



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 We do not publish this information unless you agree.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, Berlin, Germany

2. Authors of the case study and contact details

(Please provide the 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 Vierendeis
Deutsche AIDS-Hilfe
carolin.vierendeis@dah.aids-hilfe.de
www.aids-hilfe.de

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..)

Facilitator:
Klaus Stehling
Aids-Hilfe Hessen
info@aids-hilfe-hessen.de
www.aids-hilfe-hessen.de

4. Project/programme

(Please briefly describe the project/programme to which you applied the tool.)

We applied the tool during a workshop on the topic of participation of people living with HIV (PLHIV) in AIDS Service Organisations (ASOs) in Germany. The workshop was part of a conference on living with HIV ('Positive Encounters') that mainly attracts People living with HIV engaged in self-organisation, ASOs or both. People who attended the workshop were interested in finding ways to improve the participation of people living with HIV in ASOs.

There were 11 workshop participants and two facilitators. The workshop ran for three hours.

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

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

Applying the tool aimed at different goals: first, we wanted to use the method to help people to get a picture of the current dynamics of stakeholders in their respective ASO - with a special focus on PLHIV. This was intended to help people discuss their needs and wishes regarding the future participation of PLHIV in their ASO. A third goal was to plan next steps towards attaining their vision regarding the participation of PLHIV.

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.)

PQD: Circles of Influence

We used tape on the floor to represent the different levels of participation as concentric circles. People first named the different stakeholders, which we wrote on cards that were arranged within the circles on the floor. In a second step, participants were asked to locate themselves and other stakeholders within these circles (in person, by actually walking there). We collected their views on the benefits and disadvantages of their respective locations. We then asked the participants where they would locate themselves if they had the choice. These questions and tasks stimulated discussion among participants.

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.)

Participants got a picture of the different levels of participation of different stakeholders in their own ASO. They also got to know different models of participation used in other ASOs. People who themselves weren't deeply involved in a local ASO got a better insight into how diverse ASO work is. It helped some people realise how far away from the centre of decision making people living with HIV (not those who are employees) are located in some ASOs. On the other hand, it demonstrated that there are some 'good practices' where people with living with HIV are involved intensively at the centre of decision making.

The discussion showed that

- > very often, the level of participation also depends on the people working in ASOs; it is also dependent on the size of the organisation, and on the history of participation in that ASO
- > participation and decision making are factors in satisfaction with cooperation among stakeholders
- > high job qualification requirements are an obstacle to participation
- > sometimes help is needed to find people who want to get involved
- > self-organising has the benefit of being more independent (in comparison to participating in ASOs)
- > very often there are hierarchical disputes between different stakeholders in ASOs

Ideas were gathered on how to tackle the different problems identified in the discussion.

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.)

The tool helped initiate discussion among participants.

It was interesting to see that the tool actually also does work within the context of a workshop and with people who didn't yet know each other very well. Still, there are some limitations that came along with this.

We didn't know the number or background of participants before the workshop and it became clear that this would have been beneficial in preparing to apply the tool (we mainly expected people living with HIV who do not belong to an AIDS service organisation, but most participants were actually working for ASOs in some way).

It is probably also easier to apply the tool if all participants work in the same organisation or in the same project.

We had to deal with ambiguous accounts of situations within different ASOs. However, we responded by using the ambiguous accounts as discussion starters.

Due to the diversity of people (and their respective ASOs), it might have been more helpful, as a step after the discussion, if people had worked individually or in small groups on very detailed next steps for them to take in their ASO to improve participation.

It was difficult to make contextual factors visible within the model offered by the Circles of Influence method. We just put these outside the circles to keep them in mind. Decision making in ASOs takes place on different levels: financial, operational, content - it was a little difficult to show all this within the model.

Participants liked that the tool makes real-life constellations visible and emotionally more accessible. Still, it also made some people realise that they'll probably never progress to the centre of influence due to structural barriers, and this resulted in some frustration.

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.*