

1 **Do Networks facilitate innovation, learning and sharing? An evaluation of the Quality-of-**  
2 **Care Network (QCN) in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda**

3 Kondwani Mwandira<sup>1</sup>, Seblewengel Lemma<sup>2</sup>, Albert Dube<sup>1</sup>, Kohenour Akter<sup>3</sup>, Asebe Amenu  
4 Tufa<sup>4</sup>, Agnes Kyamulabi<sup>5</sup>, Gloria Seruwagi<sup>5</sup>, Catherine Nakidde<sup>5</sup>, Kasonde Mwaba<sup>6</sup>, Nehla  
5 Djellouli<sup>6</sup>, Charles Makwenda<sup>1</sup>, Tim Colbourn<sup>6</sup>, Yusra Ribhi Shawar<sup>7,8</sup>

6 **Affiliations**

7 1: Parent and Child Health Initiative Trust, Lilongwe, Malawi

8 2: Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, based in  
9 Ethiopia

10 3: Perinatal Care Project, Diabetic Association of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh

11 4: Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

12 5: Department of Social Work and Social Administration, Makerere University School of  
13 Public Health, Kampala, Uganda

14 6: Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK

15 7: Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

16

17 8: Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University,  
18 Washington D.C., USA

19

20

21

22

23 **Key Words:** Quality of Care, Quality of Care Network (QCN), Sharing, Learning, Innovations,  
24 Maternal Health

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 The Quality-of-Care Network (QCN), launched by WHO and partners, links global and national  
27 actors across several countries to improve maternal and newborn health. We examine if QCN  
28 facilitated learning, sharing and innovations within and between network countries.

29

30 We evaluated the QCN in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda. We conducted a total 227  
31 qualitative interviews with QCN actors iteratively across a 3-year period from October 2019 to  
32 March 2022. We also reviewed all accessible QCN documents.

33

34 Sharing and learning opportunities were evident through a number of virtual and in-person  
35 platforms such as meetings, conferences, webinars, and websites. Conferences and webinars have  
36 been hosted on online resource libraries such as the quality-of-care network website. These  
37 provided access to materials on strategies and approaches shared by different countries and actors.

38 Innovations were also evident in some countries like Ethiopia. Innovative software applications  
39 aimed at boosting the capacity of service providers were developed and these were adopted by  
40 countries such as Bangladesh. Locally, there had been strengthening of learning collaborative  
41 meetings, coaching and mentorship. Regular meetings such as Stakeholder Coordination Meetings

42 and Learning Collaborative Sessions provided an opportunity for stakeholders to strategize, as well  
43 as share and learn approaches within the network.

44  
45 The network has promoted coordination among stakeholders. Similar approaches to sharing and  
46 learning such as Learning Collaborative Sessions were evident across the study countries.  
47 Innovations were not as apparent across countries and most of the learning and sharing approaches  
48 were similar to those from broader, pre-existing maternal health approaches, adopted from an era  
49 preceding the QCN. There was evidence that the introduction of the QCN improved the  
50 functionality and visibility of learning and sharing platforms.

51  
52 **INTRODUCTION**

53 Many women and babies continue to die from complications in pregnancy and childbirth due to  
54 poor quality of and access to peripartum care, especially in low and middle-income countries  
55 (LMICs) like Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda [1]. To achieve Sustainable Development  
56 Goal (SDG) targets for ending preventable maternal and neonatal deaths, there is need for  
57 governments and all stakeholders to deliver on the actions called for in global action plans and  
58 global strategy [2-4], which require sustained and locally led implementation efforts.

59 Although in recent years, there have been improvements in rates of institutional delivery across  
60 low-income settings, including Malawi (91% in 2015-6 up from 55% in 2000), Bangladesh (37%  
61 in 2014 up from 12% in 2004), Uganda (73% in 2016 up from 57% in 2011) and Ethiopia (26%  
62 in 2016 up from 10% in 2011) [5, 6]. These improvements in access to care have not been  
63 accompanied by improvements in quality, and institutional maternal and neonatal mortality remain  
64 very high. For instance, institutional neonatal mortality in Malawi slightly increased from 8.3 in

65 2017/2018 to 9 for every 1000 live births in both 2018/19, while maternal mortality was at 439 for  
66 every 100,000 live births in 2015-16 [7]. While effective interventions exist to treat the main  
67 causes of maternal and neonatal deaths in LMICs, effective implementation remains a challenge  
68 [8], with contributing factors ranging from insufficient human resources, poor training of health  
69 staff, and inadequate infrastructures to shortages in equipment and medications [9], Further, there  
70 have been few quality measurements to assess the performance of services and to quantify the gap  
71 between reality and expectations in reference to certain standards and guidelines [9, 10].

72 In response to challenges in the implementation of quality care across many countries, in 2017,  
73 World Health Organisation (WHO) and global partners launched ‘*The Network for Improving*  
74 *Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health*’ (QCN) [11]. The aim was to reduce in-  
75 facility maternal, neonatal and stillbirth case fatality rates by 50% in five years in nine countries:  
76 Bangladesh, Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Malawi, Nigeria, Tanzania and Uganda [12].  
77 To achieve this main aim, WHO and partners sought to build a cross-country platform for joint  
78 learning around quality improvement implementation approaches based on a shared theory of  
79 change (ToC) and shared health outcome goals championed by promotion of partner coordination  
80 while emphasising country ownership, leadership and accountability, and shared learning [13].

