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ABSTRACT
This study attempted to determine ELT trainees’ needs in Higher Diploma Program (HDP) module evaluation, and assess the overall pedagogical value of the training module to teachers at higher education. The study applied qualitative case study design by purposively selecting six English language teachers completed HDP training from Arba Minch University. E-mail interview and module evaluation checklist were tools used for data collection. The data was analyzed based on themes in the interview and the contents in the rubric with the level of quality stated in the scale. The results revealed that the training material did not fit for all trainees equally. Though trainees were different in their knowledge bases, the enhancement of HDP training module content for some knowledge bases was adequate. Furthermore, the training material helped trainees to develop their pedagogical skills in the field-based study. However, the topics and contents were not subject area specific, and some activities were weak to promote interaction. For the well-designed activities, their applicability in addressing for diverse audience was poor. Furthermore, the material was not designed in line with the scientific research findings, lacks additional resources to support training and no instruction was indicated to adapt it for various classrooms’ learning environments. From the English Language teachers’ viewpoints, it was concluded that training and training material have to be designed according to particular discipline’s needs. Limitations, recommendations and implications for future research areas were indicated.
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Introduction
The teaching profession requires adequate knowledge and skills of the teacher to implement the classroom teaching, needs the use of appropriate classroom management skills that bring effective classroom environment for teaching and learning, and requires the application of relevant
assessment techniques to evaluate the teachers’ own way of teaching and students’ learning so as to bring change on the students’ outcome. Students’ outcome can be different; it can be either their achievement in the learning or the change of their behavior through learning. These changes can be brought as a result of the teachers’ Continuous Professional Development (CPD) despite students have their own contribution for the changes. Hotaman (2010) reported that individuals who select the teaching profession have to possess the knowledge of subject matter, teaching skills and suitable personality traits and try to assure whether the mission which is attributed to the profession is successfully fulfilled. If so, it is inevitable that the teaching profession influences everything.

Regarding the influence of the teaching profession, Saleem et al. (2021) found that the teaching profession has great importance in every society. The reason is that teachers are not only the facilitators of educational, curricular, and co-curricular activities but they help to educate people who become history makers for a nation. This makes the teaching profession as a lifelong career which begins at teacher institutions and lasts for so long in professional’s lifetime. Studies claim that teachers’ professional development is a long process of the academic career that starts at training institutions and ends at retirement as initial teachers’ education, induction, and in-service upgrading of the long-career CPD. Hence, professional development needs to be considered not as a one-time event but rather as a long-term process whereby teachers learn from series of learning events and experiences (Barea & Petrovic, 2020; Brock & Grady, 2006). The way teachers are trained, teachers’ education program’s effectiveness and the opportunities teachers have for continuing professional development are among the key global concerns of education to improve the quality of teaching and retaining good teachers in higher institutions.

In Europe, higher education institutions commonly offer CPD training in areas such as teaching, information and communication technology or foreign languages, but with a relative absence of large-scale training programs targeting academics (European Commission, 2017). Furthermore, across Europe, the most common initiatives are pedagogical training and of academic staff provided by individual institutions though there are differences according to the type of institution (Gaebel et al., 2018).

African universities must not be cut off from the rest of the world; they need to develop along the same principles and requirements as universities and higher education institutions in the rest of the world. Due to this, a similar trend has been applying at higher institutions of Ethiopia to support the lecturers’ professional development at various colleges and schools of the institutions through the continuous provision of professional development training. Due to the need of an official examination on the quality of education and the successfulness of teacher education, higher diploma program, which identified the needs of teacher educators in Ethiopia, was developed (HDP Handbook, 2008). The program began in all teacher education Institutes in October 2003 G.C., as “a new compulsory qualification” for all teacher educators (Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 4). In the HDP training handbook, trainees have presented with various ideas
and activities related to learning and teaching in general, and considered the training applicable to all academic staffs.

On the other hand, learning materials often form the basis for learning and teaching. Assuring the quality of material and identifying learners’ needs are among the criteria to check the quality of education and training at any level of educational institutions since trainees become more motivated to learn when teaching is presented to them in a material that is relevant to their needs. Since the beginning of HDP training in higher education institutions of Ethiopia, there has been continuous revision of the training handbook. Due to this, the recently published HDP handbook (2018) is enriched and aligned with the needs and interests of individual departments/academic units in higher education institutions through making discussion and getting subjective contribution of HDP leaders, candidates and all stakeholders.

