



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 We do not publish this information unless you agree.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.)

Poland, Marshall Office of the Wielkopolska Region

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.)

Jaroslav Cieszkiewicz, Head of Public Health Unit in the Department of Health of the Marshal Office of the Wielkopolska Region, Poznan, Poland
jaroslav.cieszkiewicz@umww.pl

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..)

Simontonowski Instytut Zdrowia Foundation

4. Project/programme

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

Strengthening the regional voluntary counseling and testing (VCT) centre. The project is financed by my organisation and run by an external partner - Simontonowski Instytut Zdrowia Foundation - on an annual basis. The aim of it is to allow more clients to use services provided by the regional VCT centre by increasing opening hours of the main centre and establishing its local branches outside Poznan, the capital city of the region.

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

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

It is intended to continue the project in the following years.

Therefore the goals of applying the tool were:

- to identify strengths and weaknesses of the project and the areas to be improved,
- to choose the resources and types of interventions for improvement,
- to decide how to design the process of improvement,
- to strengthen cooperation between the stakeholders.

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.)

Succeed with elements of Shift (previously known as Schiff, using the population and programme worksheet and the stakeholder snapshot).

I participated in the European-level training workshops held in Barcelona in April 2014 and January 2015. Right at the start I noticed that the Shift (Schiff) tool was not very appropriate for the project I intended to evaluate – the regional Voluntary Counseling and Testing centre. The main reasons for this were the small number of stakeholders and partners engaged in the project and the local and very operational character of the project. I decided that each stakeholder involved in the project had to fill in the questionnaire on their own. Later, we exchanged the information, got acquainted with and discussed our answers together and commented on them to find common ground on changes and areas to be improved and how to do it.

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.)

Applying, i.e. filling in the tool itself was not difficult, though it was time-consuming, but this was expected. The construction and contents of the tool are logical and easy to follow and use. It is too early to draw final conclusions and implement them, but the good thing is that we were able to reach agreement on this. We agreed that it is essential to strengthen the role of the Regional HIV/AIDS Steering Committee in the project, as a platform where the most important regional HIV/AIDS stakeholders are represented.

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 most important benefit from applying the tool was to start perceiving stakeholders engaged in the project not only as “beneficiaries of public money” and “givers and takers” but also as “partners”. By listening to each other and acting together we can achieve much more for HIV/AIDS prevention.

The main obstacle was the risk of communication bias and lack of cooperation in the process of reaching consensus on the outcomes of applying the tool. This was overcome by sticking to an agreed timetable and good facilitation. Also, the inclusion of the Shift worksheets and exchange of the completed questionnaires by stakeholders early enough in order to give them time for preparation for the final discussions were very important and helpful.

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.*