

Training courses and workshops on International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-11) in 2023: Polish participants' perception

Szkolenia i warsztaty nt. 11 edycji Międzynarodowej Klasyfikacji Chorób i Problemów Zdrowotnych (ICD-11) w 2023 r. w ocenie uczestników w Polsce

Wojciech Stefan Zgliczyński^{*1}, Janusz Kocik¹, Janusz Ostrowski¹, Jarosław Pinkas¹, Iwona-Wrześniewska-Wal¹, Małgorzata Wywrot¹, Alicja Baska¹

¹ School of Public Health, Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education, Warsaw, Poland

KEYWORDS:

- ICD-11
- evaluation of educational process
- CMKP
- Poland

ABSTRACT

Introduction. Training of health professionals on the Eleventh Revision of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-11) is essential for the health system. Consequently, the various elements of this training, including workshops and training courses, should be monitored on an ongoing basis, and the views of participants in these forms of training are useful in this regard.

Objective of the paper. The aim of the study was to find out the opinions of the participants of the ICD-11 training courses and workshops conducted by the School of Public Health, Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education (CMKP) on the forms of training provided in 2023 and their usefulness, as well as on future training needs.

Material and methods. The material for the analysis consisted of 234 online questionnaires (including 52 questionnaires from online workshop and 182 from online training) and 129 evaluation questionnaires (including 88 questionnaires from online workshop and 41 from online training) obtained from the participants of the workshops and training courses conducted in 2023.

Results. Workshops and training courses on ICD-11 were assessed as improving knowledge of the ICD-11 classification, which will be introduced in Poland in the future. Participants expressed interest in attending further workshops and training course and indicated the specific topics they would be most interested in.

Conclusions. The results indicate the relevance of the chosen forms of workshop and training courses organisation. The survey of participants' opinions is an important tool for improving the quality of the educational process.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:

- ICD-11
- ewaluacja kształcenia
- CMKP
- Polska

STRESZCZENIE

Wstęp. Szkolenie pracowników systemu ochrony zdrowia w zakresie 11. edycji Międzynarodowej Klasyfikacji Chorób i Problemów Zdrowotnych ma zasadnicze znaczenie dla systemu zdrowia. W związku z tym poszczególne elementy tego szkolenia, w tym warsztaty i szkolenia, powinny być na bieżąco monitorowane, w czym przydatne są opinie uczestników tych form kształcenia.

Cel pracy. Celem badania było poznanie opinii uczestników szkoleń i warsztatów dotyczący ICD-11 prowadzonych przez Szkołę Zdrowia Publicznego Centrum Medycznego Kształcenia

Address for correspondence: *Wojciech Stefan Zgliczyński; School of Public Health, Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education, Kleczewska 61/63 street; 01-826 Warsaw, Poland; e-mail: wzgliczynski2@cmkp.edu.pl.

ISSN 2657-9669/ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Copyright © 2024 CMKP.

Published and financed by Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education; <https://doi.org/10.36553/wm.166>.

Podyplomowego (CMKP) na temat prowadzonych w 2023 r. form kształcenia i ich przydatności oraz przyszłych potrzeb szkoleniowych.

Materiał i metody. Materiał do analizy uzyskany w 2023 r. stanowiło łącznie 234 ankiet online uzyskanych od osób uczestniczących w warsztatach (52 ankiety) i szkoleniach (182 ankiety) i 129 ankiet ewaluacyjnych (88 ankiet z warsztatów i 41 ankiet ze szkoleń).

Wyniki. Warsztaty i szkolenia w zakresie ICD-11 były oceniane jako poszerzające wiedzę na temat klasyfikacji ICD-11, która będzie w przyszłości wprowadzona w Polsce. Uczestnicy wyrazili zainteresowanie wzięciem udziału w kolejnych warsztatach i szkoleniach oraz wskazywali jakie dokładnie zagadnienia najbardziej by ich zainteresowały.

Wnioski. Wyniki wskazują na trafność przyjętych form organizacji warsztatów i szkoleń. Badanie oceny warsztatów i szkoleń przez uczestników jest ważnym narzędziem poprawy jakości procesu dydaktycznego.