Thus, it is inevitable that quality material brings quality in training. Therefore, the quality of materials must be assured pre-use, in-use or post-use with standardized checklist. According to Rubdy (2003), the main aim of evaluating materials pre-use is to measure the potential of what teachers and learners can do with them in the classroom. In-use and post-use evaluations are important in establishing “how successful learning materials are” (McDonough & Shaw, 2003, p. 71).

Regarding the teachers’ professional quality at higher education institution of Ethiopia, study shows that majority of teachers luck professional skills of teaching and pedagogy (Mohammed, 2020). To fill this gap, the Ethiopian MOE has been trying to introduce the HDP training program for teachers at higher institutions using training material particularly developed and revised periodically for this purpose. Although the Ethiopian HDP training material has been revised regularly since its beginning, some of the studies’ result confirmed that the preparation of HDP training material lacks quality. For instance, Tesfaye (2017) did a survey study on the implementation and opportunities of HDP program for classroom instruction on HDP Candidates from Dire Dawa University. The results show that, however HDP program has a great value for the instructors to improve their professional development, HDP module, mode of delivery and the program by itself need some amendment. On the other hand, Simeneh et al. (2019) investigated a descriptive survey study on instructors’ perceptions, practices and challenges regarding HDP training in Debre Markos University. The results of the study revealed that most instructors did not practice appropriate active learning methods when their classes were observed. In addition, lack of interest, the irrelevance content of the training manual with the classroom course and absence of well-organized follow-up and support were the major challenges of instructors for implementing HDP. Furthermore, Atinafu (2018) did related study on the effects of HDP program training on teaching learning process at Assossa University, Ethiopia. The study finding indicated the shallow impact of HDP training on teaching learning process due to factors contributed by different entities.

Moreover, Zelalem (2017) did a qualitative case study on Teachers' Perception of HDP at Arba Minch University. The results revealed that teachers have positive perception towards HDP training program. However, the study participants noticed that HDP training lacks incentive,
follow up and support from the side of the university. Furthermore, the research found that HDP training module needs revision because of the module’s standard problem. Some contents in the module were written in the primary and secondary schools’ context than higher education institutions.

Despite all the above studies conducted using the overall staff’s implementation, opportunities, perception, practice and challenges regarding the HDP training in their institutions, none of the researches conducted on a particular college or department staffs’ needs to HDP training. However, we suspect that there might not be a holistic approach that bring common understanding among the HDP trained staffs from various disciplines. This is because different departments have their own teaching methodologies that make one different from the other. Hence, it is advisable to apply a pedagogy one must develop understanding of the teaching and learning requirements of one’s particular discipline. This has been termed as discipline-specific pedagogical knowledge (Berthiaume, 2007; Lenze, 1995).

Although the stated researches identified the limitations related to HDP training module preparation, little systematic and objective evaluation has been done on the overall pedagogical value and suitability of the HDP training module for diverse audience. Due to this, we suspect that the former revision did not take into account the specific needs of the particular trainees’ staff adequately. Furthermore, the editors of HDP Handbook (2018) also felt that there is room for producing an even more adequate handbook by using feedback from its users and by including additional subject-specific instructional methods and illustrations. Hence, there was a need for a more systematic approach to training materials evaluation emerged in this study as it becomes apparent that any set of produced training materials would be unlikely to be completely suitable for a particular group of trainees’ needs. Being different from a forementioned studies, and the need for discipline-specific pedagogical knowledge training for the particular discipline, the present study evaluated the English language teachers’ needs in HDP training module evaluation. Thus, we intended to apply the post-use evaluations technique focusing on the trained English language teachers’ needs in HDP training material evaluation.

**Purpose of the present study**

The purpose of this research project was to determine ELT trainees’ needs for HDP training module evaluation and assess the overall pedagogical value and suitability of the HDP training module.