81 Learning, one of the strategic objectives in the WHO’s Learning, Accountability, Leadership and  
82 Action (LALA) Framework [14], focused on three prominent outcomes namely: (1) data systems  
83 development or strengthening to integrate and use quality of care data for improved care (2)  
84 development and strengthening of mechanisms to facilitate learning and sharing of knowledge  
85 through a learning network and (3) analysis and synthesis of data and practice for an evidence base  
86 on quality improvement (Figure 1). These three objective outcomes were developed on the  
87 background that individual countries and the global community have much experience of what

88 does and does not work, and each country needs to adapt good ideas to its local context. Therefore,  
89 it was presumed that a learning network would allow the transfer of information and knowledge  
90 freely between and within all countries interested in improving quality of care.

91 Drawing on the third objective (learning) of the WHO Learning Accountability Leadership Action  
92 (LALA) framework, this paper examines if and how QCN facilitated learning, sharing and  
93 innovations within and between network countries. We investigate how the attributes of the  
94 network, its operational strategy and performance affect learning, sharing, and innovations among  
95 network actors at global and national level.

96

## 97 **METHODS**

98 This analysis was part of a broader multi-country evaluation of QCN [15-18], common methods  
99 are reported in our methods supplement for our QCN evaluation collection of papers (S2 Text).  
100 Key aspects of the methods in relation to this paper are summarized below.

101

### 102 **Research setting and Population**

103 This research was conducted in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda; selected case study  
104 countries in our broader QCN Evaluation study (S1 Text). We conducted key informant interviews  
105 (KII) with selected individuals from the Ministry of Health and stakeholders at the national, district  
106 and facility level. To complement our findings, we further conducted non-participatory  
107 observations of service provision in selected facilities at the local level. KIIs and observations at  
108 the facility level were conducted in four facilities in each country. These four facilities were

109 selected at the onset of the research in 2019. The selected facilities included two high performing  
110 and two low performing (Table 1). This performance-based selection was based on maternal and  
111 new-born health outcomes which included comparison of maternal and child mortality indicators  
112 and other quality of care data (for example those used in national schemes). The QCN survey was  
113 extended to all facility stakeholders within selected QCN learning districts in each country:  
114 learning facilities across 7 districts in Bangladesh, 6 learning districts in Malawi, 6 districts in  
115 Uganda and 8 regions and city administrations in Ethiopia.

## 116 **Data used**

### 117 **Key Informant Interviews**

118 We conducted semi-structured interviews with selected national and local level network members  
119 and key stakeholders in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda between October 2019 and  
120 May 2022. At the national level, we interviewed actors from the Ministries of Health (MoH) and  
121 key implementation partners. Beyond the national level, we conducted qualitative interviews with  
122 key quality improvement and QCN representatives in 4 selected districts in each country (Table  
123 1). We paid particular attention to the perspectives and goals of those carrying out the work of the  
124 network, with a specific interest on information pertaining to learning and sharing platforms within  
125 the network and pertinent innovations linked to delivery of care in facilities and innovations on  
126 delivery of strategic management. Two to four longitudinal iterative rounds were conducted in  
127 each country to capture changes and evolution of the network operations, including exploring  
128 innovations, learning and sharing and views pertaining to network activities as well as follow-up  
129 on emerging findings from the previous rounds. The iterative nature of our study included follow-  
130 up of emerging findings from the previous rounds. In total we conducted 227 KII at country level  
131 (Table 2).

132

### 133 **Document review**

134 We reviewed all accessible published and unpublished documents and communications relating to  
135 the QCN. These included strategy and management documents, operational plans, directives,  
136 formal minutes, and reports (Table 3). We were able to access unpublished documents via WHO  
137 and MoH's QCN contacts. These documents aided understanding of how the QCN is enacted at  
138 the global level and the national level, and how the two levels are linked to influence delivery of  
139 care at the facility level. We also reviewed online accessible resources including websites and  
140 YouTube channel specific to the Quality-of-Care Network.

141

### 142 **Data Analysis**

143 To address the objective of this paper (explore whether QCN facilitated learning, sharing, and  
144 innovation), we analysed the qualitative data (KIIs and documents) for each of the four countries  
145 across all rounds. We synthesised and populated country specific qualitative data using 3 main  
146 themes (Table 4; sharing, learning and innovations). To understand factors that influence  
147 knowledge sharing and learning in the global context across countries, we used a common coding  
148 framework developed from an underlying theory adopted from Wu SY et al 2014, "*Knowledge*  
149 *Sharing Among Healthcare Practitioners: Identifying the Psychological and Motivational*  
150 *Facilitating Factors*" (Figure 2) to group data [19].

151 The theory used in this paper [19] hypothesized that Knowledge Sharing Behaviour (KSB) is a  
152 result of Knowledge sharing Intention (KSI), However, the theory suggests that KSI is directly  
153 influenced by Psychological Empowerment (path H3e) or indirectly through intermediate  
154 predictors such Organization-based psychological Ownership (path H3a), Knowledge-based

155 psychological Ownership (path H3b) and Autonomous Motivation (path H3d). In Summary,  
156 Figure 2 indicates relationships between several predictors and outcomes in the theory; ranging  
157 from Psychological Empowerment, immediate determinants of Knowledge Sharing Intention  
158 (intermediate predictors) to Knowledge Sharing Behaviour. In this paper, we use the theory as a  
159 guide to present global results on Psychological Empowerment and Psychological Ownership  
160 (organisation-based and knowledge-based) as direct and intermediate predictors that influence KSI.  
161 Psychological empowerment focuses on personal perceptions and empowering experiences and  
162 how organizations build a conducive environment for these. Organisation-based psychological  
163 ownership can be built via knowledge sharing behaviours, improved teamwork, and  
164 communication and coordination, and can facilitate changes in behaviour that can improve  
165 practices in quality of care and service delivery, and ultimately clinical outcomes [19, 20].

