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Content

• The development and implementation process of training models for health care providers
• Methodology of trainings: on-line, interactive
• Evaluation process
Aim

• To:
  ▫ share the development process of a health literacy training program depending on the results of survey to determine the level of health literacy and needs assessment for health care providers (Family Physician, Family Nurses)
  ▫ explain the training performed
  ▫ explain the evaluation process of the trainings
  ▫ share the results
Training Programme Development Team

• MoH representative
• Provincial Health Directorate representative
• Field staff (family physician, family nurse)
• Experts on health education
• Public Health Academicians
Training Programme Development-Practice- Evaluation Studies

Needs Assessment studies

I. Evaluation of behaviour on community health literacy
II. Community health literacy level and related factors
III. Information, attitudes and behaviours about health literacy on health professionals

Development of training programs for health professionals

- Training of trainers
- Pre-test practices
- Face to face and online training for health professionals
- Post-test practices
- Evaluation of training programme

Development and dissemination of training programs with revisions
Development of the Training Programme: Needs assessment survey

- Health literacy level of the community
- Health literacy level, attitudes and behaviours of primary health care professionals about health literacy
- The level and determinants of the health literacy among the community were determined...
Goal and Learning Objectives of the training programme
Goal of the Training Programme

To improve the level of information, attitude and skills of health personnel about health literacy
Learning objectives

• At the end of the training, participants will be able to;
  ▫ Explain the concept of health literacy
  ▫ Define and describe public health literacy
  ▫ Describe the health literacy levels among the world and in Turkey
  ▫ List factors that influence public health literacy
  ▫ Explain the link between health literacy and heath level
  ▫ Describe the health communication approach
  ▫ Recognize the role of public health literacy in meeting core public health services.
  ▫ Apply lessons learned to improve public health literacy
Target Group

• Physicians
• Nurses
• Mid-wives
• HCWs in Family Health Centers
• HCWs in Community Health Centers
Trainers

- One moderator
- Eight facilitators (2 for each group)
- 4 residents (1 for each group)
Training of Trainers

1. Web-based
2. Face to face
Content of Training

• **Web-based training programme (4 modules)**
  ▫ Module 1: Introduction
  ▫ Module 2: What is health literacy?
  ▫ Module 3: Importance and determinants of health literacy
  ▫ Module 4: Practices of health literacy

• **Interactive face-to-face training: (One day course)**
  ▫ Short introduction
  ▫ Scenarios, case-studies
  ▫ Group-work (20 trainees in each group, groups of 5 within groups)
# Web-based training

## Pre-test

### Module 1. Introduction
- Health literacy and public health
- What is health literacy and why does health literacy matter?
- Applying health literacy to practice

### Module 2. What is health literacy?
- Learning objectives
- Health communication
- Health communication according to health literacy level of the individual
- The scope of health literacy
- Affective factors
- Health literacy level among the world and Turkey
- Summary

### Module 3. Importance and determinants of health literacy
**Learning objectives**
- Importance
- Health literacy with respect to individuals and the community
- Role of public health literacy in meeting core public health services
- The stakeholders in public health literacy and their roles
- Applying lessons learned to improve public health literacy
- Scenarios
- Summary

### Module 4. Practices of Health Literacy:
- Learning objectives
- Improving health literacy
- Barriers against health literacy
- Basic principles
- Planning
- Evaluation
- Summary
Face to face training

• **GOAL:** To improve attitudes and skills on health literacy of the trainees who have completed the on-line modules

• **LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** By the end of the course, the participants will be able to:
  - Explain health literacy
  - List the factors that influence public health literacy
  - Explain the link between health literacy and the factors that influence health literacy
  - Recognize the link between the public health literacy and health
  - Apply health communication skills for improvement of health literacy
  - Develop health literacy material
Setting

• U-shaped setting with available tables for group-work
• Batches
• Materials provided for each group as defined in the Facilitator’s guide
• Available infrastructure for group presentations
Evaluation of the Training

- Pre and post-tests
- Feed-back from the trainees - evaluation of the day
- Feed-back of the trainers/facilitators
- Feed-back of the moderator
- Feed-back of the developers of the programme
Pre and post-tests
BİRİNCİ BASAMAK SAĞLIK PERSONELİ
SAĞLIK OKURYAZARLIĞI
EĞİTİMİ

HOŞGELDİNİZ
Face to face training programme

1 full-day course
• Learning objectives
• Practise(Scenarios, case-studies, role-play, brain-storming, problem tree, group presentations etc.)
• Summary

