care
	2. Recommended metrics for the commission report for all working groups

# Background Work

1. Metrics Overview (systematic review)

# Deliverables

*Teaching Cases*

*Basic Case Studies*

*Possible Primary Research Papers*

*Key Messages/Figures and Tables*

# Potential Supporting Documents

1. Birkmeyer et al, Measuring the Quality of Surgical Care: Structure, Process or Outcomes?
2. Weiser et al, Standardised metrics for global surgical surveillance
3. Parts of the MDG commission report talking about reasons for success/failure
4. A Paxton, The United Nationals Process Indicators for emergency obstetric care: Reflections base on a decade of experience
5. Hsia et al, Access to emergency and surgical care in sub-Saharan Africa