166

## 167 **Ethics**

168 All interviews were conducted after obtaining informed written consent from the participants,  
169 including separate consent for tape recording. All data is confidential and anonymised. Ethical  
170 approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee at University College London  
171 (3433/003), National Health Sciences Research Committee in Malawi (Protocol number:  
172 19/03/2264), Institutional Review Boards in Bangladesh (BADAS-ERC/EC/19/00274), Ethiopian  
173 Public Health Institute in Ethiopia (EPHI-IRB-240-2020) and Uganda (Makerere University  
174 School of Public Health Higher Degrees Research Ethics Committee, Ref: 869).

175

## 176 **RESULTS**



177 **Global level**

178 We present global level results systematically under two themes adopted from a learning and  
179 sharing theory by Wu et al 2014 [19]. Foremost, we present results on psychological empowerment,  
180 being the first main driver of learning and sharing intents, and psychological ownership  
181 (Organisation and Knowledge based) being the intermediate predictor of learning and sharing  
182 intentions and behaviour [19]. We further explain how these influence learning and sharing across  
183 member countries at the global level. We also present a narrative of findings on platforms  
184 available globally for learning and knowledge sharing.

185 **Psychological empowerment**

186 Actors from both the global and national level found QCN to be an important opportunity to  
187 facilitate learning and sharing knowledge on quality-of-care practices among countries; allowing  
188 countries within the network the ability to learn and adopt working strategies and practices from  
189 other countries with similar contextual factors. Further, sharing of strategies was perceived to be  
190 a medium to finding common solutions to address causes of maternal and child mortality that are  
191 prevalent in LMICs such as sepsis, birth asphyxia and other childbirth complications. QCN's  
192 establishment was largely motivated by the observation that different countries were approaching  
193 problems around maternal, newborn and child health in different ways, and that countries could  
194 benefit from more information sharing among countries.

195

196 *“Sharing of information...is important for learning. The problem*  
197 *we are dealing with in our country might have been dealt with by*  
198 *some other country. Maybe that other country addressed that*

199 *problem successfully which can be used to solve our country's*  
200 *problem. Then, some learning of our country may be helpful to*  
201 *other countries.” **Round1-National-BGD***

202  
203 One major component of psychological capability for QI in member countries like Bangladesh  
204 was adequate training and reporting systems, which enabled improved monitoring, as well as  
205 learning from identified deficiencies. QCN-related activities in Bangladesh, particularly the efforts  
206 of UNICEF, Save the Children-IHI, and QIS, focused on introducing new data systems and  
207 training hospital staff to use them. Global level webinar training for national level actors also acted  
208 as a tool for psychological empowerment for in-country actors to spearhead implementation.

#### 209 **Psychological Ownership - Knowledge based and Organisation Based**

210 The operational design of the QCN fostered network ownership and motivated in-country actors  
211 to share and learn. Specifically, QCN's enactment enabled actors at each level (national and  
212 facility) to take the activity implementation lead and champion implementation independently, at  
213 the same time ensuring that global and national actors oversee implementation at the national level  
214 and the district level or facility level respectively. For instance, in Malawi and Bangladesh, below  
215 the QCN coordination team at the national level, local focal persons (District and Facility QI  
216 Coordinators) and Quality Improvement Support Teams (QISTs) were selected within their  
217 implementation level to oversee the QCN implementation at their own respective implementation  
218 level too, imparting a sense of ownership. QIST for example operated at management level and  
219 comprised heads of departments (or representatives) and were responsible for overseeing quality  
220 improvement at their respective health facilities and reporting the same to a quality focal person  
221 within their district and facility. Below the QI focal persons, each MNCH ward was also motivated

222 by having its own Work Improvement Team (WIT), which was responsible for implementation of  
223 QI projects at ward level based on the common issues that they face, mostly informed by data over  
224 a specified period. The national level stakeholder’s major responsibility was to provide strategic  
225 support, while implementation was done by local teams. For instance, in Malawi, the quality  
226 improvement plans developed by the WITs outline the QI efforts they undertake based on the  
227 needs and gaps identified through the baseline assessments facilitated by the Quality Management  
228 Directorate (QMD). This in turn encouraged high participation by QISTs and WITs representatives  
229 at collaborative meetings and knowledge sharing events.

230 *“The fact that the institutions can identify problems is one*  
231 *result in itself. The development of quality projects,*  
232 *identifying problems, solving those problems and sharing*  
233 *lessons with others is a manifestation in itself. Designing the*  
234 *projects, implementing and reporting for the federal*  
235 *government and the federal government to make them*  
236 *available for others to share experiences is a great*  
237 *manifestation” Ethiopia Round1-Local”*

## 239 **Sharing and Learning Platforms**

### 240 **Virtual and in-person meetings for sharing and learning within the QCN**

241 Globally, the network offered several platforms for rapid sharing across its member countries,  
242 with the ability to bring high-level professionals from different countries and regions together to  
243 discuss key issues relevant to the network. This was centrally organized by WHO and UNICEF.

244 Countries were brought together through virtual forums like webinars and conference calls.  
245 Where feasible, face-to-face meetings were also conducted. Webinars had been conducted since  
246 the onset of the QCN in 2017, and they were more prominent from the year 2020 as the onset of  
247 the Covid 19 pandemic stalled regular face-to-face meetings between network members;  
248 ultimately, proving to be much less costly compared to face-to-face meetings which require huge  
249 resources to bring people together.

