

Evaluation Systems for Clinical Governance

Development: a Comparative Study

Elahesh Hooshmand^{1,2}, Sogand Tourani³, Hamid Ravaghi³, and Hossein Ebrahimipour^{1,2}

¹ Department of Health and Management, Faculty of Health, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran

² Department of Health and Management, Health Sciences Research Center,
Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran

³ Department of Health Services Management, Faculty of Health, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Received: 30 Dec. 2012; Accepted: 5 Aug. 2013

Abstract- Lack of scientific and confirmed researches and expert knowledge about evaluation systems for clinical governance development in Iran have made studies on different Evaluation Systems for Clinical Governance Development a necessity. These studies must provide applied strategies to design criteria of implementing Clinical Governance for Hospital's Accreditation. This is a descriptive and comparative study on Development of Clinical Governance Models all over the world. Data have been gathered by reviewing related articles. Models have been studied in Comprehensive Review Method. The evaluated Models of Clinical Governance Development were Australian, NHS, SPOCK and OPTIGOV. The Final aspects extracted from these models were Responsiveness, Policies and Strategies, Organizational Structure, Allocating Resources, Education and Occupational Development, Performance Evaluation, External Evaluation, Patient Oriented Approach, Risk Management, Personnel's Participation, Information Technology, Human Resources, Research and Development, Evidence Based Medicine, Clinical Audit, Health Technology Assessment and Quality. These results are applicable for completing the present criteria which evaluating Clinical Governance Application and provide practical framework to evaluate country's Hospital on the basis of Clinical Governance Elements.

© 2014 Tehran University of Medical Sciences. All rights reserved.

Acta Medica Iranica, 2014;52(8):607-612.

Keywords: Evaluation; System; Clinical governance; Development; Comparative study

Introduction

Health and Treatment Services are confronted with different changes and challenges such as increasing demands for qualified Services (1). Today as a result of Globalization all governments are involved in Providing qualified Medical and Treatment Care and also the Medical Tourism in which patients are considered as a client has made the Health System more Competitive and International (2,3).

Complexes resist against changes, variety and different views in Healthcare System. increasing medical and diagnostic costs, increasing society's knowledge and expectations of Healthcare Organization and limitations in Health sources have result in a move toward an Assurance which considers needs and specifications of Medical and Healthcare System (2).

In 1977, NHS System of England Introduced a new

aspect named Clinical Governance on the basis of the providing pattern of World Health Organization and present it as a tool for Assurance high quality Care (3). Clinical Governance is a frame in which Health Care organizations are responsible for Improving quality and safeguarding of the best standards in Health care service in an Environment that promote clinical care (4).

The Main goal of implementing Clinical Governance Principles is to promote quality of Healthcare Services (5-13). Additionally, researches indicate that Clinical Governance significantly has Positive effect on Promoting services' Quality in practice (5,14-18).

While different methods have been performing to improve the quality of Health Services during past 20 years, most of those are failed in practice because of the difference in culture, society and atmosphere of Healthcare Organization which indicates the necessity of qualitative approaches for Health System

Corresponding Author: S. Tourani

Department of Health Services Management, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
Tel: +98 912 3458077, Fax: +98 21 88883334, E-mail address: sogandtourani@yahoo.com

Complexes (19).

In our country, improving qualitative plans and various models with their own weak and strength points and In some cases, deficient and unnecessary applications caused to the unwanted results that don't Lead to Qualitative Improvement in practice (20). On the other hand, Qualitative improving activities are mostly focused on organizing better and more modern equipments, reconstructing buildings and facilities and training staffs (21). Although all of these efforts are valuable but lake of relation between them will lead to inefficiency in complex processeand Wasting resources (20).