This study is significant because its findings will draw HDP training material designers, leaders, tutors and trainees’ attention to the importance of evaluating training material for its effectiveness based on trainees’ needs. Moreover, the findings of this study will assist material writers and editors to develop locally appropriate criteria of material evaluation and make it more suitable for evaluating the training material based on trainees’ needs. It also helps evaluators to become more systematic and objective in their approach. Furthermore, the findings of the study will act as a reference for other interested researchers as well as trainers to evaluate training material and design and delivery of the training based on their discipline’s needs.
Method
Sample and sampling technique
In general, 35 trainees were participated in the HDP training in 2019 at Arba Minch University. Out of this number, six English language teachers were purposively selected for the present study.

Instruments
Two types of data collection instruments were used for this study: Email interview and Module evaluation checklist criteria.

Email interview is one of the online tools in which qualitative data is collected. As Murray and Sixsmith (1998) asserted that interviews via e-mail can be used for the same reasons as in face-to-face interviews, i.e., understanding personal and shared meanings, thoughts and feelings from the interviewee's perspective. The present researcher chose it instead of applying face-to-face interview due to the constraints hindering its application. One of these constraints was the global outbreak of COVID-19 cases that limited the freedom to do face-to-face interview. The other was the place in which participants live. This is because the access and opportunity of contacting participants from distance through email interview is better than that of using the face-to-face interview. This was the case in this research that one of the interviewees was in Addis Ababa for his further education, and some others were far from the research area due to the semester break. Online interviews are viewed as a second-choice alternative when face-to-face interviews are not possible (Deakin & Wakefield, 2014). Therefore, the designed semi-structured qualitative face-to-face interview questions on ELT trainees needs in training material evaluation were translated into the context of e-mail exchange.

The module evaluation checklist was adopted from Evaluating Professional Development Resources: Selection and Development Criteria by Sherman et al. (2003). The rubric uses twenty items with a four-point rating scale—Exemplary, Adequate, Marginal, and Unacceptable—to help State staff assess training modules. The contents of the rubric are divided into four sections: Appropriateness of General Content (3 items), Appropriateness of Design and Delivery (4 items), Quality of Research Base (5 items), and Ease of Adoption/Adaptation (8 items). The present researcher used this rubric to evaluate the pedagogical value and suitability of the Ethiopian HDP training module.

Design
Qualitative case study design was applied to accomplish this study.

Methods of Data Analysis and Interpretation
The interview data was analyzed based on themes in the interview. The collected data through evaluation checklist was analyzed based on the contents in the rubric together with the level of
quality stated in the scale. Finally, discussion, conclusion, limitations and recommendation were made, and future research area was indicated.

**Results**

*Results of the interview Data*

An Email interview was made on ELT teachers’ needs in HDP training material evaluation. Due to this, each respondent’s response on the interview was analyzed based on the three themes: discipline specific needs, appropriacy of general content and design and delivery in the interview questions.

When respondents were asked whether they think that various fields of study have common needs in HDP training, they replied that they did not think so. However, one interviewee (T3) said, “although all fields of study are not similar, they share some common needs.” When respondents were asked for the design of discipline specific pedagogical training to fulfill individual department’s needs in HDP training, they all accept that training material and the training should be based on disciple’s interest, and should be different due to its diversity. The other interviewee (T2) said, “I think it would rather be better if it were. Training the academic staffs from the diverse fields (in one classroom) make them lack what their discipline specifically needs from them (thus they might simply have a shallow understanding, not the deep one). It would be better if the program is redesigned so as to be given at each department level.”

When respondents were interviewed whether the general content of the HDP training material helped them to get the desired ability, they positively replied as the content focuses on methods of teaching, informs how to handle teaching and learning process and comprises varied methodologies and approaches with regard to classroom management and the students’ learning preferences.

When they were asked whether the HDP material topics and contents contribute for their current classroom practice, two interviewees agree in their response that the contents contribute to their practice. One interviewee(T2) said, “Yes, the topics and contents for example, about measurement and evaluation have a direct contribution in evaluating my students.” On the other hand, T2 put his idea differently, and said, “No. It is not subject area specific rather than general teaching method.”

When interviewees were asked whether the material train them how to monitor their teaching, all respondents agree that the material deals with pedagogical practices and it encompasses the ideas how to manage the class and the lesson as well.

For the interview question whether the material hold good qualities of interesting, compressible activities to promote communication, respondents replied as the contents do not promote communication. One of the interviewees(T1) said, “No. activities are more of individual than interactive.”