250 One prominent example of a virtual meeting was the WHO coordinated meeting called “*integrated*  
251 *approach for implementing MNCH-QOC,*” conducted in August 2020, where Malawi and Uganda  
252 along with other member countries were in attendance. During this meeting, experts from the  
253 WHO and partners led the mentorship of countries on several issues such as strategies to ensure  
254 sustained quality experience of care for clients in facilities. Prominent face-to-face meetings  
255 include the March 2019 meeting in Addis Ababa which had French-English bilingual translation  
256 services to allow participation of Francophone countries. The meeting provided both plenary and  
257 focused small group opportunities for the 11 network countries and 11 observer countries to share  
258 their experiences and progress of working towards improved quality of care.

### 259 **Website-based platforms for sharing, learning and accessing QCN resources**

260 Dedicated online websites were also created to serve as a key resource for all network related  
261 material [14]. For instance, a QCN dedicated YouTube channel was established in March 2019  
262 where several webinars were posted. As of the 15th of September 2023, the channel had 695  
263 subscribers, 102 videos posted and 29079 views [21]. The webinars posted mainly served as a  
264 refresher for the “*WHO MNCH Quality of Care Guidelines*” and a space for countries to share  
265 implementation progress.

266 From the webinar series available on the QCN dedicated website, a few data oriented innovations  
267 have been evident. For example, an online application called “Safe Delivery App” [22], which was  
268 shared by stakeholders from Ethiopia in 2020. According to the webinar presentation, this  
269 application was designed to provide service providers with evidence-based and up-to-date clinical  
270 guidelines on most common childbirth procedures through animated instructions and videos.  
271 Countries including Bangladesh, Guinea, Ghana and India adopted the customised version of the  
272 application. In India, for example, from 2018 to 2021, there have been more than 100,000  
273 downloads of the application; 86,242 active application users employ it as a job aid or self-learning  
274 tool. It is used in 698 districts across all 36 states and union territories (UTs) [23].

275 The QCN dedicated website was designed with multiple functionalities which, among others,  
276 would enable country actors to explore practical resources such as all QCN updates and reports.  
277 By grouping updates, reports and other webinars by country, the “learn from other countries  
278 section” also provided an opportunity for country actors to explore country specific QCN material.

### 279 **Country-specific learning, innovation, and sharing**

280 We present country specific results on learning, innovations and sharing at the national and local  
281 level. This representation is also in line with the LALA strategic objective number 3: mechanisms  
282 to facilitate learning and to share knowledge through a learning network (Figure 1).

### 283 **Malawi**

284 At the national level, a QCN Coordination Team was established in 2019. Its operations were  
285 coordinated by the Ministry of Health’s Quality Management Directorate (QMD) with a dedicated  
286 officer responsible for stakeholder coordination [18]. With funding from partners such as WHO,  
287 UNICEF, GIZ and USAID, regular meetings were held by this committee, among others to review

288 and develop strategic documents and brainstorm quality improvement implementation progress  
289 and provide strategic planning and technical support to the network. Between 2017 and 2021, the  
290 stakeholder’s coordination team met quarterly, and sometimes at non-regular intervals depending  
291 on the availability of funding.

292 *“In terms of coordination at national level there is a*  
293 *coordination team which is comprised of partners as well as*  
294 *government, which meets almost on monthly basis just to*  
295 *discuss how the whole network in terms of performance and*  
296 *implementation how it is progressing... it meets on monthly*  
297 *basis” **Round1-National-MWI-MoH***

298 Key outcomes of these coordination meetings included strategic documents such as “Maternal  
299 New-born Child and Adolescent Health Quality of Care Roadmap” [24] and “The Malawi MNH  
300 Standards” [25]. These and other QCN strategies were shared to learning facilities through  
301 Trainings of Trainers (ToTs) led by the national level stakeholders. These ToTs were meant to  
302 build local capacity and create ownership and hence ensure sustainability. Those trained were  
303 expected to take the lead in teaching their fellows in their facilities. Beyond the national level,  
304 learning and sharing was carried out through quarterly collaborative learning sessions at zonal and  
305 district levels. Learning facilities came together to share and showcase various QI project  
306 approaches and successes being carried out in their respective MNCH wards. Facilities also  
307 presented their quantitative data on how they have performed on reducing in-facility child and  
308 maternal mortalities. Those doing better in one aspect would share what they were doing to attain  
309 such an achievement so that others could learn and adopt strategies. Facilities doing poorly also  
310 shared challenges during these sessions to discuss possible solutions.

311 *“Ok, in these meetings we normally discuss the indicators,*  
312 *on how we are faring on maternal and neonatal indicators.*  
313 *So, we meet like clusters we group these health facilities in*  
314 *clusters whereby we meet for some hours and each facility*  
315 *present their data on how they have performed in antenatal,*  
316 *labor delivery, postnatal and from there we discuss others*  
317 *learn from other facilities where they are doing better and*  
318 *others facilities which are not doing better, they tell us their*  
319 *problems why they are not doing better that part and we*  
320 *help each other coming up with solutions to address the*  
321 *challenges.”* **Round2-National-MWI-MoH**

322 In some districts, learning sites were brought together to share notes on progress and challenges  
323 on a quarterly basis. Beyond these learning sites, partners also supported integrated collaborative  
324 sessions between quality-of-care learning sites and the other sites within the district so that the  
325 learning sites could lead and showcase what they are doing so that the other facilities could learn.