Based on evidences of Ministry of Health and Medical Education it is expected that if these attempts be performed on the basis of Iran Health and Treatment System, Clinical Governance will be able to solve some problems of Health System and promote quality of care and meet people's needs [Iranian health minister's official letter No.388044, November 2009 (Persian)]. according to this, Health Policy-Making Council has studied on the recent attempts and provided Clinical Governance Plan in the form of seven main pillars in the meeting dated Nov, 2009 [the MOHME official letters No.45025, 92561, 106083, and 113205 (Persian)].

it is critical to design a system to evaluate Clinical Governance Development to ensure proper implementation of this approach (3,22). There are various patterns which used in Health Systems of different countries to evaluate Clinical Governance development (3). These models consider not only evaluating Clinical Governance Development and measure readiness of Health and Treatment Organizations in the field of implementing Clinical Governance, but also evaluate the success of these organizations to implement this system (3). Despite importance of Clinical Governance as an approach that promotes quality of all aspect of Clinical Services, lake of a tool for assessment the weak and strength points of hospitals and health centers on the base of clinical governance is clear (22).

Lake of scientific and confirmed Researches about Evaluation System for Clinical Governance Development and deficit of expertise knowledge in Iran has caused to perform this research to study the different Evaluation Systems for Clinical Governance Development and determining authentic standards based on clinical governance Pillars for health care sector in Iran.

Materials and Methods

This is a descriptive and comparative study on Evaluation Systems of Clinical Governance Development all over the world. Information has been gathered by reviewing related articles in scientific data banks. Finally, the present models have been studied in Comprehensive Review Method. Key Words that used to search were: Health Services Evaluation, Quality of Health Care, clinical governance. They found via searching in Yahoo and Google in Feb. 28, 2011 and the first 10 pages of finding links (totally the fist 100 links in each site for each keyword) were studied, and the related subjects were extracted after deleting overlappings manually. Those keywords have been searched on valid external and internal Electronic Information Banks such as Scopus/BMJ Medline/ PubMed/Ovid/Chochran/ Embase/ Iranmedex/ SID/ Irandoc and Science direct. Also, the researchers try to search the related subjects by interviewing with the specialists. In this process, some cases such as goal of plan, criteria of accepting studies in the research, search strategies and method of quality evaluation of reviewed papers has been determined exactly in protocol review. It has been trying to select some papers that following cases has been analyzed:

- Definition of Clinical Governance
- Definition of necessary prerequisites and properties to implement Clinical Governance
- Quality Indices in Health Services

Initially 54 Article were selected from the research. When Papers were omitted on the exclusion criteria eight studies remained. The researchers have studied these models based on content analysis (23). They obtained a framework and based on it determined the models. Content Validation Method and parallel sustainability verification used to proof the confirmation and sustainabilityof the framework.

Two researchers separately analyzed these models by the framework and then their results compared with each other (analogy percent: 80). Eventually, the final Dimensions obtained as follow: Responsiveness, Policies and Strategies, Organizational Structure, Allocating Resources, Education and Occupational Development, Performance Evaluation, External Evaluation, Patient Oriented Approach, Risk Management, Personnel's Participation, Information Technology, Human Resources, Research and Development, Evidence Based Medicine, Clinical Audit, Health Technology Assessment and Quality (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparative Matrix of Criteria for clinical governance Development in the considered models

Criteria	Development in the considered models																
	Quality	HTA	C.A. ¹³	EBM	R.D. ¹²	H.R. ¹¹	IT	P.P. ¹⁰	R.M. ⁹	P.O. ⁸	E.E. ⁷	P.E. ⁶	EO ⁵	A.R. ⁴	OS. ³	P.S. ²	RSP ¹
Models																	
Australia																	
NHS																	
OPTIGOV																	
SPOCK																	

Responsiveness, ²Policies and Strategies, ³Organizational Structure, ⁴Allocating Resources, ⁵Education and Occupational Development, ⁶Performance Evaluation, ⁷External Evaluation, ⁸Patient Oriented Approach, ⁹Risk Management, ¹⁰Personnel Participation, ¹¹Human Resource, ¹²Research and Development, ¹³Clinical Audit

Results

The Models that found in Evaluation of Clinical Governance Development in the search were:

- 1) Australian Model (24)
- 2) NHS Model (25)
- 3) SPOCK (22)
- 4) OPTIGOV (3)

Table 1 shows criteria of clinical governance Development in each model.