When respondents were asked for the field-based learning they were assigned by the HDP leader, they found it good and successful. One of them (T2) said, “I found the field-based
learning the best way to boost up my teaching experience and understand the school environment in a better way.”

For the interview question whether the training helped them to find a better way for managing their classes, they agreed that it is area of training how to manage class. One interviewee (T2) added that “The training helped me to cope with a large class size, misbehaving, fast and slow learners.” When respondents were asked whether the training helped them to find a better way for using appropriate techniques and methodologies for teaching, respondents replied negatively. Their common responses were that although there were issues raised with regard to the diversified learning choice and a plenty of approaches as per the varied subject matter content, the training did not follow particular pedagogical approach. One of the respondents (T3) said, “It is general; not specific to my subject matter. It is better to make it need based.” Whether the training helped respondents in using different types of assessment techniques for their students learning, respondents agreed that the training helped them in such a way. One interviewee (T2) said, “Since learners prefer a variety of ways to learn, I have gained from the training that applying various techniques of assessing as per their diversified learning choices.”

Results of the module evaluation

Based on the module selection and development criteria, and the rubrics stated to rate the items, HDP training module was evaluated for its pedagogical value and suitability for teachers at higher education institutions. The evaluation was based on the four areas in which training material is evaluated: Appropriateness of General Content, Appropriateness of Design and Delivery, Quality of Research Base and Ease of Adoption/Adaptation.

Regarding whether the appropriateness of general content is aligned with the learning goals, state standards and its contribution for the knowledge base, the evaluation of the HDP training module indicated that the material was designed based on learning goals as it is stated in the module introduction section with an emphasis on the “improvement of the quality of teaching and learning and development of reflective practitioners” as well as alienation of plan and implementation strategies of higher education institutions on local, regional and national needs and expectations. However, whether the content enhance the knowledge base of HDP trainees, trainees had from various departments with different specializations. Even if the knowledge base of trainees was different, there are things in the present HDP training module that work for all. These include knowledge of the: instructional planning, general pedagogy, learner (learning style), educational contexts (macro & micro level), educational ends (evaluation), reflection and action research. However, trainees were different in their content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.

With regard to appropriateness of Design and Delivery of the training material, learning activities support the goals and objectives, and they help trainees what they will do up on returning to their classroom. On the other hand, although the strategies reflect varieties of teaching and learning modes, their applicability is poor. This is because it is difficult to make
instructional strategies appropriate to the different target audience since audiences are from different disciplines. Although the written language in the training module focuses on inclusivity, the visual material is provided only in print, no video or audio material to reflect the diversity of the audience.

Concerning quality of Research Base of the module, the evaluation was done in two forms: evaluation according to basic research principles and evaluation of effectiveness of professional development module. The module revision group did not state that the module was prepared based on practices on rigorous, systematic and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge from the research so as to revise and redevelop the training module.

Although the module lacks evidence of research findings support for the development of module, the module editors were high professionals in the area. For checking effectiveness, the training module was field tested, particularly in school placements through planning, teaching and evaluating lessons and doing action research, and in other organization placements, collecting data and writing report in the form of portfolio. Moreover, the module contains four evaluation plans as “end of module self-assessment” at the end of each section of the module, the final assessment plan and an appendix with Self-rating scale for candidates. This scale is intended to assist candidates to identify changes in the level (state) of their knowledge, skill, and attitude prior to the program and at the end.

Regarding ease of Adoption/Adaptation, the material’s organization, its easiness for understanding and using, clarity of language, layout, legibility for reading is good. However, whether or not to adapt the module to suit for a variety of classrooms and learning environments was not indicated. Furthermore, lack of references and web addresses due to the gap in consulting other works of material evaluation, lack of video and audio images to support the print material, and web sources to access the soft copy of the module in the absence of the hard copy was not indicated in neither the top nor the bottom sides of the pages throughout the module.

Discussion
In this section, the results of both interview and training material evaluation data are interpreted for their common contents and different ones respectively based on the objectives of the study. The discussion begins from the desire of discipline specific training program to fill the ELT trainees’ needs for HDP training module evaluation, followed by the training module evaluation.