Introduction

The Centre of Postgraduate Medical Education (in Polish: Centrum Medyczne Kształcenia Podyplomowego, CMKP), in cooperation with the Ministry of Health's Department of Medicine and the Centre for e-Health, has implemented the project entitled "Improving the quality of medical information by increasing the competence, knowledge and skills of medical staff in the correct use of the ICD-11 classification" (Stage I) in the period 01.10.2020-31.12.2023, within the framework of the Operational Programme "Development of Knowledge and Education" (Priority axis I). Improving the quality of medical information by increasing the competence, knowledge and skills of medical staff in the correct use of the ICD-11 classification (Stage I) under the Operational Programme Knowledge Education Development (Priority axis V: Support for the health sector, Measure 5.2: Pro-quality measures and organizational solutions in the health care system facilitating access to affordable, sustainable and high quality health care services). On 26 February 2021, CMKP signed a partnership agreement with the Ministry of Health for the joint implementation of the project. In turn, on 26 March 2021, a decision was made to co-finance project No: POWR.05.02.00-00-0004/20-00/1212/2021/51 (1).

The objectives of this project were to adapt the Eleventh Revision of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-11) and a set of WHO tools to assist future users of the classification to Polish conditions (Phase I of the work), and to acquire/improve knowledge of the ICD-11 classification and improve the skills of approximately 400 people in using the ICD-11 (2).

In addition to coordinating the work of translators and experts in translating the ICD-11 classification, CMKP prepared and conducted training courses and workshops for future users of the ICD-11 classification. The project provided workshops for three groups: medical university lecturers, medical coders from the Central Statistical Office, and epidemiologists. On the other hand, an e-learning course was prepared for employees of medical institutions and employees of the National Health Fund for self-paced learning.

Each of the 3 workshops consisted of 9 elements, i.e.:

1. introduction to the workshop,
2. introduction to ICD-11,
3. introduction to ICD-11 tools,
4. ICD-11 and the principles of morbidity coding,
5. ICD-11 and the death certificate,
6. ICD-11 and the principles of mortality coding,
7. ICD-11 chapters 1-26 and sections V and X,

8. summary, discussion and
9. online survey and test. Each component was tailored to the specific needs of each group.

The training also consisted of 9 components, i.e.:

1. ICD-11 Care Integration,
2. module I: Introduction to ICD-11,
3. module II: Introduction to the use of ICD-11 tools,
4. module III: ICD-11 and morbidity coding principles,
5. module IV: ICD-11 and the death certificate,
6. module V: ICD-11 and the principles of mortality coding,
7. module VI: ICD-11 chapters and sections (basic and extended version),
8. module VII: Integration of ICD-11 with information systems, and
9. survey and test.

The number of participants for the ICD-11 workshop was set at 70. In the end, a total of 111 people completed the three workshops, which is 158.5% of the target. The number of participants who completed the e-learning training course was 400 which is 100% of the target.

Objective of the paper

The aim of the study was to find out the opinions of the participants of the ICD-11 training courses and workshops conducted by the School of Public Health CMKP on the forms of training provided in 2023 and their usefulness, as well as on future training needs.

Material and methods

The study group consisted of individuals who participated in the ICD-11 online workshops and training courses organized by the School of Public Health, CMKP between 27 September and 4 December 2023. Participation in the workshops and training courses was voluntary and required prior registration. In the end, 111 people attended the workshops and 472 attended the training courses.

All workshop and training participants were invited to complete training needs and evaluation surveys. No email addresses or other data that could identify respondents were collected to ensure their anonymity.

Finally, 234 training needs survey questionnaires [including 52 questionnaires from online workshop participants (response rate – 46.9%) and 182 questionnaires from online training participants (response rate – 38.6%)] and 129 evaluation questionnaires [including 88 questionnaires from

Table 1. Distribution of answers to the question of whether participation in the workshop/training contributed to the knowledge of the ICD-11 classification.

