

# A framework and evaluation metrics for sustainable global surgical partnerships

We ask that you please share your thoughts about and experience with this checklist so we can continue the sustainability dialogue and improve the checklist. A short evaluation survey for the checklist can be found [here](https://ubc.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3QOan1nGMJ3SZTM) or by scanning the QR code below:  
([https://ubc.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_3QOan1nGMJ3SZTM](https://ubc.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3QOan1nGMJ3SZTM))



Catherine Binda, BSc. (Hons.), Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia  
Jayd Adams, BSc (Hons), Faculty of Science, University of British Columbia  
Rachel Livergant, MBT, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta  
Sheila Lam, Faculty of Science, University of British Columbia  
Kapilan Panchendrabose, MSc, Max Rady College of Medicine, University of Manitoba  
Shahrzad Joharifard, MD MPH, Department of Surgery, British Columbia Children's Hospital  
Faizal Haji, MD PhD, Department of Surgery, British Columbia Children's Hospital  
Emilie Joos, MD Msc, Department of Surgery, University of British Columbia

Stakeholder Engagement		
<b>Definition:</b>	<p><b>Stakeholders:</b> In the context of global surgery partnerships, stakeholders should be defined as a group that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• local people who do not hold a traditional leadership role (ex: non-patient),</li> <li>• patients,</li> <li>• traditional care providers (ex: Elder, or traditional bone setter),</li> <li>• medical care providers,</li> <li>• local organizations (ex: hospitals and professional organizations),</li> <li>• local leadership (ex: politicians, religious leaders), and</li> <li>• government ministries (ex: ministry of health and/or education)</li> </ul> <p><b>Engagement:</b> Engaging stakeholders involves incorporating feedback from all stakeholders on an ongoing basis, actively involving stakeholders with the project design, clearly communicating project outcomes to all stakeholders, and fostering longitudinal relationships between partners.</p>	
Has a community-led needs assessment been completed prior to the start of the project?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has there been documentation of approval and/or commitment from at least one member of each stakeholder group prior to the start of the project?	Local person who does not hold a traditional leadership role (ex: non-patient)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Patient	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Traditional care provider (ex: Elder, or traditional bone setter)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Medical care provider	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Local organization (ex: hospitals and professional organizations)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Local leadership (ex: politician, religious leader)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Government ministries (ex: ministry of health and/or education)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has a local champion been identified?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has at least one community town-hall been planned during the project to create spaces for knowledge translation between community and project partners?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has there been documentation of how feedback from community partners and stakeholders has shaped the planning and direction of the project?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has a community-lead communication plan been developed to share the project outcomes and results at local and regional levels?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has a conflict resolution strategy been developed to help mitigate and resolve potential conflicts between stakeholders?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If "No" has been selected for any items in this section, please provide an explanation.		

<b>Multidisciplinary Involvement</b>	
<b>Definition:</b>	<p><b>Multidisciplinary:</b> To be “multidisciplinary”, at least one surgical care provider (ex: surgeon/obstetrician or physician with enhanced surgical training), one anesthesia provider (ex: anesthesiologist or nurse anesthetist), and one allied health provider who provides post-surgical care (ex: nurse, physiotherapist) should be involved in the partnership.</p> <p><b>Involvement:</b> There should be ongoing intra- and inter-disciplinary education, relationship building, and knowledge translation.</p>
Have project partners thoughtfully reflected on which specialties should be involved in the project and completed an intentional recruitment step to engage individuals from these specialties prior to the start of the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has there been documentation of knowledge translation between disciplines involved in the partnership at each key project milestone?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If a given discipline is represented by individuals from more than one partner, have open channels for communication and bilateral knowledge exchange been established between individuals representing that discipline?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If a given discipline is represented by individuals from one partner and not the other(s), has a plan to provide training and support to the lower-resourced partner been created to strengthen the less-resourced partner’s future capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If “No” has been selected for any items in this section, please provide an explanation.	