Discussion

This paper presents the finding from a comparative study of Evaluation System of Clinical Governance Development. It is concluded that Evaluation is one of the fundamental elements in the field of evaluating clinical governance Development and the only criterion that present in all models. Based on the evaluation of the results of models' dimensions analyzing, Cases that should be studied are indices of functions related to Clinical Governance, Evaluation and improvement of the Efficiency, quality and security of the staff's function. Scally and Donaldson believed that the main goal of Clinical Governance is to distinguish the proper function via reviewing standards of function and identifying gaps and recovering domains and finally providing functional plans to remove gaps and a guarantee quality (4). Araho and Hindle also emphasize on designing functional indices on the basis of Clinical Governance Elements (9,26). Furthermore, Australia Health Department and Wrights indicates that the number of these indices should be proper to suggest fundamental advances in the field of Clinical Governance and promotion of security and quality to be able to provide understandable criterion to evaluate Clinical Governance Development in the hospitals (27, 28).

The next criteria that considered in three models of four models consist of Responsiveness, Policies and Strategy, Occupational Education and Development, external Evaluation, patient-oriented approach, Risk management; Evidence based Medicine, Clinical Auditing and personnel's participation.

On the basis of analyzing dimensions of models, there are some cases that should be considered as the Responsiveness evaluators such as determining charts, responsible person of Clinical Governance, Clinical Governance Committee and Reporting System of Clinical Governance in the hospital. According to Rosen and Mack sherry, Responsiveness is the base of Clinical Governance, and they emphasize that Clinical Governance is a framework that conduct the organization to focus on its systems and processes and being responsible for providing and promoting Standards (29,30).

In the field of evaluating Policies and Strategy Criterion on the basis of analyzing dimensions of selected models, some cases should be considered, including, the present Policies and Strategy related to each elements of Clinical Governance, studying functional plan of Clinical Governance and Planning and controlling System of Clinical Governance. On the other word, it should be explained as a section of Strategic Planning Process for Organization to how it utilizes its human and physical sources to implement Clinical Governance (31).

It is necessary that the goals of Clinical Governance Plans be conformed with the organizational goals and also method of confronting with environmental threats should be determined (32). Peak emphasizes on definition of values and Organization Strategic Direction on the basis of Clinical Governance Criteria (33).

Another important criterion that considered in three models of Evaluation System for Clinical Governance Development is Occupational Education

Clinical governance development systems

and Development that it suggests some factors on the basis of analyzing dimensions of studied models to evaluate this criterion including documentations related to the method of determining needs, holding educational courses for staffs along with Clinical Governance Goals and evidences about staff 's individual and professional development via reinforcing knowledge and skill and promoting lifelong learning culture in the organization. Jankowski, Clarck and Bayliss suggested that educational plans for different professional groups must be organized on the basis of Clinical Governance Principles and be evaluated with the same criterion. Because it this way it can be expected that educational plans has a similar goal and finally lead to promote Clinical Governance and Services Quality (34-36).

external evaluation of Clinical Governance Development on the basis of analyzing dimensions, can be implemented by studying documentations related to combining internal and external evaluation results and studying documentations related to reporting of internal and external auditing results .Organization can determine properties in the field of Clinical Governance by External Evaluations and then the chance of successes in the field of effective implementation and application of Clinical Governance will be increased (37). Gilbert believes that , Clinical Governance Components and its implementation amount can be used to benchmarking (38).

