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Background: Indicator Guide for M&E of iCCM

- iCCM Task Force published an Indicator Guide for M&E of iCCM in 2013

- Lists indicators across programme components and phases to “encourage the consistent use of standardized definitions and metrics

- 48 indicators spanning the 8 components of the Benchmark Framework [periodic, routine and special studies]
Background: Indicator Guide for M&E of iCCM

• Many indicators initially adapted from sub-national programs; few had been used by national iCCM programs

• Not intended as a prescriptive set of indicators for all programmes but rather a menu that MOH and partners can use to identify the most appropriate for their programmes and contexts

• Guide was intended to evolve and incorporate experience and learning from national iCCM programs
Review of feasibility of routine monitoring indicators

- Purposive sample of 10 countries implementing iCCM
- Analyzed 18 routine monitoring indicators reviewing 4 types of tools:
  1. CHW tools
  2. Tools used to aggregate and report CHW data
  3. CHW supervisor tools
  4. Tools to aggregate and send information from health facility level to higher levels
Review of feasibility of routine monitoring indicators (2)

Main findings:

• Countries are already collecting the data needed to calculate many of the routine monitoring indicators

• In general data are most available for human resources, service delivery and referral and M&E and health information systems.

• Data are less available for supply chain management and supervision and performance quality assurance.
Review of feasibility of routine monitoring indicators (3)

- Most data remain only available at the health facility level, not district and national levels.

- Countries may rightfully decide that certain data only needs to be available at the health facility or district level
Review of feasibility of routine monitoring indicators (4)

Suggested next steps:

• Some indicators in their current form may be overly difficult to measure and need revising e.g. supply chain management and performance quality assurance.

• Other indicators require up-to-date CHW deployment data. This is currently lacking in many countries but should be feasible.

• Countries should choose 3-5 high-value routine monitoring indicators based upon these criteria: (1) effort required for data collection, aggregation and computation; (2) reliability of measurement and interpretation; and (3) utility for all stakeholders.
Process to Review and Refine iCCM indicators for Routine Monitoring

- The M&E sub group of the global CCM Task Force started a process in Aug 2015 of reviewing the indicators and defining routine data needs at every level of iCCM implementation.
- Developed an initial list of indicators and criteria for prioritizing the routine indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Important for decision-making/actionable</td>
<td>Captures critical aspect for program performance/linked to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feasible in routine systems at scale</td>
<td>Possible to collect and analyze through routine systems at scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experience/use in national HMIS systems</td>
<td>Indicator has been used in national HMIS and/or large programs at scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technical merit/face validity</td>
<td>Indicator has face validity/measures what it is meant to measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contributes independently to set of indicators</td>
<td>Indicator contributes independently to a group of indicators/does not duplicate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process to Review and Refine iCCM indicators for Routine Monitoring

• Feedback on list of proposed indicators sought from other CCM TF subgroups and the Steering Committee – representing a wide range of partners supporting iCCM.

• The sub group has proposed a set of 10 indicators in 6 domains to be collected through routine systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resources (3)</th>
<th>Service Delivery (3)</th>
<th>Supply Chain (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referrals (1)</td>
<td>Reporting (1)</td>
<td>Clinical coaching (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The sub group urges countries to identify opportunities to include these high value iCCM indicators in the DHIS or other national HMIS.
Routine Indicators: Human Resources

1. Under-five catchment population per CCM site: # of children under five per CCM site

2. iCCM program coverage for target population: Percentage of target population (target communities) with access to iCCM services

3. CHW to supervisor ratio: Ratio of CHWs deployed for CCM to CCM supervisors

Measurement notes:
- Data collected/updated annually
- Countries to define eligibility of target communities for iCCM
- Requires information on CHW and CHW supervisor training and deployment and population data for target communities
Routine Indicators: Service Delivery

1. **Case load by CHW:** Number of cases seen by CHW over reporting period

2. **CCM treatment rate:** Number of **two** cases treated by CHWs treated per 1,000 children under five in target areas in a given time period
   a) RDT+ Malaria
   b) Suspected Pneumonia (cough or difficulty breathing with a high respiratory rate for age)
   c) Diarrhea (can report ORS, zinc and ORS+zinc)
   d) **Severe Acute Malnutrition**
   e) **Moderate Acute Malnutrition**

3. **RDT positivity rate:** Percentage of fever cases presenting to CHW who were tested with RDT and received a positive result

**Measurement notes:**

- CCM treatment rate indicators enable routine assessment of utilization in iCCM target areas. Should be examined in comparison with the expected number of cases to draw inferences about estimated coverage of CHW treatment

**Recommended by nutrition experts for collection where CHWs are treating SAM and MAM**
Routine Indicators: Supply Chain

1. **Medicine and diagnostic availability:** percentage of CCM sites with all key CCM medicines and diagnostics in stock on last day of reporting period
   - low osmolarity ORS and zinc supplements for diarrhea
   - amoxicillin for pneumonia
   - ACTs and RDTs (where appropriate) for fever/malaria in malaria-endemic countries
   - others required by program (tailor to each country’s needs)

**Measurement notes:**
- SC group recommends countries work toward capturing continuous stock availability (% of CHWs with no stockouts in the past month) to gain a more complete picture of product availability
- Countries may opt to identify 1-2 items as ‘tracers’ to limit reporting burden and focus attention
Routine Indicators: Referrals