From the data on the interview made on whether the various fields of study had common needs, the findings indicate that even if the fields are different in nature, they share some common needs. This is true in the applicability of the general pedagogical knowledge for all teacher trainees. On the other hand, the study found that training and training material are designed according to particular discipline’s needs rather than general as a holistic approach to training. This imply that the knowledge gaps of individual trainees can be filled if training and training materials are designed separately across disciplines.
With regard to the HDP training material evaluation for its pedagogical value and suitability for teachers at higher education institutions, standardized evaluation criteria was employed. The evaluation of the module was based on the four areas in which training material is evaluated: appropriateness of general content, appropriateness of design and delivery, quality of research base and ease of adoption/adaptation.

When the general content of the module was checked in line with the learning goal, state standards and its contribution for the knowledge base, evaluation result confirmed that the module was developed based on learning goals of the country with an emphasis on the “improvement of the quality of teaching and learning and development of reflective practitioners” and alienation of plan and implementation strategies at local, regional and national needs and expectations. According to basic education sector analysis report developed by the study team in reference to Ministry of Education of Ethiopia (2011b) of Ethiopia, there was a standard on capacity building for trainers at colleges and universities. Due to this, HDP handbook was revised and distributed for College of Teacher Education (CTE) trainers and CPD framework was developed for higher education institutions. Therefore, the content of the module is aligned with high state standard professional ethics in education. Thus, the design of training material content provides good example for other training material designers to copy. Trainees were different in their content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, and the training module lacks these two types of knowledge bases. However, instructional planning, general pedagogy, learner (learning style), educational contexts (macro & micro level), educational ends (evaluation), reflection and action research are knowledge bases that all trainees share in common. Thus, the enhancement of HDP training module content to knowledge base is adequate, if not Exemplary.

From the email interview made with respondents on the appropriateness of the general content of the training module, supportive results were found. The interview results indicate that the HDP training material helped them to develop their teaching methods, manage classroom as well as teaching and learning so as to bring the desired ability of the trainees. While two of the interviewees responded that the topics and contents in the HDP training material contribute for their current classroom practice, whereas one replied as the topics and contents were not subject area specific rather than general teaching method. This variation may come due to the differences in the participants’ knowledge of the teaching methodologies. Furthermore, the material trained respondents with pedagogical skills, classroom and lesson management skills as well. However, the activities in the module are weak in promoting communication. On the other hand, respondents were satisfied with the field-based learning they were assigned by the HDP leader to schools and found it interesting, implying that it contributed a lot for their actual classroom practice.

Concerning the appropriateness of Design and Delivery of the training material, an interesting design of activities for trainee’s actual classroom practice was included based on the goals and objectives of the training. Hence, the design of the material was good. Due to the difficulty in making the different instructional strategies appropriate for a diverse audience, its
applicability was poor, implying that the design of the strategies need some revision so as to make it appropriate for different audience to address. Furthermore, despite the written language in the module address inclusivity, the material was provided only in print form so that it lacks adequacy in addressing individual differences.

From the interview result on the appropriacy of the design and delivery of the training material, it was found that the training helped trainees to manage their class and use different types of assessment techniques effectively though it lacks appropriate teaching methodologies to suit for all audiences. Hence, appropriate subject specific pedagogical methodologies are needed to fill the methodological knowledge gaps of the various audience.

In order to check the quality of the module in line with scientific research findings, no rigorous, systematic and objective procedures were employed to get reliable knowledge for the revision and redevelopment of the HDP training module despite the material was edited by high professionals with adequate knowledge base in the area. If the material does not be revised with the support of evidence of research findings, it lacks quality. This is the case for the lack of quality of the training material in some aspects. On the other hand, the field test made on the training module in schools through planning, teaching, evaluating lessons, doing action research and assessing individuals throughout the module to check their change in knowledge using self-assessment plans and Self-rating scale for candidates. This scale is intended to assist candidates to “identify changes in the level(state) of their knowledge, skill, and attitude prior to the program and at the end” (HDP handbook, 2018, p.143). Therefore, these all provides some evidence of effectiveness for the HDP training module.

Concerning the material’s level for the trainees, it was found that the material was organized in a way that makes it easy for understanding and using, clear in language, layout and legibility for reading, implying that the material lacks difficulty. However, instructions to adapt material to suit for a variety of classrooms and learning environments was not indicated. This forced the trainer to be limited only on the module. Furthermore, lack of references and web addresses due to the gap in consulting other scientific works of material evaluation, lack of video and audio images to support the print material, and web sources to access the soft copy of the module in the absence of the hard copy was not indicated in neither the top nor the bottom sides of the pages throughout the module. This implies that the material lacks adequate resources that help trainees to get extra information so as to boost their knowledge.

