



Quality Action
Improving **HIV** Prevention in Europe

Quality Action CASE STUDY

1. Name and country of the organisation

(Please state the name and the country of the organisation that implemented this practical application of a QA/QI tool as part of Quality Action. We do not publish this information unless you agree. You can remain anonymous by adjusting the settings at the end of this form).

Deutsche AIDS-Hilfe e.V., Germany
www.aidshilfe.de

2. Authors of the case study and contact details

(Please provide then name of the author(s) of this case study and any contact names, Email address or websites where readers can access more information about this practical application of a QA/QI tool).

Carolin Vierneisel
Juliane Böthner
Silke Klumb
Karl Lemmen

3. External support (facilitators/partners/technical assistance)

(Please list the names of other organisations and/or people who were involved in this practical application of a QA/QI tool, e.g. project partners, technical assistance, external stakeholders etc..).

None

4. Project/Programme and key population/target group addressed

(Please describe the project/programme to which you applied the tool and the key population/target group addressed).

We used the Shift tool to reflect on and discuss our organisational strategy.

The DAH, founded in 1983, and the largest HIV/AIDS self-help organisation in Germany today, is

- * a specialised association for structural prevention within the context of HIV/AIDS, STIs, hepatitis and other diseases that are sexually transmitted or transmitted through drug use
- * an association of those particularly at risk of or affected by HIV and AIDS (for example, gay and other men who have sex with men, people who use drugs, migrants, prisoners, sex workers, family members and friends)
- * an umbrella organisation of AIDS service organisations in Germany (AIDS service organisations, support groups for people who use drugs, prevention projects, gay and lesbian centres, accommodation and care projects).

5. Goals/aims of applying the QA/QI tool

(Please list the goals you wanted to achieve with the practical application of the tool).

We used the Shift tool to reflect on and discuss our overall work and organisational strategy. The application aimed at identifying the current status quo of our work beyond departmental boundaries and some emerging ideas on potential steps forward.

6. Tool and methodology used

(Please indicate which of the five tools you used (Succeed, QIP, PQD, PIQA, Schiff) and briefly sketch out the steps and measures of how you applied it).

We used the Shift tool.

We had an organising team of four members with one person in charge, all involved in Quality Action in some way, including the head of the department for quality development and our organisation's CEO.

We met three times for preparation. Additionally, many individual working hours were spent on preparing the meeting, the questionnaire etc. We used an existing translation of the tool into German. Still, it had to be proofread and adapted again. The subsections of the questionnaire to be discussed for each meeting and the methods per subsection were agreed on within the organising team. We used some of the methods suggested in the tool guide, such as the sheet on key populations, but added others, such as the 'circles of influence' from the PQD tool, to make it more varied.

We invited all heads of departments or projects of our organisation to the meetings. Participation was on a voluntary basis. Well in advance we arranged three dates spread over a period of 1,5 months (1st: 3hrs, 2nd and 3rd: 2 hrs). Many colleagues were not available or dropped out. The constitution of the group changed slightly over the course of the meetings. On average, 10-12 people joined the meetings.

One member of the organising team facilitated the meetings and another documented the results of the discussions. After the first meeting, feedback from participants and discussions among the organising team suggested to shorten some of the subsections to minimise redundancy. Also, some questions didn't seem to fit our purpose. In the end, we changed some of the subsections completely (e.g. the stakeholder mapping was replaced by an adaptation of the PQD method 'circles of influence') as it seemed to fit our needs better. After the three meetings, we collected data from the participants with an anonymous feedback form to reflect on the process.

7. Results and benefits of applying the QA/QI tool

(Please describe what resulted from applying the tool and if and how your project/programme benefitted).

* Already during the process, participants said how much they appreciated the arranged structured time and space to reflect on their work with colleagues. They said this was not as easy to achieve to the same extent during daily working routines, other than as part of project-specific collaboration and exchange.

* some questions and methods sparked more discussion than others. In general, the meetings proved to be valuable in sharing knowledge and experiences on the topics discussed.

* as we didn't want to burden ourselves with another action plan, we decided to pick out only some of the steps forward we identified for each subsection, which are to be worked on in the future.

8. Recommendations

(Please describe the lessons learnt from positive and negative experiences during the process of using the tool itself and about the quality of projects/programmes like yours).

- * For many reasons, the Shift tool itself did not fit our purpose of reflecting on our organisational strategy - though the process initiated by the application did. The main reason is that the tool is designed to be applied different processes/within other contexts. The match of the goal of using the tool and the scope of the tool itself should be considered thoroughly when picking the tool. As a consequence, we used the Shift tool after the first meeting mainly as an orientation framework only and discussed and within the organising team created new ways of reaching our goal for the next meetings.
 - * The questions in the Shift tool seemed, especially during the first meeting, a little redundant in the way that they sparked the same discussion and were thus tiring for participants. It might be an option to combine some of the questions in a future version of the tool.
 - * To not create confusion among participants, it is important to have a good translation of the tool.
 - * The time allocated for the application was too short to discuss matters comprehensively. Still, the time taken seemed to be the maximum amount people could allocate for another extra meeting. Announcing the meetings well in advance didn't help as much as we had hoped. Maybe the application process can be stretched more or condensed to 1,5 days.
 - * We decided to invite people to the meetings on a voluntary basis. It turned out that people who would have been important to be there for a comprehensive discussion decided not to take part in the meeting. Lack of time was one of the factors. Another one is that some people are more into the process of quality development than others. In the future there is the alternative to agree on one fixed group of interested people for the process.
- It was essential to have a fixed organising team and one main person in charge of the process. The team met up before and after each meeting to exchange experiences and adapt the plan. This proved to be crucial.
- The application proved to be very valuable in terms of time and space for discussion as these are rare during the daily working routine. As for tool selection, we'd have been better advised to use a tool that was more suitable for our goals.

Please indicate how you want this case study to be published:

- ☒ *I want this case study to be published mentioning the names of countries, organisations, people and contact details/websites in the text above.*
- ☐ *I want this case study to be published anonymously, meaning that names of countries, organisations, people and contact details/websites in the text above will be removed by the editors before publishing.*
- ☐ *I want this case study to be published without mentioning people's names, meaning that names of people in the text above will be removed by the editors before publishing, but names of organisations and countries as well as website addresses will remain.*

*Please return the filled in document to your country contact
(who will then forward it to their WP 6 contact).*

Thank you!