Quality Improvement in HIV/AIDS Programs
A Skills Building Workshop for NGOs/CBOs and their Partners

Facilitators' Guide

Workshop Logistics: The Workshop is scheduled to take five and one half (5.5) hours and is designed for 50 participants. The case study presented below is broken into an overview, introduction and 4 parts. A certain amount of time is allotted to each section. Workshop discussion group facilitators lead each of the five case study parts by reading the case study section with their group. If a French translator is needed then it is recommended that the translator read with the group from the translated text.[1]

The workshop outline and case study questions should be projected from overheads or from a power point presentation. In the case that the workshop is conducted in English and French, overheads in both languages should be presented simultaneously. Workshop books should be presented to each participant. The books should include the copies of the case study and questions (in French and English) and examples of PIR instruments and forms, including the PIR conceptual framework.

Participants discuss each case study in small groups. Tables should be arranged so that when participants enter the workshop room they will sit at the appropriate. Tables should thus be labeled for English or French and should face the front of the room so participants can follow the overheads. A flip chart and markers should be placed at each table for note taking.

1) **Each small group facilitator reads the case with participants.**

2) **A minimum of 5 discussion group facilitators and 1 workshop coordinator are necessary to implement this workshop.**

Materials

- Overhead projector (1 for each language)
- Overhead projector screens (1 for each language)
- Flip charts 5 (1 for each table)
- Flip chart stands 5 (1 for each table)
- Markers and pens
- 6 Copies of this facilitator's guide
- 60-70 Copies of the Case Study
- 5 large tables and at least 2 small tables (for OH projectors)
- Registration forms
- Travel expense claim forms, if necessary or appropriate

Other Supplies

- Make sure that water and drinking glasses are provided on each table
- Tea or snacks for participants
- Participant certificates if planned – be sure to bring in a pen to fill in participants' names if they cannot be filled in ahead of time.

[1] It is recommended that the case study be translated before use in languages other than French or English.

Time = 5 Minutes

ZIHP and the PIR Process:

Welcome the participants and give a brief, **no longer than five minute**, introduction to the ZIHP project and its experience with the PIR process. If your organization is not affiliated with ZIHP, give an introduction to your program and a statement of your interest in and experience with the PIR process.

Time = 5 Minutes

General Overview:
Present the goal and objectives of the workshop to participants. Do not read the general overview to the group.

Time = 45 Minutes

Introduction:

Each small group discussion leader begins by reviewing the questions relevant to the introduction, then he/she reads the introduction to the case study with his/her group. Read the case study allowed to help participants follow along. Groups will then discuss the case with the assistance of their facilitator.

Trainer's Notes

The introduction to the case study gives the details necessary to understand the organization and its objectives. It sets up the foundation for the rest of the case study.

ASSIST Case Review - Introduction

Review: Ask participants to repeat what they learned about the organization. They should be able to recall:

- The organization's name;
- Who the organization's manager is;
- The organization's main objectives; and
- How ASSIST set these objectives.

Questions and Discussion: Lead a discussion of participants' responses to the case question. Key points to cover for each question are given below. These points are not exhaustive and participants should be encouraged to bring out other relevant points. Write participants' comments on the board (flip chart) and summarize after all questions are discussed.

1. Why did the NGO establish measurable objectives?
- To have quantitative markers of program performance. - To be able to measure progress towards an established goal. - To monitor the effectiveness of program activities.

2. How do you think these objectives will be useful to the NGO in the year to come?

- ✍ The NGO will be able to compare real achievements against stated goals and get an understanding of the program's status.
- ✍ The NGO will be able to periodically measure their progress toward these goals and make changes accordingly.

Participant Input: Ask the participants if they have any additional comments or questions. They may have questions about setting measurable goals, such as what types of measurable goals or objectives are reasonable or how to collect data for particular measurable goals. Workshop facilitators should be prepared to answer such questions.

Time = 1 Hour

Case Study Part 1:

Each small group discussion leader begins by reviewing the questions relevant to the first part of the case study, then he/she reads part 1 of the case study with his/her group. Groups will then discuss the case with the assistance of their facilitator.