There is another important criterion named patient-oriented approach that related to staff's education in order to interference patient in the treatment process, studying information providing process complete related to the treatment process and selecting treatment method and considering the patient's dissatisfactory reasons should be taken to evaluate it on the basis of analyzing the studied models dimensions. Patient-oriented approach has played an important role in the field of Clinical Governance Development. In fact, one of the main goals of Clinical Governance is to change views of Healthcare Providers as it considers an active role for patients in this process of treatment and their participation to make clinical decisions (39). This system is an approach that clinical judgments and Health National Strategies can be led in one direction and verified them to the patient's needs, if necessary (40).

Personnel's participation is another criterion that considered in three models of clinical governance application. So, to evaluate it on the basis of analyzing models' dimensions, there are some cases that should be considered such as evidences indicating all staff's information about politics and strategies of Clinical

Governance is adequate, gathering annual reports of Clinical Governance and to be assured the staff's participation in the processes related to Clinical Governance is obtained. If the staff is equipped with the necessity information and recourses, they can participate in the actions of implementing Clinical Governance. Additionally, the organization should show practically how much is the staff's value? (37) Miles and his colleagues believe that it should be a balance between the physicians' freedom of action to make clinical decision and limitations from implementing of Clinical Governance to maximize results from Clinical Governance development and its effectiveness (41).

Three next criteria that have close relation with each other are Risk Management; Evidence based Medicine and Clinical Audit. In the field of Risk Management on the basis of analyzing dimensions of studied models, some cases should be evaluated such as: establishing Risk Management Committee, its affiliated Committees, written strategy for Risk Management, documentations related to providing routine reports about Risk Management and complains reporting, to be assured of awareness and staff's participation in clinical risks process, evidences indicating routine meetings of discussion adverse events, medical errors and malpractices, maintenance and the organization focus on learning and informing about errors and complains. In fact, Clinical Governance was emerged because there were some expectations about services security and quality (42). It indicates the key role of Risk Management as one of the main criteria to evaluate Clinical Governance Application. On the other word, Clinical Governance provides main standards to promote quality of cares and to prevent medical errors and to cause to improve cares (43).

On the other hand, Clinical Governance is focused on factors including Clinical Decision Making, Proportion of Services and Evidence based Medicine (42). In the field of clinical effectiveness on the basis of analyzing dimensions of the studied models, some cases such as evidences indicating using evidence based medicine via using treatment and diagnosis protocols and Clinical Function Instruction to provide services and evidences indicating that reinforce the staff's research potential and critical skills should be evaluated. Squire suggests that Clinical Governance leads Health care Systems to increase their functional clearness and causes to decrease difference in Outcomes by using national standards and Evidence based Medicine on the basis of results of effective and scientific researches (12).

In the field of implementing clinical audit in the

hospital, structures and process of auditing, evidences indicating function changes on the basis of data from auditing, documentations related to gathering and exchanging auditing results should be evaluated on the basis of the studied models. Taylor and Jones suggest that Clinical Auditing has played important role to make clinical decision and provide services (44). Clinical Governance has been recognized as a framework to promote quality that auditing is a tool to evaluate Evidence based Clinical Governance (45).

Although these criteria are on the basis of studies in other countries but as Iran's clinical Governance System has been sampled from NHS, so, it can be expected that these criteria provide understandable basis for decision makers of Clinical Governance.

More over all evidences that used to evaluate Clinical Governance Development include papers published in English Language and they are accessible by Internet references.

It is necessary to note that policy makers should pay attention to mutual effects of indices. Finally, it is expected that this research can provide a practical and applied framework to evaluate hospitals Progress in development of Clinical Governance Elements.

Acknowledgement

This is the study protocol of a PhD research supported by Tehran University of Medical Sciences (Grant No.: TUMS/SHMIS-1390/447).