326 *“We made sure was to bring together these learning sites so*  
327 *that we can share notes on a quarterly basis... notes on the*  
328 *progress and challenges and then we also used to support*  
329 *the integrated collaborative learning sites, where we had*  
330 *now the quality-of-care learning sites versus the other sites.*  
331 *So, we could bring all the health centers like at the cluster*  
332 *level, taking into consideration that those which are the*  
333 *learning sites could now lead and showcase what they are*

334 *doing so that others can learn. That was the key initiative*  
335 *that we were doing.....”* **Round3-National-mw-**  
336 **Implementation Partner**

337 **Bangladesh**

338 Since early 2020, several learning and sharing platforms within the QCN have been evident. These  
339 included national webinars for digital trainings for hospital staff, WhatsApp groups between  
340 various district staff, virtual group calls between district officials, and in-person meetings between  
341 facility level staff. Bangladesh’s internal Quality Improvement system has a long-term focus on  
342 information sharing between various districts and facilities. Respondents reported engaging  
343 regularly with both national and international channels of communication, including through  
344 webinars, poster presentations, and newsletters. These channels of communication proved more  
345 useful and prominent as the COVID-19 pandemic progressed in 2020, enabling QCN members to  
346 adapt to the restrictions posed by the pandemic.

347 *“In pre-COVID period, we had some activities on knowledge*  
348 *sharing, one activity was across the facility learning visit that*  
349 *we say experience sharing visit, so that we did among our QED*  
350 *facilities. Staff of new 4 facilities visited old facilities. So, we*  
351 *did not have to provide with so many trainings there because*  
352 *we found that [facility visit] very effective. They visited those*  
353 *facilities and they replicated those quickly. So that we did*  
354 *before COVID. During COVID, through these virtual platform*



355 *and webinar, we shared learning and practices with each other.”*

356 ***Round2-National-BGD-Implementation Partner.***

357 As of June 2021, one project, which was operating in 86 hospital facilities including some learning  
358 sites, introduced quality improvement committees and ward improvement teams in the health  
359 facilities. It also established district-level learning networks across these teams for sharing  
360 strategies and progress of QI initiatives. As part of its planning, the project explicitly intended to  
361 “facilitate cross-learning” within the WHO Quality of Care Network.

362 Several means were carried out to support knowledge management in Bangladesh. As of  
363 November 2021, the National Institute of Preventive and Social Medicine (NIPSOM) was  
364 developing its skills and strengthening its systems to support QI efforts in the country. They were  
365 developing “QI coaches”, who in turn would provide hands-on support to facilities in using QI  
366 methods, building systems to disseminate lessons on successes and failure related to efforts to  
367 improve quality of care, and building capacity to manage QoC data. The nature of knowledge  
368 transmitted through the QCN network in Bangladesh mainly focused on best practices and  
369 relatively organic conversations with national-level leaders from other countries.

370 *“Since there was no history of quality improvement activities in*  
371 *one hospital, one partner had to start with basics including*  
372 *introducing staff to QI approaches, human resource*  
373 *management, and mentorship. They supported this through*  
374 *various technical training as well as first-hand learning e.g.*  
375 *PDCA as well as learning sessions”* ***Round2-National-BGD-***  
376 ***Implementation Partner.***

377

## 378 **Uganda**

379 With the arrival of Covid-19 in 2020, online spaces like Zoom and Webinars provided an ideal  
380 space for sharing and learning within the QCN in Uganda for national and facility-level actors.  
381 Learning sites interfaced via zoom meetings with the national level to share their QCN  
382 implementation experiences. Respondents found the zoom meetings useful as they learned what  
383 other facilities were doing. For example, in one facility, their success with MNCH management  
384 was partly driven by the many resources which they had for referral, unlike the other facilities who  
385 did not have some referral resources at the time.

386 *“..... Directly you send a coin, and you demand an*  
387 *improvement. Today I have said there is no stethoscope you*  
388 *give me, and you say to get a stethoscope if you don't want to*  
389 *give me money procure it for me. They should allow me to the*  
390 *make the decision. Like right now all the incubators we have*  
391 *are old ones.....” **Round1-National-Uganda***

392 Online spaces such as WhatsApp groups were also found to be feasible, innovative, and cost saving  
393 means for closing the communication gap between national and facility level actors. Virtual spaces  
394 provided a similar environment to the face-to-face meetings and trainings at a sustainable cost.

395 Generally, partners at both the national and district level put together guidelines for QoC to train  
396 health workers and support the learning and sharing processes. At local level, health workers  
397 continued to learn and sought ideas from other QCN facilities. Departmental Continuous Medical  
398 Education was responsible for bringing Antenatal Clinic (ANC) improvements teams together.

399 Those within facilities would share challenges, identify gaps and then agree on recommendations  
400 and action plans, and later, assign a responsible person to make sure the action plans are  
401 implemented. There were also collaboration links between the ANC and the maternity teams at the  
402 same facility. Maternity heads relayed their duty roster to the ANC so that the ANC would inform  
403 them of the person on duty at the right time. For most of the facilities in Uganda, one of the most  
404 notable aspects learned by front line healthcare workers was on the usage of oxygen systems.  
405 Respondents indicated a huge gap prior to the QCN. With the onset of the QCN, health care  
406 workers at one facility were trained in oxygen therapy and case management.

407

408 *“I have noticed that this initiative would work better because*  
409 *many of the health workers didn’t know how to operate*  
410 *oxygen systems, so in line of QCN I would say yes, oxygen*  
411 *therapy and case management using oxygen therapy is one*  
412 *of the of the initiatives that would work better to improve*  
413 *QI” Round1-National-Uganda*

414

415 Training manuals using the Quality-of-Care training packages for MNH as well as simplified QI  
416 guide for facilities that were implementing MNH standards were also being developed at the  
417 national level. As of 2021, participants indicated plans to have a national level space to gather the  
418 implementers of Quality of Care to learn how to make improvements in this area. They also  
419 appreciated implementation success because of QCN implementation. While the change in  
420 leadership and organisation had facilitated more regular meetings and engagement between

421 partners, this was yet to be fully organised, documented, and synthesised for sharing to be put into  
422 practice.

