



---

# **HPH Progress Reports**

## **- Report on pilot implementation**

Fabrizio Simonelli  
HPH Regional Coordinator Tuscany (Italy) and HPH CA Task Force Leader

Kjersti Fløtten  
HPH National Coordinator Norway

Jeff Svane  
Technical Officer, WHO-CC, Bispebjerg University Hospital

Margrete Ripa  
Secretary, WHO-CC, Bispebjerg University Hospital

Hanne Tønnesen  
CEO and Head of Research, WHO CC, Bispebjerg University Hospital



## **The Progress Reports of the International Network of Health Promoting Hospitals and Health Services – a pilot study on implementation.**

### INTRODUCTION

The International Network of Health Promoting Hospitals and Health Services (HPH<sup>1</sup>) has decided to develop and established Progress Reports from National / Regional Networks (N/R Networks) and Task Forces to support exchange of knowledge and experience.<sup>2</sup>

The Progress Reports allow N/R Networks to assess and monitor their performance and their progress in HP work. The reports are mandatory, public and will be filled out bi-annually according to the HPH Constitution. Further, they provide a means of in-depth documentation of all HPH work within the Networks and Task Forces. The other HPH documentation tools - such as the Activity Database and the Online Standard Reporting - do not provide a place for this type of in-depth reporting.

The Progress Reports also allow HPH Members and other interested parties to find information on the different health promotion activities, efforts and results from within the member Hospitals and Health Services. Such reports, then, also facilitate the identification of partners for collaboration and mutual inspiration both inside and outside the Networks.

### MATERIALS & METHODS

The Progress Reports were developed on the basis of the needs and ideas articulated and discussed within the HPH Network, and they were designed so that they may be used by both Networks and Task Forces. The Reports were divided into



<sup>1</sup> See "The International Network of Health Promoting Hospitals and Health Services: Integrating health promotion into hospitals and health services. Concept, framework and organization." (WHO 2007) WHOLIS Number E90777

<sup>2</sup> The work with Progress Reports was based upon GA decisions in 2007 and 2008, the HPH Constitution, the MoU, the International HPH Strategy 2009-10, WHO Standards, the HPH Letter of Intent and the N/R Network and TF Agreements.



an administrative Part A with tick boxes and an operational Part B with open full text questions (see examples from both template forms below).

The pilot testing of the Progress Reports were conducted by the National Network of Norway, the Regional Network of Tuscany (Italy) and the HPH CA Task Force. To support the testing, the work was done in collaboration with the International HPH Secretariat.

<p><b>Part A</b></p> <p><b>Administrative information required</b></p> <p>Name of Network/Task Force: <input type="text"/></p> <p>Date of establishment: <input type="text"/> (d-mmm-yy)</p> <p>Period of signed agreement: <input type="text"/></p> <p>Network Coordinator/Task Force Leader:</p> <p>Name <input type="text"/></p> <p>Address <input type="text"/></p>	<p><b>Part B</b></p> <p><b>ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND WAY OF WORKING</b></p> <p>Describe the organization of the National / Regional Network (coordinating institution, scientific committee, steering group, task forces, etc, if available please attach organizational chart)</p> <p><input type="text"/></p> <p><b>OUTCOME AND MAIN ACHIEVEMENTS</b></p> <p>Please describe the main outcome and achievements, main facilitators and supportive factors and main problems encountered in the National / Regional Network</p> <p>What are the outcome and the main achievements of the National / Regional Network?</p> <p><input type="text"/></p> <p>What are the main problems encountered in the National / Regional Network?</p> <p><input type="text"/></p> <p>What do you think is the limit for more hospitals to join the activities of the HPH National / Regional Network in our country / region?</p>
---	--



### MAIN RESULTS

The overall test results were positive.

A general comment regarding design, however, was that the Progress Report should be put into two different template versions – one version for Task Forces and one for Networks. Another general comment was to improve reader friendliness in the report template text - for instance more space between questions so that none are overlooked, and so that one can clearly see which questions belongs where. This would make it easier to see which text has which function – what is an introduction to the following question, what is the question text and so forth.

For the administrative Part A of the reports it was noted that it was relevant, easy and quick to fill out.

As for the operational Part B, it was noted that it was equally relevant, but also more thorough and thus more time consuming. Rephrasing of questions in certain sections, such as in “Outcomes and Main Achievements” and in “Implementation of WHO Standards in the N/R Work” etc. was also requested because some questions could be interpreted to ask for different things. Some questions might be too broad, hard to answer briefly and too detailed. It was also suggested to simplify the Part B template in some sections with tick box multiple-choice options – for instance from “totally agree” to “do not agree at all”. Another suggestion was to link the Progress Reports to, or to have them refer to, more detailed descriptions of activities in the Activity Database to avoid double work. Also, it was noted that it might be relevant to include a section on innovative approaches and organizational models. Finally, it was noted that it would be useful to add a section for evaluation/self-evaluation activities on the HPH networks and their progress.

In summary then, it was actually proposed to both 1) make Part B broader and more in-depth to cover individual wishes and needs and 2) make it simpler and quicker with tick box options.

### PERSPECTIVES

The HPH Progress Reports were designed to capture information broadly about health promotion work within the networks. The Progress Reports should enable N/R Networks and Task Forces to assess and monitor their own performance and progress. The Progress Reports



should also allow one to identify partners for collaboration and exchange of knowledge and experience in an easy and efficient fashion. They should further allow external health promotion specialists and other interested parties to learn more about HPH and find inspiration regarding future HP work.

Regarding the comments that were made in the pilot test, most of them are easily fixed. One example is the division into a TF version and a Network version.

Among the more wide-ranging problems, there were evidently some conflicts with regards to Part B revisions. Some thought it should be made more in-depth and others that it should be made simpler. In this way Part B remains a challenge, since it needs to address both types of comment. The final template will of course be adjusted according to the feedback given, but it is important to note that the only advantage of simplification would be a quickly filled out report. Such an advantage does not balance out the significant inherent disadvantage of then not being able to register important individual descriptions, details and experience from each Network and Task Force. Also, previous experience with broad and open questions are very positive, since this type of questions can be adapted to all networks easily.

That being said, it is always time consuming to report the work, activities, projects and developments of an entire network. However, this should not be a major problem as the report is only filled out bi-annually.

One way to go about making it simple and still have the required depth could be to include tick boxes and then just have attachments of the rest of the relevant information. However doing that would impair the integration in the search function and loss of overview of the report.

What remains now is to revise the templates on the basis of the feedback, and resolve the issues that still need to be addressed, and most of which are relatively easy to deal with and improve upon for the up-coming online version. In the online version, all user experience and reported issues will thus be addressed and implemented. Also, the Progress Reports online will be integrated into the site's search function to allow easy access to relevant topics in relevant reports. After some usage in this online form it is recommended to have a new evaluation of the reports and the templates.