References

1. Effective Health Care, Getting evidence into practice. The Royal Society of Medical Press. (Accessed in Feb. 2014, 1 at www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/EHC/ehc51.pdf).
2. Chambers R, Boath E, Rogers D. Clinical Effectiveness and Clinical Governance Made Easy. 4th ed. Oxon: Radcliffe Pub; 2007: p. 75.
3. Spechia ML, La Torre G, Siliquini R, et al. OPTIGOV - A new methodology for evaluating Clinical Governance implementation by health providers. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2010;10(1):174.
4. Scally G, Donaldson L. The NHS's 50 anniversary. Clinical Governance and Drive for Quality Improvement in the new NHS in England. *BMJ* 1998; 317(7150): 61-5.
5. Robertson-Steel I, Edwards S, Gough M. Clinical Governance in Pre-Hospital Care. *J R Soc Med* 2001;94(Suppl 39):38-42.
6. Donaldson L. Clinical Governance and Service Failure in the NHS. *Public Money Manag* 1998;18(1):10-1.
7. Mc Neily Y. Clinical Governance: The Whys, Whats and Hows for Theatre Practitioners. *Br J Theatre Nurs* 1999;9(5):209-16.
8. Swage T, editor. *Clinical Governance in Health Care Practice*. 1st ed. Oxford: Batterworth0Heinemann; 2000: p. 49.
9. Hindle D, Braithwaite I, Jeffrey II, et al. Patient Safety: A Comparative Analysis of eight Inquires in six Countries. Excellence Commission (Accessed in Feb 2012, 5 at <http://www.cec.health.nsw.gov.au/publications>).
10. McMurray R. Our Reforms, Our Partnerships, Same Problems: The Chronic Case of English NHS. *Public Money Manag* 2007;27(1):77-82.
11. Patel S. Identifying Best Practice Principles of Audit in Health Care. *Nurs Stand* 2010;24(32):40-8.
12. Squire S, Cullen R. Clinical Governance in Action. Part7: Effective Learning. *Prof Nurse* 2001;16(4):1014-5.
13. Walshe K, Freeman T, Latham L, et al. *Clinical Governance: From Policy to Practice*. Health Services Management center, University of Birmingham; 2000.
14. Baker R. Reforming Primary Care in England--again. Plans for improving the quality of care. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2000; 8(1):72-4.
15. Nicholls S, Cullen R, O'Neill S, et al. Clinical Governance: Its Origin and its Foundations. *Clin Perform Qual Health Care* 2000;8(3):172-8.
16. Chandy J, Gooffellow T, Vohrah A. Clinical Governance in Action: Radiology. *Hosp Med* 2000; 61(5): 326-9.
17. Masterton RG, Teare EL. Clinical Governance and Infection Control in the United Kingdom. *J Hosp Infect* 2001;47(1):25-31.
18. Ellis BW, Johnson S. The Care Pathway: A Tool to Enhance Clinical Governance. *Clin Perform Qual Health Care* 1999;7(3):134-44.
19. Balding C. From Quality Assurance to Clinical Governance. *Aust Health Rev* 2008; 32(3): 383-91.
20. Mosadegh Rad AM. A survey of total quality management in Iran: Barriers to successful implementation in health care organizations. *Leadersh Health Servs* 2005;18(3):12-34.
21. The Islamic Republic of Iran's fourth economic. Social and Cultural Development Plan Act. (Accessed in Feb 2014, 4 at <http://www.parliran.ir/index.aspx?siteid=1&pageid=2941>]. 2004).
22. Grainger C, Hopkinson R, Barrett V, et al. Implementing Clinical Governance--Result of a Year's Programme of Semi-Structured Visits to Assess the Development of Clinical Governance in West Midlands Trusts. *Br J Clin Governance* 2002;7(3):177-86.
23. Hsieh HF, Shannon SE. Three approaches to qualitative