423

424 *“I think that one of the important things that is supposed to show*  
425 *that the network is maturing, is if learning is being effectively*  
426 *generated, shared and used for implementation. So, if you ask me*  
427 *whether that is happening, I will say yes. If you ask me whether*  
428 *that is happening in an organized manner, I will not be very sure*  
429 *about what to tell you.”* **Round1-National-Uganda**

430

431

## 432 **Ethiopia**

433 In Ethiopia, at the national level, notable sharing and learning platforms such as Telegram channels  
434 were used for the quality improvement work in the regions where MNCH projects were  
435 implemented. QCN specific works were also posted on the same group for the wider MNCH group  
436 to appreciate. Regional level meetings and learning collaborative sessions also provided a platform  
437 to strengthen sharing and learning.

438

439 In regional meetings, stakeholders shared experiences from the implementation of the QCN.  
440 During these meetings, learning facilities were given an opportunity to present their QI projects  
441 and presenting facilities were advised by experts from the national level on areas to improve and  
442 maintain. Rewards and recognition were given to well performing facilities. Nonetheless, facilities

443 that were doing better were on a performance decline due to negligence to sustain substantial QI  
444 projects.

445

446 “... *Last year, we were awarded money from the federal*  
447 *government. We couldn't be awarded that if we were presenting*  
448 *it only at regional level. At a stage where the federal government*  
449 *prepared it was presented and they were satisfied; then we were*  
450 *recognized and awarded. After we returned with the award, and*  
451 *to have a better service, there are some inputs needed” **Round2-***

452 ***Local-Health Center-03***

453

454 Collaborative Learning Sessions and coaching were also available at the local level for sharing  
455 best quality improvement projects. Usually conducted for a period of three days, the hospitals and  
456 health centers in the region presented the best practices in QI projects, providing an opportunity  
457 for learning and addressing challenges. Coaching programs, which occurred once or twice a year,  
458 also provided an opportunity for learning to the frontline healthcare workers. Although supportive  
459 supervisions were conducted as a way of transferring knowledge, these were perceived to be of  
460 less value compared to the coaching and mentorship programs.

461

462 “*We used to do supportive supervision based on a checklist but*  
463 *now we have changed that to coaching. Coaching is onsite*  
464 *based on their area of interest” **Round2-Local-Hospital-Eth-***

465 ***04***

466

467 Some facilities shared their story on the approaches they employed to decrease ANC 1 to 4 dropout  
468 rate. Although this sharing has occurred across facilities, some respondents felt that it was not easy  
469 to adopt the strategies to fit in their context because of differences in geographical status and  
470 population. As such, although the national level strategic direction could be unified, approaches to  
471 quality-of-care improvements may be different from facility to facility. Respondents indicated that  
472 adoption of QoC strategies across facilities should be data driven, however, there hasn't been any  
473 evidence to support the feasibility of any intervention or approach before adoption.

474

475 *“..... You need to collect data which incorporates*  
476 *process. It should be evidence based. Being evidence based, the*  
477 *data which we have got on learning can fill can correct gaps.*  
478 *So, the network has improved the process of quality*  
479 *improvement. It enhanced commitment; brought learning;*  
480 *mobilized resources. So, I think these are the benefits of*  
481 *networking” Round2-National-Eth-Implementation Partner*

482

## 483 **DISCUSSION**

484

485 The emergence of the quality-of-care network contributed to sharing and learning across member  
486 countries and their corresponding QCN facilities. Development and strengthening of mechanisms  
487 that facilitate knowledge sharing, as well as those related to data system improvement were evident  
488 at the global, national and local levels.

489

490 The secretariat for the network and stakeholders at the national level led efforts to create  
491 knowledge sharing platforms between countries. A number of conferences and webinars were  
492 hosted, providing access to materials on strategies and approaches within the network.  
493 Strengthening of learning collaborative session meetings, coaching and mentorship were also  
494 evident at the national and local level, despite some of these not necessarily specific to the QCN.  
495 This serves as evidence of the progress made by the QCN to achieve the learning strategic objective  
496 outcome on setting up mechanisms to facilitate learning and to share knowledge through a learning  
497 network.

498

499 Although most of the national level actors compared to facility level actors have actively been  
500 involved in several global level meetings, their attendance has hardly contributed to transforming  
501 the day-to-day operations of the QCN in facilities [16]. Resources and approaches learned from  
502 other countries have not substantively descended to facility level actors by national level  
503 stakeholders. Further, there has not been a substantive number of innovations reported across the  
504 network countries. Whilst the network has created systems and contributed to improved  
505 circumstances for learning, innovation and sharing for quality improvement, further improvements  
506 and investments in individual and organizational capacities are required to effect greater changes  
507 [18]. Implementation has also often followed a MNCH holistic approach to quality improvement,  
508 not necessarily specific to the network itself. For instance, several participants had challenges  
509 distinguishing conferences meant for QCN or quality improvement in general. Further,  
510 implementation funding has often been donor driven [15, 16]; this may also pose as a challenge to  
511 the sustainability of the network activities [17].

