Re: An evaluation of New Zealand’s iterative Workforce Service Reviews: a new way of thinking about health workforce planning

The New Zealand Nurses Organisation, having concern that this paper is being cited in New Zealand as supporting Health Workforce New Zealand’s (HWNZ) confidence in the success of the Workforce Service Reviews (WSRs), accessed the full paper by Naccarella et al. and critically reviewed it. Independent review was also sought. A copy of the review is available at www.nzno.org.nz/services/publications.

The main concerns identified were:

• The abstract did not represent the paper accurately, depicting a far more positive summary than appears warranted by the results.
• The independence of the evaluation is questionable, as Australian Health Workforce Institute provides support to HWNZ and one of the authors was the director of HWNZ, who also commissioned the research.
• No information about the impact, outcomes or costs of the WSRs was presented, nor was it demonstrated how they differed from the processes of reviewing and ensuring ongoing health service improvement that is at the core of clinician-led management.

In summary, we feel this paper is not sufficiently robust and in no way could or should it be used as an endorsement of the success or otherwise of HWNZ’s WSRs. We would urge revision of the abstract so that those who rely on abstracts alone can draw more reliable conclusions.

Yours sincerely,

Susanne Trim
Professional Services Manager
New Zealand Nurses Organisation.

---

Reply

We have read and thoughtfully discussed the letter and review by the New Zealand Nurses Organisation and have chosen not to respond.

Regards,

Lucio Naccarella
(on behalf of Louise Greenstock and Brenda Wraight)
The Australian Health Workforce Institute, University of Melbourne.
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