Trainer's Notes

Part 1 of the case study gives information about the PIR planning process. It describes the formation of the PIR team and the steps necessary for organizing a review. The main objectives of this part of the case are:

- ✍ To orient participants to the steps of planning a PIR monitoring program;

- ✍ To illustrate the importance of coalition building in creating participatory monitoring teams.

ASSIST Case Review Part 1

Review: Before beginning the discussion, give participants several minutes to review the Performance Improvement Review schedule on page 8. Then begin the discussion by asking participants to repeat what they learned about the planning process. They should be able to recall:

- ✍ How many days the review would take;
- ✍ Who made up the PIR team;
- ✍ Materials copied;
- ✍ That transportation and space for summary meetings were arranged;
- ✍ That the planning meeting covered: a review of the PIR process, data collection, translation, and a data collection plan.

Questions and Discussion: Lead a discussion of participants' responses to the case questions. Key points to cover for each question are given below. These points are not exhaustive and participants should be encouraged to bring out other relevant points. Write participants' comments on the board and summarize after all questions are discussed.

1. What is the purpose of conducting the Performance Improvement Review?
✍ To measure program performance on a routine basis; ✍ To improve program performance by identifying problems and creating solutions; ✍ To strengthen partnerships and program activities; ✍ To get a sense of program performance as well as staff training and supervision needs; ✍ To build staff competence to identify problems and develop solutions to key issues.

2. What is the reason for involving the health center nurses, district manager and the school committee member to be part of the monitoring process?
✍ To strengthen partnerships; ✍ To involve them in problem identification and decision making; ✍ To get assistance making important decisions that involve partners.

3. What are the key steps in planning the Performance Improvement Review?
✍ Assembling the PIR team (Inviting partners); ✍ Assembling and copying materials (instruments); ✍ Arranging logistics – meeting rooms and transport - organizing and conducting a planning meeting with team members, translating PIR instruments; ✍ Making a data collection plan; ✍ Planning meeting.

Participant Input: Ask the participants if they have any additional comments or questions. They may have questions about which partners they should include, forming PIR teams, or the cost and logistics of PIR monitoring activities. Workshop facilitators should be prepared to answer such questions. It is important to remember that monitoring activities do cost money to conduct; however, PIR is designed to take only a few days and is flexible so that NGOs can adapt their process to suit their programmatic and financial needs and limitations. Nonetheless, PIR activities must be incorporated into a program budget in order to be feasible.

Time = 1 Hour

Case Study Part 2:

Each small group discussion leader begins by reviewing the questions relevant to the second part of the case study, then he/she reads part 2 of the case study with his/her group. Groups will then discuss the case with the assistance of their facilitator.

Trainer's Notes

Part 2 of the case study outlines the process of data collection and problem identification. A list of qualitative and quantitative problems is included to help the participants understand the organization's findings. The objectives of this session are:

- To introduce participants to some of the fundamental aspects of PIR data collection and problem identification;

- To examine the assessment of quantitative results.

ASSIST Case Review: Part 2

Review: Before beginning the discussion, give participants time to review the Performance Improvement Review Schedule example on page 8. Then begin the discussion by asking participants to repeat what they learned about the planning process. They should be able to recall:

- The main people interviewed, for example, service providers, manager etc.;
- How the team identified problems;
- What problems were identified;
- How quantitative data were collected;
- Quantitative results;

Questions and Discussion: Before beginning the discussion, give participants a few minutes to look over the instrument example on page 12. Than, lead a discussion of participants' responses to the case question. Key points to cover for each question are given below. These points are not exhaustive and participants should be encouraged to bring out other relevant points. Write participants' comments on the flip chart and summarize after all questions are discussed.

1. Can you describe the data collection process, its advantages and limitations?

Advantages:

- It enables an organization to collect a lot of information in a short period of time;
- It enables an organization and its partners to assess service provider/staff performance;
- Touches on a wide range of issues and collects information from many different perspectives.

Limitations:

- While comprehensive PIR is not meant as an evaluation, which is has a larger scope than a monitoring process. For example, one does not collect population-based statistics from PIR;
- Takes good planning and coordination to get everyone in the right place at the right time;
- Takes time and organizations must commit to the process for it to be useful and effective.

