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Target 3.8: Universal Health Coverage (UHC)
All people and communities receive the quality health services they need, without financial hardship

2018: 3 Global reports-High Quality UHC

Questions:
- Involvement of implementers at ‘coalface’, in conceptualising the IDC initiative?
- Perceptions of implementers on their degree of authority during implementation?
  - Study is part of PhD

SOUTH AFRICA

- National Health Insurance (NHI)
- Range of initiatives
  - Quality of care
  - Re-engineering of PHC including Ideal Clinic (IDC) Initiative.
- The IDC was steered by NDoH
- Lack of consultation influences buy-in, implementation and sustainability
**Ideal Clinic Initiative**

- An approach to transform all PHC facilities of South Africa to comply with norms and standards prescribed by the **Office of Health Standards Compliance (OHSC)**. Criteria for evaluation divided into:
  - **Vital**
  - **Essential**
  - **Important criteria**

- **Vital elements** were those items that meant a difference between life and death situation if not in place in the facility (e.g. essential medicines, medical equipment etc.)

**Decision space**

- “The range of effective choice that is allowed by central authorities for use by local authorities, which could be based on formally defined laws and regulations, or by lack of enforcement of these formal definitions allowing lower levels to bend the rules” Bossert, 1998: 1518
  - **Narrow** - little choice
  - **Moderate** - a range of choice but limited by central rules
  - **Wide** - little constraint on choices
PHD AIM

- Analyse the implementation of the Ideal Clinics Initiative as a major health policy reform in order to contribute to the discourse and the development of recommendations on the proposed National Health Insurance (NHI) system

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF COMPONENT

- Determine the perceptions of PHC facility managers on their:
  - Participation in implementation of ideal clinic initiative
  - Decision space in the ideal clinic initiative
METHODOLOGY

Study population and sampling
All facility managers of day clinics (8 or 12 hours), n=127

Data collection instrument
Self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) designed on REDCap
4 sub-sections:
✓ Demographic characteristics
✓ Perceptions on participation
  • Likert scale
  • 9 statements-conceptualisation through to negotiation for resources
✓ Perceptions on decision space
  • 10 statements
  • Vital criteria as listed in manual
  • Narrow, moderate, wide
✓ Open ended questions for additional comments

Quantitative data analysis
✓ STATA® 15 for analysis
✓ Cronbach’s alpha = 0.77 (Participation) and 0.81 (Decision space)
✓ Descriptive statistics to analyse socio-demographic data
✓ One-way ANOVA test to compare overall mean scores by descriptive factors
✓ Multiple regression analysis to analyse factors influencing decision space and participation
✓ All tests conducted at 5% significance levels

Data collection
✓ SM led process
✓ 2 trained fieldworkers
✓ Tablets used for data collection

Qualitative data
✓ Inductive thematic analysis
✓ 3 researchers Lincoln and Guba’s principles of trustworthiness
RESULTS
### Socio-Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>GP n = 63</th>
<th>MP n = 64</th>
<th>Total n = 127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59 (93.65)</td>
<td>56 (87.50)</td>
<td>115 (90.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4 (6.35)</td>
<td>8 (12.50)</td>
<td>12 (9.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (SD)</td>
<td>53 (7.03)</td>
<td>49 (6.90)</td>
<td>51 (7.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of years as PN (SD)</td>
<td>28 (7.85)</td>
<td>22 (8.68)</td>
<td>25 (8.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of years as FM (SD)</td>
<td>7 (5.59)</td>
<td>7 (6.94)</td>
<td>7 (6.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received training on ideal clinic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received training on ideal clinic n (%)</td>
<td>51 (80.95)</td>
<td>59 (92.19)</td>
<td>110 (86.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received one day training n (%)</td>
<td>37 (72.55)</td>
<td>11 (18.64)</td>
<td>48 (34.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received week long training n (%)</td>
<td>6 (11.76)</td>
<td>24 (40.68)</td>
<td>30 (23.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received other training n (%)</td>
<td>8 (15.69)</td>
<td>24 (40.68)</td>
<td>32 (25.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Mean Score for Participation: 5.77, SD: 0.90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership to achieve the ICRM programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have knowledge on how to achieve the ideal clinic status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating for resources to achieve ICRM programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a plan to achieve ideal clinic status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRM programme is an excellent initiative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish ICRM programme started much earlier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud to be part of the ICRM programme</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising other clinics on how to achieve the ideal clinic status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took part in first meetings to discuss ICRM programme</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Mean Score for decision space: 2.54, SD: 0.24
## Multiple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Co-eff.</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing a facility of choice</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0 (baseline)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12 ; 0.49</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of training received</td>
<td>1 day workshop</td>
<td>0 (baseline)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Week long training</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03; 0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other trainings</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.12; 0.41</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of Involvement
- Top down policy making
- Apparent ongoing exclusion of frontline managers in policy revisions

Creating illusion of compliance
- Self-funding for clinic needs
- Borrowing of equipment

Lack of Control
- Budget
- Supply chain management
- Penalties for areas beyond FM control

115/127 Participants
DISCUSSION

- **PHC facility managers**
  - Lack of involvement in conceptualisation
  - Participation in implementation

- **Narrow to moderate decision space on critical areas**
  - Medicines supplies
  - Resuscitation equipment

- **Predictors of perceptions of decision space**
  - One week training
  - Managing a facility of choice

- **PHC facility managers critical to successful implementation**
  - Excluded from conceptualisation
  - Findings indicate deficiencies in empowering facility managers for their role in implementing the initiative

- **Unintended negative consequences of encouraging a compliance culture**
  - Influences sustainability of the initiative
CONCLUSION

- PHC - central plank of NHI reforms in SA
- These reforms depend on involvement and participation of PHC facility managers
- The findings suggest the need to ensure:
  - Adequate resources
  - Enabling practice environment and support for PHC facility managers
  - Ongoing training for implementers
  - Culture of learning from both mistakes and successes
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- My PhD supervisor: Prof. Laetitia Rispel
- PHC facility managers from the City of Tshwane and Gert Sibande Districts
- The fieldworkers: Jabulile Ndaba, Khosi Tshabalala & Nonkululeko Mahlangu
- This PhD is part of the LESEDI project funded by the Atlantic Philanthropies (Grant ID: 21408). The views expressed in this study are those of the authors and not of the funder.