

A comparative study on supportive supervision models for community oriented resource persons

1. What were the findings/results in 3-5 bullets

- Research Question: How does standard supportive supervision using health facility-based supervisors (CHEWs) compare with standard supportive supervision supplemented with peer to peer supervision on the performance of CORPS in terms of adherence to treatment guidelines for iCCM and quality of health data reporting?
- 12 health facilities will be randomly allocated to either an intervention arm or a control arm. From the CORP population belonging to the six health facilities in the intervention arm, ten peer supervisors will be appointed by the CORPs by popular vote and trained in supportive supervision using adult learning methods and best practice.
- A user-friendly supervision checklist and problem-solving tool will be developed.
- Peer supervisors will be equipped with bicycles and will receive a small incentive for conducting supervision to the fellow CORPs in the health facility catchment area. In the control arm quarterly supervision will continue as per MOH protocol.
- After 12 months of implementation, an evaluation will establish:
 - Feasibility Proportion of CORPS that participate in one supervision event per quarter
- Acceptability
 - Proportion of CORPS that would recommend that form of supervision from their colleague
- Adherence to guidelines
 - Proportion of children treated with an ACT who were mRDT positive
 - Proportion of children treated with an antibiotic who had cough and a high respiratory rate.
 - Estimate of proportion of caregivers who reported administering treatment according to guidelines.
- Quality of health data reporting
 - Proportion of CORPs maintaining 100% complete records every quarter
 - Proportion of CORPS submitting their records within one week of the deadline for submission.
- Cost-benefit analysis
 - Comparative analysis of cost benefit of the two arms of the interventions