2. What could you learn about service provider competence from the service provider instrument?

Ask participants to refer to the instrument included in the case.

Possible answers include:

- Could learn about SP knowledge;
- Could get some understanding of SP experience of supervision;
- Could learn about SP understanding of referral;
- Could get a sense of SP training experience.

3. Why did the team examine the peer educator and YFC registers? How is the information they obtained useful to the NGO and the peer educators?
✍ Examining registers is a way of collecting quantitative data and assessing program performance in relation to its goals; ✍ Examining registers helps the team get a sense of which SPs need special attention, who is performing well and who is having difficulties.

Participant Input: Ask the participants if they have any additional comments or questions. They may have questions about which partners to include in PIR activities, forming PIR teams, or the cost and logistics of PIR monitoring activities. Workshop facilitators should be prepared to answer such questions. It is important to remember that monitoring activities do cost money to conduct; however, PIR is designed to take only a few days and is flexible so that NGOs can adapt their process to suit their programmatic and financial needs and limitations. Nonetheless, PIR activities must be incorporated into a program budget in order to be feasible.

Time = 1 Hour

Case Study Part 3:

Each small group discussion leader begins by reviewing the questions relevant to the third part of the case study, then he/she reads part 3 of the case study with his/her group. Groups will then discuss the case with the assistance of their facilitator.

Trainer's Notes

Part 3 of the case study addresses action planning and scoring. It describes the process of discussing problems and developing remedial actions. It includes an example PIP and asks participants to respond to the PIP. It also presents graphs of program performance. The main objectives of this part of the case are:

- ✍ To introduce participants to participatory problem analysis;
- ✍ To introduce participants to the process of identifying and recording corrective actions to program problems;
- ✍ To orient participants to the formalization of a Performance Improvement Plan including: definition of responsibilities, establishment of deadlines, and PIP dissemination;
- ✍ To introduce participants to the step of creating a performance picture.

ASSIST Case Review Part 3

Review: Before beginning the discussion, give participants a few minutes to review the action plan on pages 14 and 15 on their own. Then begin the discussion by asking participants to repeat what they learned about the planning process. They should be able to recall:

- ✍ That the team discusses problems together;
- ✍ That for each problem an outcome, solution/action, person responsible, deadline and monitoring strategy are developed;
- ✍ Problems are reflected in the graph.

Questions and Discussion: Lead a discussion of participants' responses to the case question. Key points to cover for each question are given below. These points are not exhaustive and participants should be encouraged to bring out other relevant points. Write participants' comments on the board or flip chart and summarize after all questions are discussed.

1. Why did the team discuss problems together instead of the NGO manager making a list and plan by herself and delivering the plan to the team?

- To get the input of all team members, particularly partners, in the decision making process – to make the process more democratic;
- To get individuals to take responsibility for actions instead of delegating responsibility;
- To ensure that all partners have an equal understanding of problems, actions, and monitoring strategies.

2. Why did the team identify a person responsible for making sure corrective actions are carried out, a deadline for the action's completion, and a strategy for monitoring the action?

- So that one person would be sure to follow-up activities and would be responsible if they were not carried out;
- To put a time limit on when an action should be conducted/completed;
- To make sure that the activity is followed up and to verify the quality of its execution.

3. What actions did partners take responsibility for? Why is their involvement important

- Improving peer educator information/education – **Mr. Chimbo** and the **Clinic Nurses;**
- Patrons to spend more time with PEs – **Patrons**;
- Referral – **Peer Educators**, **Patrons**, and **Clinic Nurses**;
- Supply at YFC – **Clinic Nurses/DHMT**;
- Information on Sex and Sexuality – **School Board Representative**, **Mrs. Bemba**, Mr. **Chimbo**.

- Their involvement is important because they can take responsibility for issues that are under their jurisdiction;
- They diversify the NGO's manpower and associations, and help connect the NGO to other authorities and agencies that effect the NGO's work.