512  
513 National-level respondents indicated that it was not easy to test ideas learned because the  
514 implementation partners responsible for channeling resources had other priority areas. Mentorship,  
515 coaching and collaborative learning sessions have been key for individual learning facilities to  
516 interface with each other and the national level to share projects and progress being made. Many  
517 of these activities were pre-existing before the network. However, no real adoption of approaches  
518 learned has been manifested and a lack of funding also affected their implementations, especially  
519 for facility specific learning sessions between quality improvement teams. A lack of a coherent  
520 evidence generation system to qualify intervention process contributed to lack of evidence to  
521 distinguish what qualifies as a working intervention and why the intervention works. Monitoring  
522 data for quality improvement was generally found to be a work in progress with many gaps in the  
523 availability, accuracy and use of data remaining, as corroborated by our related study on the  
524 effectiveness of QCN [16].

525  
526 This qualitative research investigated whether health networks facilitate innovation, learning and  
527 sharing, learning from an evaluation of the Quality-of-Care Network (QCN) in Bangladesh,  
528 Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda. Firstly, the research methods demonstrate an insightful and  
529 contextually rich approach, utilizing KIIs and document reviews to capture the multilevel and  
530 multidimensional aspects of the network. The use of qualitative methods aligns well with the  
531 exploratory nature of the research topic, allowing for a deep exploratory understanding of learning  
532 and sharing mechanisms in the QCN network. Further, our KIIs guides were not rigid across  
533 rounds of data collection, we reviewed and revised the topic guides before each round to make  
534 sure that pertinent issues from the previous round were explored during the follow up round.



535 Additionally, the sample selection was purposive, encompassing a diverse range of network actors  
536 from various levels of the network. This deliberate sampling strategy enhances the transferability  
537 of findings to a broader population for a multilevel network evaluation. As a limitation, the study  
538 misses substantive data on innovations at country level within the network hence presenting little  
539 evidence on innovation emanating from the network because.

540  
541 It is unclear how the Psychological Empowerment; the immediate determinants of Knowledge  
542 Sharing Intention and Knowledge Sharing Behaviour are clearly linked in a multilevel health  
543 network and whether these linkages are significant. Future research could focus on this to advance  
544 understanding of how it influences sharing, learning and innovation in a health-related network.

545

## 546 **CONCLUSION**

547

548 Health networks are important to fostering learning and sharing. The network promoted  
549 coordination among stakeholders, and several sharing platforms and meetings were conducted to  
550 equip countries with implementation updates and facility QoC approaches. Similar approaches  
551 across the study countries to sharing and learning, for example, Learning Collaborative Sessions,  
552 were evident. However, innovations were not as apparent across countries due to the broader pre-  
553 existing maternal health approach adopted from an era preceding the QCN by countries towards  
554 its implementation. There was evidence however that the introduction of the QCN improved the  
555 functionality of learning and sharing platforms.

556

## 557 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

558

559 We thank all respondents and stakeholders for their time and contributions toward making this  
560 work possible. The QCN Evaluation Group is: Nehla Djellouli, Kasonde Mwaba, Callie Daniels-  
561 Howell, Tim Colbourn (UCL Institute for Global Health, UK), Kohenour Akter, Fatama Khatun,  
562 Mithun Sarker, Abdul Kuddus, Kishwar Azad (BADAS-PCP Bangladesh), Kondwani Mwandira,  
563 Albert Dube, Gladson Monjeza, Rachel Magaletta, Zabvuta Moffolo, Charles Makwenda (Parent  
564 and Child Health Initiative, Malawi), Mary Kinney, Fidele Mukinda (independent researchers,  
565 South Africa), Mike English (Oxford University), Yusra Shawar, Will Payne, Jeremy Shiffman  
566 (Johns Hopkins University, USA), Kathy Lubowa, Agnes Kyamulabi, Hilda Namakula, Gloria  
567 Seruwagi (Makerere University, Uganda), Anene Tesfa, Asebe Amenu, Theodros Getachew,  
568 Geremew Gonfa (Ethiopia Public Health Institute, Ethiopia), Seblewengel Lemma, Tanya  
569 Marchant (LSHTM, UK).

570

## 571 REFERENCES

- 572 1. UNICEF "Maternal and new-born health" [https://www.unicef.org/health/maternal-and-](https://www.unicef.org/health/maternal-and-newborn-health)  
573 [newborn-health](https://www.unicef.org/health/maternal-and-newborn-health) retrieved 20/09/2023
- 574 2. World Health Organisation, *The Global Strategy for Women's Children's and Adolescents'*  
575 *Health (2016-2030)*. Geneva: World Health Organisation. 2015.
- 576 3. Organisation, W.H., *Ending Preventable Maternal Mortality (EPMM) A Renewed Focus for*  
577 *Improving Maternal and Newborn Health and Well-Being*. Geneva: World Health  
578 *Organization*. 2021.
- 579 4. WHO, U., *Every Newborn: an action plan to end preventable deaths*. Geneva: World Health  
580 *Organization*. 2014.