Context Relevant Education and Training	
<b>Definition:</b>	<p><b>Context-Relevant:</b> Education and training should take into consideration locally identified knowledge gaps, expertise, and resources. Education and training should contextualize the partnership in larger systems and regions.</p> <p><b>Education and Training:</b> The bilateral exchange of knowledge between high- and low-resourced partners featuring information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- practical procedural skills,</li> <li>- research competencies, and</li> <li>- non-technical skills such as communication, leadership, situational-awareness, and decision-making.</li> </ul>
Have all partners (low- and high-resourced) contributed equally to the identification of learning objectives in the partnership?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has there been identification and involvement of content experts from both low- and high-resourced partners?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has education around practical procedural or technical skills training been planned?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has scholarly education on existing literature and evidence and/or on research competencies relevant to the partnership been planned?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has a non-technical skills education been planned (ex: communication, leadership, situational-awareness, and decision making)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Have education and training resources been made available to both participants from the high- and low-resource sites?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has a "train-the-trainers" model been adopted so that project participants can go on to share their knowledge and skills with others?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will there be a certificate, diploma, or other means of formal recognition of participation in the educational components of the project for low-resource and high-resource participants?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If "No" has been selected for any items in this section, please provide an explanation.	

<b>Bilateral Authorship</b>	
<b>Definition:</b>	Individuals from both high-resourced and low-resourced partners have the opportunity and support to make intellectual and physical contributions to the project and be equally represented in the authorship of manuscripts, products of the partnership, and conference abstracts.
Has a written strategy from both partners outlining how they will promote bilateral authorship prior to the start of the project (ex: In their ethics application) been established?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has there been discussion and agreement between all project partners and community members/stakeholders about how they will be acknowledged for their contributions to the partnership prior to the start of the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) authorship criteria be implemented for all aspects of work <sup>1</sup> ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If trainees are involved with the project, will both professionals and medical trainees be represented in the authorship?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If multiple disciplines contribute to the project, will all relevant disciplines be represented in the authorship (ex: surgeons and nurses)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
When possible, will there be an equal number of individuals recognized through authorship from each of the project partners?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will at least 80% of the individuals involved in the project state that they are neutral, satisfied or very satisfied with the authors list prior to the publication of written materials using a 5-point Likert scale?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If "No" has been selected for any items in this section, please provide an explanation.	

<b>Multisource Funding</b>		
<b>Definition:</b>	When project specific funds are required, at least two funding sources must be involved in the project including at least one governmental partner and one non-governmental partner; and including at least one high-resourced partner and one low-resourced partner. For example, a project may be funded by a high-resourced governmental sponsor and a low-resourced non-governmental sponsor. Project-specific funds should have clear benefits to the local communities and all project partners. The value of project resources donated in-kind by project partners, such as space and services, should be acknowledged as a form of project funding.	
If project specific funds are required, has one governmental and one non-governmental source contributed to funding the project?	Governmental funding source	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Non-governmental funding source (private foundation, academic institution, philanthropy, grant)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If project specific funds are required, have resources been contributed to the project by both high-resourced and low-resourced partners?*	High-resourced funding source	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Low-resourced funding source	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
*Sources fulfilling this criteria may overlap with the sources fulfilling the criteria above. Resources may be financial or services provided "in kind".		
If the partnership's major funding source pulled their financial support from the project, would the partnership still be possible?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Is there a budget and funding plan describing how the project will be supported longitudinally?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Is there a plan to acknowledge the goods and services each partner contributes to the partnership "in kind".		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If "No" has been selected for any items in this section, please provide an explanation.		

Outcomes' Measurements	
<b>Definition:</b>	The ongoing evaluation of quantitative and/or qualitative metrics that investigate the domains of: community satisfaction, clinical outcomes, and education (ex: what knowledge and skills have the participants gained?).
Will relevant Vital Health Metrics including Community Engagement, Affordability, Access to Care, and Patient Reported Well Being be identified and evaluated <sup>2</sup> ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will mid and post-project evaluations be conducted where stakeholders rate how meaningful they perceive their involvement to be in the project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will stakeholder satisfaction with the project be evaluated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will short-term patient outcomes (ex: rate of postoperative infection) be evaluated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will long-term patient outcomes (ex: return to work or improved functioning) be evaluated?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Has a critical analysis of the potential harms and negative impacts of the partnership been conducted?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If applicable, will Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs) or a comparable assessment tool be used to track the technical and non-technical skills development of learners?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Will project outcomes and/or lessons learned through the partnership be communicated to partnership stakeholders and to the larger global surgery community?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If "No" has been selected for any items in this section, please provide an explanation.	

### Works Cited

1. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Recommendations for the conduct, reporting, editing, and publication of scholarly work in medical journals. 2022:1-19.
2. McGinnis JM, Malphrus E, Blumenthal D. *Vital signs: Core metrics for health and health care progress*. National Academies Press; 2015:1-308.