iCCM Data Quality Assessment Toolkit

RAcE 2015 Programme

Multi-Country Results Dissemination Meeting

26 October 2017

Introduction

- In 2013, ICF designed a tool to assess the quality of iCCM data and the iCCM data collection, reporting, and management system based on MEASURE Evaluation's tool.

- ICF conducted two DQAs in each RAcE project area using these tools.

- The iCCM DQA Toolkit:

  - Designed to assess the iCCM data collection, reporting, and management system from CHWs through central HMIS

  - Designed for routine use; collects data from a sample of the iCCM programme area.

  - Piloted in Abia State Nigeria July-August 2017.

Overview of the Toolkit Contents

- iCCM DQA Toolkit Guidance Document
  - Personnel and Logistics
  - Sampling
  - Fieldwork Preparation
  - Adapting each of the tools
  - Implementation
  - Analyzing, visualizing, and interpreting data

- iCCM DQA System Assessment Tool

- iCCM DQA Data Tracing Tool

ICF

System Assessment

Presentation Title
ICF proprietary and confidential. Do not copy, distribute, or disclose.

12/3/2018   4

iCCM System Assessment Tool

- A set of modules for each level of the data reporting system (national, subnational, and facility levels):

  I. Staffing, Responsibilities, and Capabilities
  II. Reporting System and Guidelines
  III. Data Collecting and Reporting Tools
  IV. Data Elements and Indicators
  V. Data Management Processes
  VI. Integration with National HMIS

- The DQA team records and scores each item in the module.

- Tool generates a scorecard to display the results.

ICF

Conduct at each selected facility. Consider conducting jointly with several CHW supervisors, if there are multiple CHW supervisors at a single facility.

System Assessment - Facility Level	
Facility:	
District:	
Province:	
Date of Review:	

Instructions: Go through each item on the list and mark "Yes - completely or true" if the item is true/available/observed. If something is not true/available/observed, mark "No - not at all or not sure." If something is partly true, such as a guideline is under development, mark "Partly or partially true." If something is not applicable, mark "N/A."* Provide a comment for any responses marked "Partly," "No," or "N/A."

* *N/A should rarely, if ever, be marked because the tool should be have been tailored to remove any items that are not applicable before the checklist is used.*

Component of the M&E System	Answer Codes: Yes - completely or true Partly or partially true No - not at all or not sure N/A (not applicable)	REVIEWER COMMENTS (Please provide detail for each response coded "Partly," "No," or "N/A." Detailed responses will help guide strengthening measures.)
I - Staffing, Responsibilities, and Capabilities		
1	Designated staff at facility are responsible for reviewing the quality of CHW data (i.e., accuracy, completeness, and timeliness).		
2	Designated staff at facility are responsible for reviewing aggregated CHW data prior to submission to the district.		
3	All relevant facility staff are trained on the data management processes and tools.		

SYSTEM ASSESSMENT TOOL DEMO

System Assessment Tool - Scorecard

SCORECARD

Data Management and Reporting System Assessment

Color Code Key			Component of the M&E System						
green	75.0% - 100%	Yes - completely or true	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Average (per site)
yellow	50.0% - 74.9%	Partly or partially true	Staffing, Responsibilities, and Capabilities	Reporting System and Guidelines	Data Collection and Reporting Tools	Data Elements and Indicators	Data Management Processes	Integration with National HMIS/DHIS2	
orange	25.0% - 49.9%								
red	0% - 24.9%	No - rarely, not at all, or not sure							
National									
			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District (Subnational)									
			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Facility									
1			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Facility average			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average (per component)			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ICF

Data Tracing Tool

Presentation Title
ICF proprietary and confidential. Do not copy, distribute, or disclose.

12/3/2018   9

iCCM Data Tracing Tool

- The DQA team uses the tool to review and collect data from sites at each level of the reporting system.