- 581 5. Csa, I., *Central statistical agency (CSA)[Ethiopia] and ICF*. Ethiopia demographic and health  
582 survey, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and Calverton, Maryland, USA, 2016. **1**.
- 583 6. Raru, T.B., G.M. Ayana, M. Yuya, B.T. Merga, M.A. Kure, B. Negash, A. Birhanu, A. Alemu,  
584 Y. Dessie, and M. Dheresa, *Magnitude, Trends, and Determinants of Institutional Delivery*  
585 *Among Reproductive Age Women in Kersa Health and Demographic Surveillance System*  
586 *Site, Eastern Ethiopia: A Multilevel Analysis*. *Frontiers in Global Women's Health*, 2022. **3**:  
587 p. 821858.
- 588 7. Health Sector Strategic Plan, Mid-term review of the Malawi HSSP II  
589 [https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning\\_cycle\\_repo](https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_reportory/malawi/health_sector_strategic_plan_ii_030417_smt_dps.pdf)  
590 [sitory/malawi/health\\_sector\\_strategic\\_plan\\_ii\\_030417\\_smt\\_dps.pdf](https://extranet.who.int/countryplanningcycles/sites/default/files/planning_cycle_reportory/malawi/health_sector_strategic_plan_ii_030417_smt_dps.pdf)
- 591 8. Larson, E., D. Vail, G.M. Mbaruku, R. Mbatia, and M.E. Kruk, *Beyond utilization: measuring*  
592 *effective coverage of obstetric care along the quality cascade*. *International Journal for*  
593 *Quality in Health Care*, 2017. **29**(1): p. 104-110.
- 594 9. Jaeger, F.N., M. Bechir, M. Harouna, D.D. Moto, and J. Utzinger, *Challenges and*  
595 *opportunities for healthcare workers in a rural district of Chad*. *BMC health services*  
596 *research*, 2018. **18**(1): p. 1-11.
- 597 10. Akachi, Y. and M.E. Kruk, *Quality of care: measuring a neglected driver of improved health*.  
598 *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 2017. **95**(6): p. 465.
- 599 11. WHO “The Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health  
600 (Quality of Care Network)” retrieved 20/09/2023 [https://www.who.int/groups/Quality-](https://www.who.int/groups/Quality-of-care-network)  
601 [of-care-network](https://www.who.int/groups/Quality-of-care-network)

- 602 12. World Health Organisation. Monitoring Framework (Working Document). Quality, Equity,  
603 Dignity: A Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health  
604 (available at [http://www.who.int/maternal\\_child\\_adolescent/topics/quality-of-](http://www.who.int/maternal_child_adolescent/topics/quality-of-care/quality-of-care-brief-m-e.pdf?ua=1)  
605 [care/quality-of-care-brief-m-e.pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/maternal_child_adolescent/topics/quality-of-care/quality-of-care-brief-m-e.pdf?ua=1) accessed 5th Jun 2018). Geneva: WHO, 2017.
- 606 13. <https://www.who.int/groups/Quality-of-care-network>
- 607 14. The Quality of Care Network. “*Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal,*  
608 *Newborn and Child Health*” retrieved 20/09/2023 available at  
609 <https://www.qualityofcarenetwork.org/>.
- 610 15. Akter, K., Y.R. Shawar, A. Tesfa, C.D. Howell, G. Seruwagi, A. Kyamulabi, A. Dube, G. Gonfa,  
611 K. Mwaba, and M. Kinney, *Influences on policy-formulation, decision-making,*  
612 *organisation and management for maternal, newborn and child health in Bangladesh,*  
613 *Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda: the roles and legitimacy of a multi-country network.*  
614 medRxiv, 2023: p. 2023.03. 06.23286634.
- 615 16. Djellouli, N., Y.R. Shawar, K. Mwaba, K. Akter, G. Seruwagi, A.A. Tufa, G. Gonfa, K.  
616 Mwandira, A. Kyamulabi, and J. Shiffman, *Effectiveness of a multi-country*  
617 *implementation-focused network on quality of care: delivery of interventions and*  
618 *processes for improved maternal, newborn and child health outcomes.* medRxiv, 2023: p.  
619 2023.03. 03.23286747.
- 620 17. Lemma, S., C. Daniels-Howell, A.A. Tufa, M. Sarker, K. Akter, C. Nakidde, G. Seruwagi, A.  
621 Dube, K. Mwandira, and Q.E. Group, *Opportunities to sustain a multi-country quality of*  
622 *care network: Lessons on the actions of four countries Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and*  
623 *Uganda.* PLOS Global Public Health, 2023. **3**(9): p. e0001672.

- 624 18. Tesfa, A., C. Nakidde, K. Akter, F. Khatun, K. Mwandira, S. Lemma, G. Seruwagi, K. Mwaba,  
625 M. English, and C. Daniels-Howell, *Individual, organizational and system circumstances,*  
626 *and the functioning of a multi-country implementation-focused network for maternal,*  
627 *newborn and child health: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda.* PLOS Global Public  
628 Health, 2023. **3**(7): p. e0002115.
- 629 19. Wu, S.-Y., W.-T. Wang, and M.-H. Hsiao, *Knowledge sharing among healthcare*  
630 *practitioners: identifying the psychological and motivational facilitating factors.* Frontiers  
631 in Psychology, 2021. **12**: p. 736277.
- 632 20. Kalaris, K., M. English, and G. Wong, *Developing an understanding of networks with a*  
633 *focus on LMIC health systems: how and why clinical and programmatic networks form and*  
634 *function to be able to change practices: a realist review.* SSM-Health Systems, 2023: p.  
635 100001.
- 636 21. Quality of Care Network “Videos from the Network for Improving Quality of Care for  
637 Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (Quality of Care Network)” retrieved 15/09/2023  
638 available at <https://www.youtube.com/@QualityofCareNetwork/videos>
- 639 22. Quality of Care Network “Digital tools to improve quality of care: Lessons from using the  
640 Safe Delivery App in Ethiopia” retrieved 20/09/2023 available at  
641 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xeTwbFUQaSk>
- 642 23. Sodha, T.S., A. Grønbaek, A. Bhandari, B. Mary, A. Sudke, and L.T. Smith, *mHealth learning*  
643 *tool for skilled birth attendants: scaling the Safe Delivery App in India.* BMJ Open Quality,  
644 2022. **11**(Suppl 1): p. e001928.

645 24. Malawi Ministry of Health and Population, Maternal New-born Child and Adolescent  
646 Health Quality of Care Roadmap. 2017.

647 25. Malawi Ministry of Health and Population, The Malawi MNH Standards. 2019.

648