1. **Referral rate**: number of cases referred per 100 cases seen by CHW

**Measurement notes:**

- Reasons for referral will often include danger signs or stock-outs
- No ‘benchmark’ value exists; countries need to establish range and follow-up to determine reasons behind low or high values
- Does not capture how well CHWs identify danger signs, whether referrals are made correctly, nor whether the referred child is actually taken to a health facility for care
- Special studies are recommended to better understand referral
Routine Indicators: Reporting

- **Reporting level:** percentage of expected iCCM reports received during time period

**Measurement notes:**

- Disaggregate by level (CHW, health facility, district)
- Does not provide information on the timeliness or quality of the data nor whether the data are being used by district, facility staff or CHWs to inform decision-making about CCM programs.
- Countries using DHIS2 may be able to track whether reports were received by reporting date
- Periodic data quality audits are recommended to evaluate data quality and identify areas for improvement
**Routine Indicators: Clinical Coaching**

- **Clinical coaching/mentorship**: percentage of CHWs who received coaching/mentorship activities* during reporting period;
  - * - to be defined locally'

**Measurement notes:**

- Definition of clinical mentorship, coaching and/or supervision will need to be determined by countries.

- Clinical mentorship, coaching and/or supervision activities are those that review and discuss the CHW quality of services and quality and accuracy of data completeness.

- Does not provide information on the quality of the mentorship, coaching or supervision, nor does it indicate whether the treatment of the sick child was considered appropriate.
Next Steps

• M&E subgroup is close to finalizing indicator reference sheets that provide detailed information on definition, rationale, data sources and methods, interpretation and caveats.

• Will disseminate online and through meetings, conferences, workshops etc.

• Working to develop supporting tools (e.g. sample registers and reports; DHIS2 dashboards and visualization aids)

• Collaborating with other global initiatives to harmonize recommended indicators at community level (Global Data Collaborative, Global Fund, etc)

• Please send your comments on these recommended indicators to Dyness at dkasungami@jsi.com
Monitoring Integrated Community Case Management (iCCM): a Feasibility Study of the Indicator Guide for Monitoring and Evaluating iCCM
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Monitoring Integrated Community Case Management (iCCM): Background

- The iCCM Task Force published an Indicator Guide for monitoring and evaluating (M&E) of iCCM in 2013; the Guide provides indicators across program components and phases to “encourage the consistent use of standardized definitions and metrics”
- Many indicators were initially adapted from sub-national programs; few had been used to monitor national iCCM programs
- The Guide was not a prescriptive set of indicators for all programs, but a menu that MOHs and partners can pick from for their programs and contexts
- The Guide is intended to evolve, incorporating experience from national iCCM programs

Review of iCCM Routine Indicators in 10 Countries

Methods

- A purposeful sample of 10 countries from sub-Saharan Africa at various stages of iCCM scale-up
- Remotely reviewed four types of tools used by CHWs: used to aggregate and report data from CHWs, used by CHW supervisors to record data during supervision visits, and used to aggregate and send information from health facility level to higher levels in the health system
- Analyzed and color-coded the availability of data to calculate the Guide’s 18 routine monitoring indicators

Results

- Countries are already collecting the data needed to calculate many of the routine monitoring indicators
- In general, data is most available for human resources, service delivery and referral and M&E and health information systems
- Data is less available for supply chain management and supervision and performance quality assurance
- Although countries are collecting the data, most remains only available at the health facility level, not district and national levels
- Countries may rightfully decide that certain data only needs to be available at the health facility of district level

Recommendations

- In their current form, some indicators may be overly difficult to measure and need revising (e.g., supply chain management and performance quality assurance)
- Other indicators require up-to-date CHW deployment data, which is currently lacking in many countries but should be feasible
- Countries should choose 3-5 high-value routine monitoring indicators based on these criteria:
  - Effort required for data collection, aggregation and computation
  - Reliability of measurement and interpretation
  - Utility for all stakeholders

Next Steps

- The MSE subgroup of the global CCM Task Force has proposed 12 indicators to be collected through routine health information systems, and 6 through special studies
- The subgroup urges countries to identify opportunities to include these high value iCCM indicators in the DHIS2 or other national HMIS

List of 18 routine monitoring indicators with summary color classifications indicating the highest level of the health system at which data is available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data available in district level (e.g., monthly reports from health facilities submitted to district office)</th>
<th>Data available in health facility level (e.g., supervision checklists, monthly reports from CHWs submitted to health facilities)</th>
<th>Data available in district level (e.g., stock control forms, patient registers)</th>
<th>Data not available; requires information that is not collected at any level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Human resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1: iCCM CHW density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2: Targeted CHWs providing iCCM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3: Annual iCCM CHW retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supply chain management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1: Medicine and diagnostic availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2: Medicine and diagnostic continuous stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3: Medicine and diagnostic storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4: Medicine and diagnostic validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Service delivery and referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1: iCCM treatment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2: Cashed by CHW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3: Referral rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervision and performance quality assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1: iCCM supervisor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2: CHW-supervisor ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3: Routine supervision coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4: Clinical supervision coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5: Correct case management (knowledge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6: Correct count of respiratory cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7: Complete and consistent registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring and evaluation and health information systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1: District reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>