	K	%K	W	%W	E	%E	KWE	%KWE	P	%P	Total	% Total
Definitely yes	2	100,0	2	66,7	22	46,8	26	50,0	62	34,1	88	37,6
Yes	0	0,0	1	33,3	14	29,8	15	28,8	57	31,3	72	30,8
Rather yes	0	0,0	0	0,0	10	21,3	10	19,2	32	17,6	42	17,9
Difficult to say	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	2,1	1	1,9	23	12,6	24	10,3
Rather not	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	3	1,6	3	1,3
Not	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	3	1,6	3	1,3
Definitely not	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	1,1	2	0,9
	2	100,0	3	100,0	47	100,0	52	100,0	182	100,0	234	100,0

K – cause-of-death coders of the CSO, W – academics, E – epidemiologists, P – employees of medical entities and employees of the National Health Fund.

online workshop participants (response rate – 79.3%) and 41 questionnaires from online training participants (response rate – 8.9%)] were used for the analysis.

Results

The results of the two surveys conducted among workshop and training courses participants will be presented separately, i.e., Evaluation of the training and workshops and the results of the evaluation questionnaires with differences between the groups.

The question "Did your participation in the workshop contribute to your knowledge of the ICD-11 classification to be introduced in Poland in the future?" was answered in the affirmative by more than 97.9% of workshop participants, while 2.1% answered "difficult to say".

On the other hand, when asked whether participation in the training contributed to an increased knowledge of the ICD-11 classification, 83% of participants answered in the affirmative. The opposite view was held by 4.3%.

On the other hand, the answer „difficult to say” was given by 12.6% (Table 1).

In order to gather information for future editions of the workshop, participants were asked the question "Do you think any modules of the workshop should be expanded or reduced? Please indicate the module/topic". There were 34 responses to this question. On the other hand, the question "Do you think any modules of the training should be expanded or reduced? Please indicate the module/subject and write what changes should be made", yielded 104 answers, which will also be used for the preparation of future training courses.

In order to determine the possible need for ICD-11 training in the future, workshop participants were asked the question "In the future, when ICD-11 is introduced in Poland, would you be interested in attending an ICD-11 workshop?" with 100% of workshop participants answering in the affirmative. As far as the participants of the trainings are concerned, when asked about their willingness to take part in training courses in the future, 83.5% of the participants gave an affirmative answer. The opposite view was held by 2.1%. On the other hand, 14.3% answered "difficult to say" (Table 2).

Table 2. Distribution of answers to the question about interest in taking part in workshops/training on ICD-11.

	K	%K	W	%W	E	%E	KWE	%KWE	P	%P	Total	% Total
Definitely yes	1	50,0	1	33,3	23	48,9	25	48,1	74	40,7	99	42,3
Yes	0	0,0	2	66,7	15	31,9	17	32,7	53	29,1	70	29,9
Rather yes	1	50,0	0	0,0	9	19,1	10	19,2	25	13,7	35	15,0
Difficult to say	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	26	14,3	26	11,1
Rather not	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	3	1,6	3	1,3
Not	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Definitely not	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	0,5	1	0,4
	2	100,0	3	100,0	47	100,0	52	100,0	182	100,0	234	100,0

K – cause-of-death coders of the CSO, W – academics, E – epidemiologists, P – employees of medical entities and employees of the National Health Fund.

Table 3. Responses to questions on workshop evaluation.

	K	W	E	Total
Evaluation of the organization of the workshop	4,7	4,9	4,3	4,6
To what extent was the knowledge gained during the workshop useful	5,0	4,9	4,7	4,9
Overall ocean of the workshop (average score for organization and knowledge gained)	4,8	4,9	4,5	4,8
Presentation of presenters	5,0	4,7	4,8	4,8
Value of the workshop	5,0	4,7	4,7	4,8
Punctuality of workshop leaders	5,0	5,0	4,9	4,9
Number of workshop participants/number of surveys obtained	5/3	20/10	86/75	111/88

K – cause-of-death coders CSO, **W** – academics, **E** – epidemiologists.