Post-test
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09.00-9.30 | *Opening  
*Introduction of the training program  
*Goal and learning objectives |
| 9.45-10.15 | Composition of the groups of five, ice-breaking activity |
| 10.15-11.15 | **FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE PUBLIC HEALTH LITERACY AND THEIR LINK TO HEALTH LITERACY**  
Scenario 1. Problem solving techniques and discussion  
-Group-work and reporting-30min  
-Presentations and discussion-30min |
| 11.30-12.00 | **COMMUNICATION SKILLS ACCORDING TO HEALTH LITERACY LEVEL OF INDIVIDUALS**  
Preparation of role-play with scenarios and guidance material |
| 12.00-13.00 | LUNCH |
| 13.00-14.00 | **ROLE-PLAY AND DISCUSSION**  
-Role-play-30 min  
-Discussion-30 min |
| 14.15-15.15 | **DEVELOPMENT OF HEALTH LITERACY MATERIAL ACCORDING TO HEALTH LITERACY LEVEL**  
-Group-work (Development of materials) 20min  
-Presentations-40min |
| 15.30-16.30 | SUMMARY  
POST-TEST |
|       | **EVALUATION OF THE DAY** |
Group work

• Each group:
  1. Case discussion
  2. Role-play, scenario
  3. Material development
Evaluation of the Training Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Küçük</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Büyük</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of the trainees:

- 191 for the on-line
- 167 for interactive
Analysis of the pre and post-tests

• Data are evaluated with SPSS 20.0 statistical package program
• Descriptive statistics (mean±SD, median (min, max), frequencies, and percents)
• Statistical analysis was performed
## Pre and post-test results, percentage of right answers, Ankara, Turkey 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question no:</th>
<th>Pre-test : %of right answers (n=191)</th>
<th>Post-test : %of right answers(n=167)</th>
<th>$P^{**}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>88,0</td>
<td>95,8</td>
<td>0,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68,1</td>
<td>83,3</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>22,4</td>
<td>0,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48,2</td>
<td>43,1</td>
<td>0,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57,1</td>
<td>64,1</td>
<td>0,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72,8</td>
<td>70,7</td>
<td>0,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>85,9</td>
<td>87,4</td>
<td>0,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>74,9</td>
<td>82,6</td>
<td>0,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>84,3</td>
<td>79,0</td>
<td>0,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83,8</td>
<td>80,2</td>
<td>0,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25,1</td>
<td>28,1</td>
<td>0,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,6</td>
<td>25,7</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16,8</td>
<td>26,9</td>
<td>0,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27,2</td>
<td>30,5</td>
<td>0,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>18,0</td>
<td>0,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19,4</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>0,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>77,5</td>
<td>82,6</td>
<td>0,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>85,3</td>
<td>92,2</td>
<td>0,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>18,0</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>71,2</td>
<td>80,2</td>
<td>0,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Column percent

** Analyzed by Chi-Square tests
Results

- Pre-test scores: Mean: 51.33±11.21, Median: 50 (min:15, max:75),
- Post-test scores: Mean: 56.82±14.01 Median: 55 (min:15, max:100),
- There is significant difference between pre-post test scores (p<0.001).
- Among 10 of 20 questions, a significant increase in right answers were determined (p<0.05)
**Evaluation of the program by Trainees, Ankara, Turkey, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=167)</th>
<th>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum %*</th>
<th>Orta Düzeyle Katılıyorum %*</th>
<th>Kesinlikle Katılıyorum%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eğitimin amaçları açık bir şekilde belirtildi</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>32,5</td>
<td>62,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunulan bilgiler benim için yeterliydi</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>39,1</td>
<td>55,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çeşitli görsel araçlar kullanıldı</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>34,0</td>
<td>56,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modül iyi organize edildiği</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>34,0</td>
<td>59,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunulan konu işime/mesleğime bağlantılıydı</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>29,4</td>
<td>65,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu konu işime kendimi daha yeterli hissetmeme yardımcı etti</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>40,8</td>
<td>46,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitim modülü amaçlarına ulaştı</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>42,9</td>
<td>52,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kişisel beklentilerime ulaştım</td>
<td>8,0</td>
<td>44,2</td>
<td>47,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitim modülü mesleğime bağlantılı</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>25,2</td>
<td>71,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitimin organizasyonu iyi idi</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>20,9</td>
<td>76,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitimde kullanılan eğitim gereçleri yeterliydi</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>33,7</td>
<td>62,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitimin yapıldığı yer uygundu</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>14,7</td>
<td>81,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitimin içeriği yeterliydi</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td>55,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitici etkili bir iletişim kurdu</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>87,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çeşitli görsel-ışitsel araçlar kullanıldı</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>37,4</td>
<td>59,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitici konusu hakkında çok cuşku ve hevesliydi</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>85,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konu teoriden çok uygulanmamış eğitim</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>15,3</td>
<td>82,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eğitici sorularla derse herkesin katılması sağladı</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>14,7</td>
<td>83,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu eğitim işime kendimi daha yeterli hissetmeme yardımcı eder</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>46,0</td>
<td>45,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feed-back about duration of the Training

- 44.5% - too long
- 54.8% - appropriate/enough
- 0.6% - short
Conclusion

• Two phase training is found to be an effective approach
• Face to face training with interactive sessions further improve the capacity and skills of the trainees
• Feed-backs were positive
• There is a need for a follow-up the training outcomes in the field
Thank you...
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