

# **HIV Outcomes Evaluations for BC Working Group Output Indicators Reporting Tool Feedback**

**Thursday, September 23, 2010  
Meeting at BCCDC**

**Attendees:** Sam Mohan, Emma Palmentier, Gord Cote, Bob Hughes, Evin Jones, Terry Howard, Ross Harvey, Michelle Webb, Ciro Panessa, Denise McKay, Marcie Summers, Stacy Leblanc, Janice Duddy, Susann Richter, Mark Stevens, Darren Lauscher, Brian Chittock

**Presenters:** Irene Day, David Crouch, Scott McRae

## **1. Irene Day, RN, BN, MBA, Director of Operations BC Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS – Presentation regarding STOP HIV/AIDS Initiative**

PPT on website

## **2. Scott MacRae, BC HIV/AIDS/HCV Reporting Tool**

### **Summary**

- The data collected drives the question, this is an administrative database.
- For this pilot, the population size was small but this is OK as the qualitative data provides rich information
- There is a need for standardized spread sheets, able to refresh easily, easily accessed by users

## **3. Introduction & HIV/HCV Outcomes for BC Working Group History**

A brief history of the Working Group over the last 21/2 years. It was convened by Janice and was to look at Outcomes Measurable.

Report the findings from the Agencies back to the Funder rather than the Funder providing the questions so that the reports are meaningful.

Standardization / Harmonization of questions.

The Group has developed a Survey Tool of questions that will hopefully be useful to all agencies.

## **4. Discussion of O-Chart**

Tool is useful not only as data for Funders, also rolls findings into research data.

It has implications for good communication in the Health Ministries in the future.

- Standardized data over time and regions can assist with decision-making
- Relieves time involved inputting, as there is only one tool instead of multiple collection tools.
- There is a benefit to historical collection and synthesis of data.

- Knowledge exchange because of the commonality between the Partners.
- Possibly affecting HA. Policy from the CBO's prospective.
- Can see improvement in usage of the data through the standardization.

**Issues:**

- What is the cost savings/benefits to all of this sharing of this data, who stores it, what is the impact to the Funders?
- Funder concerns about making this go forward due to the funding cuts.
- We need to look at partnerships to create the opportunities and look at funding realities.
- Funders will not want to pass on new cost cuts with this project.
- A long-term effort at standardization and commitment to it, is important.

**5. Group Feedback Sessions**

**Group 1 – Usefulness of the tool**

**Agency point of view**

- Could encourage partnerships
- Assist in sourcing funding – diversity of funding
- Identifies gaps
- Shows governance of an organization
- Helps identify the larger picture
- Pulled individuals together at the table
- Helps guide what needs to be tracked
- Cross pollination between agencies

**Funders' Perspectives**

- Statistics to justify dollars
- Recognizing potential seed dollars
- Provides more systematic opportunities for partnership between agencies and funders
- Provide clarity
- Better support in choosing directions in planning
- Inclusive rather than exclusive
- Redirects attention to where there are gaps
- Analogy of a tree – trunk is the funder, branches are the agencies
- Redirect funding to the most 'at-risk' agencies
- In-kind contributions, leverage against actual dollars, easily tracked over time.

**Group 2 – Ease of use of Tool**

**Did the tool take a reasonable time to complete?**

- Generally, yes
- Would be useful to have a time estimate for the user

- Stop and Save function to be improved
- Would be helpful to be able to review the report as a whole prior to sending
- Review tool was tedious
- Table of contents would be helpful so you can skip back and forth in the document
- Instructions should tell you what data sets you need as finding data sets takes time
- Client identifier problems
- Standardized data set, could this be modified for different funders? (enhance bean counter ability)
- Tool should indicate service line usage by individual clients. Relevant info for agency as well as showing overall costs and other general criteria .
- This can be used by Funder or Agency to show cost/usage over a geographical comparison.

**Were questions clear ?**

- Standardized data set would help
- Questions regarding services provided should reflect how much time and investment spent by your organization on each service (what percentage of your overall programming does each service represent/)
- Specify what the question is trying to ask - intent

**Were definitions helpful ?**

- Overall yes
- Guide could have more definitions

**Will the investment of time required to complete this evaluation be beneficial to your organization and/or the sector?**

- Beneficial to both sector/agency
- NGO's need to develop the capacity to analyze the data for themselves
- For funders, it will also help to identify gaps

**What is the easiest way to complete the tool – paper or electronic, spread-sheet or web-based?**

- Electronic
- Web based if it can be developed for ease of use
- Organizations should be able to go back and extract their own data afterwards
- Organizations should be able to define some of their own fields or parameters

**Other Comments:**

- Look at this tool to help create the standardized set.
- Blood Ties has done a tracking identifier for unique clients. May want to look to them for input or info.

- Time taken to complete the tool is questioned because data input and data gathering are two different things. Agencies realize they need their own databases.

### **Group 3 – Application and Evaluation**

Would you support your health authority creating a report of aggregate data as a way of reporting back to its contract organizations?

- Some would, some wouldn't
  - Questions need fine tuning
  - Impact around acute care usage
  - Show relationship to Funder
  - Time taken to gather data was large
  - Clarifications of terms, more word-smithing

### **6. Discussion of group report back**

What kind of resources would you need as an organization for evaluation? Costs versus time? What is the Funder doing about resourcing back, regarding data that has been reported, because agencies don't usually have dollars to analyze what was collected and utilize that information to actually change programs.

Regarding aggregated data -

- The "Group" previously didn't have appetite to do aggregate reporting so where is this "Group" currently on this issue?
- Group is still expressing concerns around aggregated data
- Would you be able to pull data about individual organizations out of the pooled data?
- there would be great value to changing the whole paradigm of what is collected and why it's funded. Aggregate data shows this because its evidence based and it becomes valuable to more funders.

Regarding O-Chart from Ontario - It is very expensive to operate, they have some staff resources that can pull info for agencies. Agencies have the ability to ask about their own agency and get information out. In-depth data is where resource people come into play. "O" model is logic based.

One idea- is to pool our resources to have "persons" to work for us as a whole. To do evaluation research for us all on the individual agency need as well as the funder need.

This is a bigger picture question for the Funders to look at. It should be added to the next steps list.

## **7. David Crouch - the Capture Project, based out of Simon Fraser University**

- Data collection system platform
- Ability to translate data
- All evidence is valuable
- Collaboration across boundaries of agencies, funders, government and others.

[www.thecaptureproject.ca](http://www.thecaptureproject.ca)

[info@thecaptureproject.ca](mailto:info@thecaptureproject.ca)

1-778-782-6707

## **8. Next steps**

- Taking this feedback and survey data to the Outcomes Committee to re-tool the tool. Bring next iteration to the group.
- Engaging our other partners/funders and bringing them to the table to have more detailed conversation.
- Evin's idea of creating a funding pool to support evaluations.
- Bring the tool forward to a platform base.