Clinical governance development systems

- content analysis. *Qual Health Res* 2005; 15(9): 1277-88.
24. Department of Health. Clinical Governance Standards for Western Australian Health Services. Government of Western Australia: Western Australia, 2005. (Accessed in Feb 2014, 4 at http://www.safetyandquality.health.wa.gov.au/docs/clinical_gov/1.2%20Clinical%20Governance%20Guidelines.pdf).
 25. NHS Trust. Proposed Framework for Clinical Governance. London: Main Board of NHS Trust, 2002 (Accessed in Feb 2012, 4, at http://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2003/09/02031055_implementation.pdf).
 26. Araho O, Klazinga NS, Delnoij DM, et al. Conceptual Frameworks for Health Systems Performance: A quest for Effectiveness, Quality and Improvement. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2003;15(5):377-98.
 27. Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing. A Review of Policies and Process for the Introduction of New Interventional Procedures. In: Department of Health and Ageing, editor. Adelaide, south Australia 2007 (Accessed in March 2012, 12, at http://www.surgeons.org/media/291153/Guidelines_review.pdf).
 28. Wright J, Smith M.L, Jackson DR. Clinical Governance: Principal into Practice. *J Manag Med* 1999; 13(6): 457-65.
 29. Macsherry R, Pearce P, Tingle J, editors. Clinical Governance: A Guide to Implementation for Health Professionals. 1st ed. Oxford: Blackwell Science Publications; 2002: p. 54.
 30. Rosen R. Clinical Governance in Primary Care. Improving Quality in Changing World of Primary Care. *BMJ* 2000;321(7260):551-4.
 31. Department of Health. Western Australian Clinical Governance Guidelines. Western Australia. (Accessed in Feb 2012, 4 at http://www.safetyandquality.health.wa.gov.au/docs/clinical_gov/1.2%20Clinical%20Governance%20Guidelines.pdf).
 32. Walton Center for Neurology and Neurosurgery Clinical Governance Strategy 2008-2011 (Accessed in Jan 2013, at <http://Walton%20Centre%20for%20Neurology%20and%20Neurosurgery%20NHS%20Foundation%20Trust.pdf>)
 33. Peak M. Developing of Indicators of Clinical Quality in Pediatric Setting. *Clin Governance Bull* 2005;5:7-9.
 34. Jankowski RF. Implementing National Guidelines at Local Level. *BMJ* 2001;322:1258-9.
 35. Clark CE, Smith LFP. Clinical Governance and Education: The Views of Clinical Governance leads in The South West of England. *Br J Clin Governance* 2002;7(4):261-6.
 36. Bayliss P, Hill P, Calman k, et al. Evaluation for Clinical Governance. *Br J Clin Governance* 2001;6(1):7-8.
 37. Department of Health, Operational Circular 1861/04 Quality & Safety Requirements Applying to Medical Practitioners Medical Indemnity. Version 2 (2004-2005) Western Australia, Department of Health Policy (Accessed in March 2012, at <http://intranet.health.wa.gov.au/circular/op/OP1.pdf>)
 38. Gilbert R. Using Essence of Care Benchmarking to Develop Clinical Practice. *Nurs Times* 2005;101(2):54-5.
 39. Winter J, Meehan L. The Value of Integrated Workforce Planning Across the Local Health and Social Care Economy: A Case Study. *Clin Governance Bull* 2004;5(2):6-8.
 40. Jolly B. Modernizing Regulation in the Health Professions. *Med Educ* 2011; 35(12): 1095-6.
 41. Miles A, Hill AP, Hurwitz B, editors. Clinical Governance and NHS Reforms: Enabling Excellence or Imposing Control? 1st ed. London: Aesculapius Medical Press; 2001: p(57)
 42. Travaglia F, Braithwaite J. Clinical Governance, Safety and Quality: An Overview of Literature. Sydney: Center for Clinical Governance Research: University of New south Wales 2007;15(4):45-61.
 43. Wong WH. Caring Holistically Within New Managerialism. *Nurs Inq* 2004;11(1):2-13.
 44. Taylor L, Jones S. Clinical Governance in practice: Closing the loop with integrated audit systems. *J Psychiatr Med Nurs* 2006;13(2):228-33.
 45. Clinical Governance. Government of Western Australia: Department of Health. (Accessed in Feb 2012, 4, at http://www.safetyandquality.health.wa.gov.au/docs/clinical_gov/Executive_Summary_Paper.pdf).