The final question posed to workshop and training participants concerned the need for knowledge on specific ICD-11 topics. To the question "What content do you think should be covered in future ICD-11 workshops for coders?" (2 responses were received), "What content do you think should be covered in future ICD-11 workshops for coders?" (2 responses received), "What content do you think should be covered in future ICD-11 workshops for epidemiologists?" (22 responses received). When asked "What content do you think should be covered in the future at ICD-11 trainings for employees of treatment entities and employees of the National Health Fund?", the trainees provided 95 answers. The information obtained will form the basis for the development of future editions of workshops and training courses.

The overall rating of the workshops was high (mean score: 4.8), both in terms of the usefulness of the knowledge gained during the workshops (mean score: 4.9) and their organization (mean score: 4.6). The trainers were also rated highly, including the manner of presentation (mean score: 4.8), content value (mean score: 4.8) and punctuality (mean score: 4.9) (Table 3).

The possibility of credible evaluation of the online training courses is limited by the small number of evaluation questionnaires obtained. Nonetheless, based on the questionnaires obtained, it can be concluded that the training participants rated the content value of the presentations relatively highly (mean score: 4.4). In the opinion of the vast majority of training participants, the content presented was useful, readable, applicable and is recommendable (Table 4).

Table 4. Responses to questions on evaluation of training.

Question	yes	%	not	%	I don't know	%
The program was available on the e-learning platform of CMKP and included relevant information on the form of course completion.	40	97,6	0	0,0	1	2,4
Didactic materials developed in electronic form were made available on the e-learning platform of the CMKP.	32	86,5	1	2,7	4	10,8
Class content presented in electronic form, i.e., multimedia presentations, webcasts, test items, moderated discussions, video lectures, etc. were useful in consolidating knowledge.	27	79,4	3	8,8	4	11,8
Audiovisual material was clear (quality of graphic elements, sound and image, etc.).	27	81,8	5	15,2	1	3,0
I see the opportunity to use the knowledge, skills and professional competences acquired during the e-learning activities.	29	87,9	3	9,1	1	3,0
Classes delivered on the e-learning platform met my expectations.	22	66,7	7	21,2	4	12,1
Hybrid courses complemented by e-learning are recommendable as a modern form of specialist training for doctors.	23	71,9	2	6,3	7	21,9

Discussion

According to the definition proposed in 1981 by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, evaluation is "a systematic study of the value or merits of an object" (3). In recognition of the possible relativity of values, it is worth extending the definition of evaluation to include "a systematic study of the values or qualities of a particular program, activity or object, from the point of view of accepted relevant criteria, with a view to its improvement, development or better understanding". This extended definition indicates the nature of evaluation as a research activity, the outcome of which is intended to be of practical value (4). It should be emphasized that, in a higher education institution, the process of evaluation refers to "the gathering of information about the process and the results obtained, and their analysis with a view to improving the process and achieving the intended results" (5).

Conducting evaluations of the teaching activities carried out has a long history and well established importance, which can be linked to the Joint Declaration on Higher Education of the European Ministers of Education meeting in Bologna on 19 June 1999 (6). This aspect of activity is constantly being developed as one of the key dimensions in the modernization process of higher education in the countries of the European Union (7).

However, publishing the results of the evaluation in the form of an article is not a standard practice for all universities. As the School of Public Health, CMKP, we believe that evaluation is important and that presenting the evaluation to a wide audience is the realization of the principle of transparency of the educational activities carried out – in the name of the realization of this principle, we have published articles on the evaluation of the educational activities carried out twice so far, i.e., in 2009 (8) and in 2016 (9). In the case of ICD-11, this is all the more important as in 2024 the CMKP will participate in the implementation of the second phase of the project, in which workshops and training on ICD-11 will be an important part.

The specificity of the ICD-11 workshops and training carried out by CMKP makes it difficult to compare the data obtained with those obtained by other researchers. Therefore, the focus of the discussion should be shifted to discussing the principles and objectives as well as the impact of the evaluation activities carried out.

The evaluation of the teaching activities carried out made it possible to control and assess their quality, thus providing a basis for improving these activities in the next edition. It also allowed a better understanding of the participants' needs and can be seen as a successful attempt to initiate the building of a relationship based on loyalty and commitment with the participants.