- Four components:

  - Background sheet: information needed for data tracing is entered before data collection (1 black tab)

  - Analysis worksheets to enter data collected at each site (7 blue tabs)

  - Printable tracker sheets to collect data at each site (3 yellow tabs)

  - Results worksheets containing summary data tables and figures (4 green tabs)

- Tool calculates measures of quality at each level and displays results in charts and tables:

  - Availability

  - Completeness

  - Consistency

Section A: Background	
Country	
-	
Reporting month	

Section B: Reporting levels and reporting tools			
Level (example)	Local Term	Type of Tool	Reporting Tool
Level 1 (CHW)		Data source	
		report	
Level 2 (Facility)		Report by	
		Report by	
Level 3 (District)		Report by	
		Database by	
		Report by	
Level 4 (Province/National)		Report/database by	
		Report/database by	
Level 5 (National)		Report/database by	

Section C: Indicators and Data Fields			
	Indicator name	Field(s) in register	Field(s) in reporting forms
Indicator 1: Malaria			
Indicator 2: Pneumonia			
Indicator 3: Diarrhea			

Section D: Sites Included in Assessment			
	Name of [facility]	Number of [CHW]s who report to [facility]	Date of visit
[Level 5 N/A]			
[Level 4 N/A]			
[Level 3 N/A]			
[Facility] 1			
[Facility] 2			
[Facility] 3			
[Facility] 4			
[Facility] 5			

Example #1

Section B: Reporting levels, data source, reporting forms/tools

Level (example)	Local Term	Aggregation	Reporting Form/Tool
Level 1 (CHW)	CHW	Data source	CHW register
		CHW report	CHW report
Level 2 (Facility)	Facility	Report by CHW	N/A
		Report by Facility	Facility report
Level 3 (District)	District	Report by Facility	N/A
		Database by Facility	Database entry (DHO)
		Report by District	N/A
Level 4 (Province/National)	National	Report by Facility	Database entry (MOH)
		Report by District	N/A
Level 5 (National)	N/A	Report by District	N/A

Example #2

Section B: Reporting levels, data source, reporting forms/tools

Level (example)	Local Term	Aggregation	Reporting Form/Tool
Level 1 (CHW)	CHW	Data source	CHW register
		CHW report	CHW report
Level 2 (Facility)	Facility	Report by CHW	Facility report entry
		Report by Facility	Facility report total
Level 3 (District)	District	Report by Facility	N/A
		Database by Facility	Database entry (DHO)
		Report by District	N/A
Level 4 (Province/National)	National	Report by Facility	Database entry (MOH)
		Report by District	N/A
Level 5 (National)	N/A	Report by District	N/A

ICF

Data Tracing Tool – Results Worksheets

There are 4 results worksheets:

- *Summary chart data*: contains reporting performance measures (percentage available, percentage complete, and percentage of CHWs reporting) and consistency ratios by sampled facility for each indicator traced between reporting tools.

- *Summary charts*: presents the data in the *Summary chart data* worksheet in graphs.

- *Summary tables*: summarizes the reporting performance measures and consistency ratios across the facilities (averages across facilities and values for district-level consistency ratios, if applicable).

- *Count differences:* compares the counts verified in the CHW register to the values found in the various reporting tools by facility for each indicator traced.

DATA TRACING TOOL DEMO

Analyzing and Interpreting Data – System Assessment

- Scores range from 1 (lowest) to 3 (highest).

- The average score for each component is converted to generate a percentage.

    - 75 to 100 percent ~ average scores of "Yes—completely true" ▮

    - 50 to 74.9 percent ~ average scores of "Partly or partially true" ▮

    - 25 to 49.9 percent ~ average scores of "Partly or partially true" ▮

    - < 25 percent ~ scores of "No—rarely, not at all or not sure" ▮

- Important to review explanations for scores to understand the identified gaps.

- Review components that scored 75 percent and above (green) to understand what is working well and why.

ICF

Analyzing and Interpreting Data – Data Tracing

Scoring Chart for Data Tracing Results

	Reporting performance measure percentages	Consistency ratios
Good	≥ 90%	0.90–1.10
Fair	75%–89%	0.75–0.89, 1.11–1.25
Poor	< 75%	< 0.75, >1.25

Investigate:

- Fair or poor performance measures—availability, completeness, and CHW reporting percentages—to understand underlying issues
- Consistency ratios that in fair or poor categories (more than a 10 percent deviation) by reviewing the analysis worksheet to determine whether inconsistency is due to issue with a single CHW or facility or due to broader issues.

Next Steps

- Share preliminary observations from the data tracing and system assessment with health facility staff.

- Share preliminary findings at subnational- and/or national-level debrief

- Disseminate final results

- Develop and implement action plans to address findings.

ICF

Thank You!