

IRT designing Report: Short version

Context of IRT

Integrated Refresher Training (IRT) was first introduced by mid- 2006 in rural areas based on the recommendations of *HEW and HP performance survey*, with the aim of Improving the skills and knowledge of the HEWs and as a result to help them provide quality health service to the community. Likewise, the standardized Urban IRT started by mid- 2007 in urban settings of the country.

Rational of In- Service Training (IST)/ IRT

- **Limited skills and knowledge of the providers due to loses of memories :**
- **Emergence of new updates due to changes in the program itself (2nd generation HEP)**
- **Need of standardizing IRT in accordance to level 4 curriculum**

Designing IST/ IRT modules

Designing the training course is one of the key milestones in implementing IST/ IRT program which requires a diverse expertise and active engagement of the participants. Accordingly, participants from different organizations with different educational background and experiences selected and invited before the commencement of the workshop. Then, a 6-day work shop was organized at Adama town from 7- 13 April 2019.

Major objective

The overall Objective of the workshop was to design the first draft of competency based standard- training modules for the identified core service packages of second generation HEP.

Methods

Methods of designing IRT modules included:

- (a) *Pre-selection of master designers, writers and reviewers and grouping*
- (b) *reviewing of TNA, level III modules, Level IV curriculum and training materials, UHEP- IRT modules and other relevant documents*
- (c) *provision of prior orientation to the pre- selected writers and reviewers*
- (d) *facilitating Guided group discussions, writing, presentation and debriefing/ feedback*

Highlight of theAccomplishments

A number of activities carried out before, during and after the workshop to make the workshop effective and successful. The accomplished major activities were:

Before the workshop

- The training need desk review carried out and key findings synthesized. The findings were discussed with the directorates and agreed
- As the following step, IRT designing workshop was scheduled and participants identified
- The required resources had been mobilized according to the proposal: Workshop coordinators, facilitators and supervisors assigned; workshop budget secured; venues and refreshment arranged.
- Relevant designing- aid materials (National IST guideline, Level 4 OS and curriculum, Level 4 HEW blended course modules, Level 3 IRT modules, level 4 UHEP modules, 2nd generation service packagesand implementation manual, etc.) organized.
- PPTs prepared and organized

During the workshop

The first day: Registration and climate setting exercised; sequential presentation on Level 4 curriculum, concepts and basics of CBT and basics of instructional design carried out; at the end, evaluation of the first day undertaken

The 2nd – 6th day:

- The participants divided in to 6 groups based on their expertise and affiliation to each program area;
- team leaders assigned for each group
- All relevant designing materials were distributed
- Each group developed its course syllabus for the module and further divided in to the sub groups based on number of units.
- All groups started writing their respective sessions and units on the 2nd day and kept working on their respective units and sessions as outlined in course-syllabus till the 5th day
- The writers were assisted in setting learning objectives and selecting training methods
- Some groups finalized their first draft on 5th day and others on 6th day
- On the 6th day, randomly selected groups(RMNCH, SBCC and MCD) presented their works (course syllabus and contents of their modules on 5th day
- Constructive feedbacks¹ and comments were provided by peer groups, reviewers and supervisors followed by supervisors` reminder that all groups need to compile their units at module level and finalize the draft modules
- The very draft of the modules collected from all groups on the final day and the workshop ended by the noon- gth day.

After the workshop

The draft modules are put together and being analyzed for their constancy with the course syllabus and outlines as well as the appropriateness of training methods for addressing ASK and the corresponding learning objectives

Key outputs of the Workshop

- By the 6th day a total of 54 participants attended the workshop: 45 (83.3%) writers, 4 (7.4%) supervisors and reviewers and 5(9.3%) supporting staffs.
- Participants have been able to understand and internalize:
 - Requirements of level 4 OS and curriculum
 - Basics of instructional design and CBT
- Participants have been able to demonstrate:
 - Skill of designing and writing CBT modules
- As a result
 - Draft modules produced on SBCC, RMNCN, HEH, MCD& NTD, NCDS and first aid packages of HEP

Challenges

Quick observation

- Unfortunately allocation of the writers was not proportional as a result of individual interest and experiences as well as affiliation to the specific program. This was reflected as:
 - Majority of the writers (56%) worked on RMNCHN whereas as few as 3(7%), 3 (7%) and 1(2%) writers assigned to HCH, SBCC and Basic first aid modules respectively (fig 2).
- As a result, a person had been forced to work on more than one unit and corresponding sessions in HEH and SBCC and to work the entire units in Basic first aid
- There were seemingly inappropriate allocation of sessions in some modules as compared with number of units in the module
 - As we can see from (table 1, figure 1), Modules with the same units, RMNCHN and HEH having 6 units each are constructed with different number of sessions 35 and 19 respectively. Allocation of 35 sessions for 6 units (6 sessions per unit of RMNCH module) seems exceptionally high and could go beyond the scope of IRT in terms of content and time
 - On the other hand, MCD module with fewer units (four) is given disproportionately high number of sessions (24) (six sessions per unit of the module) which is quite similar to RMNCH

¹ The feedbacks focused on the need of matching the contents of the module with course syllabus and module outline; selection of appropriate and time saving methods; maintaining consistency of the module/unit/ session descriptions, objectives, methods and time; paying more attention to skill and KPS domains of the competency and above all to keep in mind that all contents of the modules should be limited within the scope of level 4 curriculum

The major challenges were:

- Attendance: some of the eligible writers were not in attendance on the first and second even third day:
- Distribution of experts: RMNCH module was overwhelmed by a number of writers while SBCC, HEH and first aid were attended by fewer writers
- Resistance: some writers were resisting the time given to their modules as a result the produced extended modules beyond the corresponding time frame
- A lot of confusion to the participants as to which comes first (Facilitator guide or participants` manual); or even to merge both together and produce single module

Next steps

Based on what we have learned from this workshop and referring to our roadmap, the following actions are proposed to be our next endeavors

- Review thoroughly, all draft modules in a small team (possibly HEPHSD staffs); identify shortfalls of each module; share the findings with the team leaders; in the meantime revise the modules based on the findings, then share the progresses with relevant bodies as early as possible
- Organize follow-up workshop for larger groups to further enrich the modules and make them ready for field testing
- Organize pilot training for HEWs to test the modules on the right audiences in practical/ ideal environments (training institutions)
- Organize and analyze field testing data and put together key findings
- Organize sessions for middle-size group to incorporate findings from the pilot testing;
- Do the last check in small groups or on individual basis
- Finalize the modules and make the modules ready for printing

Quick findings

- Module outlines of some modules are not according to standard instructional design requirements
- Competency domains are not well balanced in some modules and seem to be in favor of factual Knowledge
- There are observable difficulties in making content analysis to identify critical competency gaps
- Most of the modules lack ELC elements to provoke adult learning
- Some modules are incomplete in terms content, time allocation and setting objectives
- Some modules seem to be larger than pre- determined time limit
- The intention was to have both Facilitator guide and participants manual by the end of the workshop. However, most of the groups didn't submit their complete set of the modules

Table 2: Tentative POA to develop and finalize IRT- modules

S N	Activity	April		May				June				
		W3	W4	W1	W2	W3	W4	W1	W2	W3	W4	
	Review thoroughly, all draft modules in a small team (possibly HEPHSD staffs)											
	Organize follow-up workshop for larger groups to further enrich the modules											
	Organize pilot training for HEWs to test the modules											
	Organize and analyze field testing data and put together key findings											
	Organize sessions for middle-size group to incorporate findings from the pilot testing											
	Do the last check in small groups or on individual basis											
	Finalize the modules and make the modules ready for printing											