The evaluation made it possible to assess the quality of the training activities carried out, i.e., whether the workshops and training sessions met the expectations of the participants and whether they were effective. The feedback received on different aspects of the workshops and trainings made it possible to identify areas for improvement. The results indicate that the training courses and workshops delivered met the expectations of the participants and also identified areas where changes should be considered.

Conducting regular evaluations makes it possible to observe changes in participants' perceptions of the activities. This allows organizers to monitor their activities and take corrective action where necessary to maintain the quality of workshops and training courses. Although it was not

possible to observe possible changes in participants' perceptions of the activities due to the essentially one-off nature of the ICD-11 workshops and training courses conducted, this aspect of evaluation will be important in the next edition of the workshops already planned.

The evaluation allowed the organizers to learn from and improve their teaching skills. By understanding what works well and what can be improved, they gain valuable knowledge to continuously improve their teaching methods and adapt to the changing needs of participants.

Typically, evaluation of workshops and training courses allows for the identification and understanding of participants' needs, including the identification of topics to focus on in future workshops and training courses, and the identification of a level of difficulty appropriate to participants' abilities. In the case of the workshops and training courses delivered, feedback was obtained from participants on how to improve the teaching activities delivered, both in terms of purely technical aspects and in terms of the choice of content to meet the specific needs of particular groups of participants.

Conducting evaluation of learning activities is a form of relationship building between training providers and trainers and participants. An invitation to evaluate sends a signal that the opinions of participants are important to the training provider. As a result, participants are likely to be more engaged and their relationship with the organization will be strengthened, which is important in terms of their participation in subsequent training courses and workshops.

In conclusion, the evaluation of the ICD-11 workshops and training courses carried out confirmed that such a survey is a key tool for quality management in training activities, helping organizers to adapt to the needs of participants and to ensure satisfaction with participation in workshops and training courses planned for the future.

Conclusions

A survey of workshop and training participants' opinions, including their evaluation and expectations for future workshops and training courses, is an invaluable source of knowledge for the organizer about the training provided and allows for quality control.

Participants in the workshops and training courses highly valued their content and usefulness and expressed their willingness to participate in other forms of ICD-11 training in the future.

The results obtained confirm the relevance of the choice of content and the forms of organization chosen for ICD-11 training.

It is advisable to conduct research on the occasion of training courses and workshops in preparation for the introduction of ICD-11 in Poland.

REFERENCES

- (1) Website of Ministry of Health. https://zdrowie.gov.pl/power/strona-1051-poprawa_jakosci_informacji_medycznej.html.
- (2) Website of CMKP. <https://www.cmkp.edu.pl/icd-11>.
- (3) Joint Committee on Standards for Educational. Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects and Materials. New York 1981, McGraw-Hill:12.
- (4) Paclawska K. Ewaluacja w dydaktyce akademickiej. [In:] Skulicz D, editor. W poszukiwaniu modelu dydaktyki akademickiej.

- Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Kraków 2004; 121-134.
- (5) Brzezińska A, Miejsce ewaluacji w procesie kształcenia [w:] A. Brzezińska, J. Brzeziński [red.], Ewaluacja procesu kształcenia w szkole wyższej, Poznań 2000. Wydawnictwo Fundacji Humaniora.
- (6) <https://www.ehea.info/page-ministerial-conference-bologna-1999>.
- (7) Zgliczyński WS. Polityka edukacyjna Unii Europejskiej. Studia BAS 2010; 2:65-88.
- (8) Opolski J, Zgliczyński WS, Ruiz M, Węgrzyn Z, Żochowski A. Jednolity, obowiązkowy dla wszystkich lekarzy kurs specjalizacyjny w dziedzinie zdrowia publicznego – w ocenie słuchaczy Szkoły Zdrowia Publicznego CMKP. Postępy Nauk Medycznych 2009; 4:277-281.
- (9) Cianciara D, Zgliczyński WS, Piętka S, Bereza T. Compulsory public health courses for physicians – assessment of courses by attendees in the School of Public Health in Centre of Post-graduate Medical Education. Postępy Nauk Medycznych 2016; 5:292-297. DOI:10.5604/08606196.1202372.