4. **Can you offer an alternative solution or monitoring strategy for one of the problems on the PIP?**

There are many possible responses to this question. Encourage participants to be creative. For example,

- An alternative monitoring strategy for peer education information giving and knowledge might be an oral examination administered by Mr. Chimbo, which each peer educator would have to pass;
- Or, for the problem of inadequate stocks at the YFCs, the DHMT might want to conduct monthly reviews of YFC stocks for a period of 3-6 months until the problems have been resolved.

5. **Why is the performance chart useful to the PIR team?**

- Because it helps teams see where the biggest problems are;
- Because it offers a visual representation of performance that the organization can compare with future performance review results.

Participant Input: Ask the participants if they have any additional comments or questions. They may have questions about problem identification, action planning, performance charts and scoring. It is important to stress in this introduction that although scoring and creating graphs of program performance can be very useful, the processes of problem identification and action planning are most critical to program improvement. In fact, scoring and graphing are not necessary to have a complete PIR review. However, no review can be successful or complete without a detailed action plan.

Time = 1 Hour

Case Study Part 4:

Each small group discussion leader begins by reviewing the questions relevant to the fourth part of the case study, then he/she reads part 4 of the case study with his/her group. Groups will then discuss the case with the assistance of their facilitator.

Trainer's Notes

Part 4 of the case study describes the organization and findings of the second PIR review conducted 6 months after the first. It begins by describing at the monitoring activities the organization undertakes between the reviews. Then it describes the planning and implementation of the second review and its results. The main objectives of this part of the case are:

- To present the step of interim monitoring for defined actions;
- To introduce participants to the significance of follow-up performance reviews and the performance improvement continuum.

ASSIST Case Review Part 4

Review: Before beginning the discussion, give the participants some time to review the results and charts on pages 17, 18, 19 and 20. Then, begin the discussion by asking participants to repeat what they learned about the planning process. They should be able to recall:

- What Mrs. Bemba and Mr. Chimbo did between the first and second review;
- The second KAP survey and its results;
- The partners involved in the second review;
- Quantitative results;
- Performance improvement chart;

Questions and Discussion: Lead a discussion of participants' responses to the case question. Key points to cover for each question are given below. These points are not exhaustive and participants should be encouraged to bring out other relevant points. Write participants' comments on the board and summarize after all questions are discussed.

1. In what areas had the program improved since the first review? What were the actions that contributed to these improvements?

- ✍ Peer educators no longer gave misinformation;
- ✍ Peer educators noted that patrons gave better support;
- ✍ Peer educators promoted condom distribution at referral sites.

2. What problems persisted/arose?

- ✍ Some peer educators were confused about where to refer students for condoms or other health services;
- ✍ Some peer educators still had problems discussing sensitive issues, particularly sex and sexuality;
- ✍ Patrons complained of time constraints;
- ✍ Some school teachers and parents were concerned about the discussion of sex and sexuality in the schools;
- ✍ Condom distribution was still very low;
- ✍ The number of peer education sessions was better but not on target.

3. How did the second review help the NGO and its partners understand program progress? How do you think additional reviews will help the program improve further?

- ✍ Team saw the benefits of the actions they undertook after the first review;
- ✍ Team identified which problems persisted and were able to make a new PIP;

- ✍ Additional reviews will help the organization monitor its activities;
- ✍ Additional reviews will improve the quality of the program and the capacity of program staff to identify problems and develop solutions to resolve problems.

4. How do you think the PIR process could be useful to your organization?
✍ Help us monitor our programs; ✍ Help us set clear goals and objectives (targets); ✍ Help us work better with our partners; ✍ Help us improve the quality of our programs; ✍ Help us understand staff needs.

Participant Input: Ask the participants if they have any additional comments or questions. They may have questions about why ASSIST chose some actions over others, or about why some problems persisted. Facilitators should be prepared to answer questions and address comments about monitoring follow-up. It is important to stress that improving quality program takes time and that monitoring is a continual process that must be institutionalized to be effective.

Time = 35 Minutes

Closing Remarks and Certificate Distribution

A workshop coordinator should take time at the end of the workshop to make closing remarks. It is important during this time to thank participants for their contributions to the workshop. If certificates are available for participants, they can also be presented at this time. If certificates are not being distributed to participants, closing remarks should be kept to 5-10 minutes.