Opening the black box: How to measure quality of household visits by community health workers in Kenya?

Nelly Muturi, Yu Nanamatsu, Maryline Mireku, Regeru Regeru, Linet Okoth, Vicki Doyle, Miriam Taegtmeyer, Lilian Otiso, Meghan Kumar





Quality is fundamental to UHC

Close-to community (CTC) Health Workers are frequently promoted as a means to achieving universal health coverage. They offer a crucial link between patients/communities and 'formal' health systems, reaching people that would otherwise be vulnerable. Yet often we lack accurate measurement of even basic statistics (such as how many CTC providers there are or how much time they spend on community health work), let alone the quality of the care they provide.

Measurement of quality challenging in all healthcare settings

Quality of healthcare services is a composite of technical clinical quality and patient experiences. This is difficult and expensive to measure even in facility-based care, and continues to be the subject of extensive research in high-income hospital settings. In community health in most countries, encounters between CTC providers and household members are held in the home, making it difficult to identify who has been visited and/or to observe those visits for supervision and mentorship purposes.

Community teams as a means of accountability for quality in community health

Quality improvement (QI) initiatives aim to measure and ultimately to improve health outcomes, and tend to be focused on (easier to measure) facility-based, curative care with clear clinical practice guidelines. In SQALE, we have taken QI principles to the CTC level of the health system. A shift to greater local ownership, with a focus on what is feasible within the local political and institutional context, provides a response to these challenges and can potentially overcome systemic barriers to quality at CTC level.

Methods

Qualitative interviews with:

- QI team members (12 IDIs + 7 FGDs)
- Community members who had served as data collections (6 IDIs)

Quantitative assessment of the quality of data collected by community follow up tool

What worked:

- The tool is **relevant:** Using community follow up tool to identify problems for quality improvement and to get user perspectives on the community health volunteers' work
- The tool is acceptable: both QI teams and data collectors thought the questions were thorough and well-structured
- The tool increases accountability and ownership by involving community members in data collection

"Through the administration of the Community Follow Up Tool, it's something that you can use to get data to quantify the quality of services given at the community level. Secondly, it is something that you can use that data to make informed decisions."

> Community Health Extension Worker and QI team leader, Nairobi County

Completed community follow up tool

ر. Malnutrition	Malnutrition						'ES	NO	Not applicable
1. Did the CHV asl	The state of the s								
If there were no ch	ldren aged under 5 years, please tick '	not app	licable'	for the j	following	question	is in	this s	ection
2. Did the CHV check the Mother/Child booklet for EACH child in the house 0-59 months to check that they are attending growth monitoring clinics?						0		V	
3. Did the CHV use a MUAC tape to measure the arm of ALL children in the house aged 6-59 months?						9		/	
	d 6-59 months had a MUAC measurement trition services? <i>(if MUAC measureme</i>)			•		vrite			<u> </u>
COMMUNICATION YES							NO		
Did the CHV treat you with respect?									
2. Did the CHV listen to you?									
3. Did the CHV give you advice?									
4. Did you understand the advice given to you by the CHV?							V		
5. Did you have a chance to ask the CHV questions during the visit?							V		
REFERRAL						Y	ES	NO	Not applicable
If there were no ref	errals made, please tick "not applicab	le" for th	e follo	ving que	stions in	this secti	on		
Did the CHV give two copies of a referral form for EACH person referred?						v	/		
2. Did you understand why EACH of the referral forms were written?						V	/		
3. Did you go to a health facility for ALL the referrals that were made?								V	
4. Did you receive ALL the services for which you were referred? (if client did not go to health facility, tick "not applicable")									V
5. If you did not go	to a health facility for all the referrals	that wer	e made	, what w	as the re	ason?			
If you did not re	ceive all the services at the facility for a	which yo	u ¹ were	referred	, what wa	as the rea	son	?	
7. Did the CHV who referred you follow-up to check that you received all services for which you were referred?						n you		V	
A T T ST TO THE TOTAL OF THE TO	mplete this table for ALL the services rabout all the services you were referred	A Section of the sect	for)					(2)	
Name of facility	Reason for referral	Very	ОК	Not	Not	Mont	o fo	-ili+v	Did not go to
Name of facility	(ANC, skilled delivery, postnatal care, immunization, nutrition, other)	good	OK.	so good	good at all	but o	nt to facility ut did not eive service ferred for		facility
	Program	-	- مخالست		***	~			~
0.00							71		

Data are

collected by community members. They receive a half day training on the tool from the QI team chairperson and are paid for their time

"It took time because...you had to wait for the parents to come back from maybe the market or maybe it's someone who has a business. So, if you had decided to go to that person, you can go and find she has gone to the market and find the kids alone. So, there is no one you will interview. You are forced to come back and when you come back sometimes you find she is busy with customers around 12 PM. So, it took time. Sometimes it took half a day to see just that one person."

Data collector, Nairobi County

What needs improvement:

- Selection of data collectors needs to balance authority in the community, heath knowledge and availability
- Language barriers are an issue exacerbated by the mixed nature of urban communities
- Issues with quality of community-collected data persist in the outputs of this tool and should be considered as the data are used for decision-making

Conclusions and Recommendations



Migori, Kenya

1. It is essential to measure quality of community healthcare

Lately policymakers have been urged to include quality in any conversation about Universal Health Coverage. Now that discussion needs to expand to cover the lowest level of the healthcare system, community health.

2. High-quality community health services must link to high-quality facility services to be trusted

The main work of community health staff in Kenya is referral. Many of them have told us that without available services, staff and commodities at link facilities, the quality of community healthcare cannot solve health problems.

3. Community Follow up Tool data can be used in QI

This tool has been tested as a programmatic 'rapid assessment' approach for QI teams in Kenya. There is widespread acceptance of its utility from national to community levels. Use as research tool may require further consideration of sampling strategies.

Lilian Otiso et al. (2018). How can we achieve Universal Health Coverage with quality? A Quality Improvement model for community health, Policy Brief, USAID SQALE program. Meghan Bruce Kumar et al. (2018). Improving data quality in community health programmes: Recommendations from inter-country research, REACHOUT brief.

The study presented in this paper is part of the USAID SQALE project: Sustaining Quality Approaches for Locally Embedded Community Health Services in Kenya. This programme is implemented under cooperative agreement number AID-OAA-A-16-00018.