Conclusion
Based on the above results and discussions, the following conclusion were drawn. Evaluations of HDP training material based on trainees’ needs assures its strength and quality so as to make teachers effective in using their pedagogical knowledge in the classroom practice. The training was given for individuals from overall departments in combination. These trainees shared some common knowledge bases, such as general pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of the learner, knowledge of educational contexts, knowledge of educational ends and research skills even though they were different in their content and pedagogical content knowledges. Therefore, it is
clear that the material did not fit for all trainees equally. From the ELT trainees’ needs for HDP training module evaluation, it was discovered that training and training material are designed according to particular discipline’s needs.

For the pedagogical value and suitability of HDP training material for teachers in higher education institutions, the material was evaluated using its appropriateness of the general content, design and delivery, quality of research base and ease of adoption/adaptation criteria. It was discovered that the training material shows good example of appropriacy since its content was designed aligned with learning goals and state standards. Although trainees were different in their knowledge bases, the enhancement of HDP training module content for some knowledge bases is adequate. Furthermore, the training material helped trainees to develop their teaching methods, management of classroom as well as teaching and learning in the actual classroom as well. Moreover, trainees were benefited a lot in planning, teaching, evaluating lessons, doing action research and assessment in the field- based learning they were assigned to schools by the HDP leader. On the other hand, contradictory results were discovered in the area that the topics and contents were not subject area specific rather than the general teaching method, and some activities in the module were weak in promoting classroom interaction.

Though some well-designed activities were included in the process of the material preparation based on the goals and objectives of the training, and the training helped some trainees to manage their class and use different types of assessment techniques effectively, the applicability of such activities in addressing different instructional strategies appropriate for a diverse audience was poor. Furthermore, the material lacks adequacy in addressing individual differences since it was only found in print form even though the written language in the module was appropriate and inclusive for wider range of people. Hence, it was discovered that appropriate subject specific pedagogical training and training material are needed to fill the methodological knowledge gaps of the various audience.

Lack of quality of the training material was due to the failure in using rigorous, systematic and objective procedures to get reliable knowledge for the revision and redevelopment of the HDP training module. Due to this, the material was not designed in line with the scientific research findings on how training material is prepared despite it was edited by high professionals.

Even though the material had no problem of language, clarity, layout and legibility for reading, there was no instructions to adapt material to suit for a variety of classrooms and learning environments. On the other hand, the material lacks adequate evidences and resources, such as references and web addresses due to the gap in consulting other scientific works of material evaluation, video and audio images to support the print material, and web sources to access the soft copy of the module in the absence of the hard copy. This may protect the trainees to some extent from getting extra information so as to boost their knowledge.

This study has various limitations: one is the inconvenience and reluctance of some of the interviewees to participate in the study. Due to this, we were unable to communicate with one English language teacher either through email or mobile phone. However, one other teacher was
reluctant to participate in the study even though the participant got the messages through email and phone. This might affect the study in getting additional interesting contributions. The second limitation was the difficulty in collecting the interviewee’s response once due to their personal issues. This affected our time to organize the data and analyze the findings early. The other limitation was the interview procedure. Unlike Face-to-Face interviews, e-mail interview involves sequential exchanges over an extended time period. This means that when we sent one question or more and then waited for a reply. The reply may appear directly or can take days or weeks to arrive. However, we failed to do this due to problems related to network. Hence, the process was changed to receive only written responses based on sent questionnaire. This to some extent affected the interviewer’s chance on posing additional leading questions and getting extra information from the interviewees. Furthermore, due to the small sample size of participants involved in the study, and they were from one university, the findings from this study might not represent the voice of all lecturers who get involved in the field of English language teaching within all Ethiopian higher education institutions.

To make the training successful and the material appropriate for the wider audience, discipline specific training material and training should be designed to fill the knowledge gaps due to diversity, contents and activities should be designed according to subject area specific methodology, the activities in the training module should be designed in a way to promote interaction, video and audio materials should be available to treat individual differences in training, training material should be designed in relation to the research findings on material evaluation, and instructions should be given to adapt the training material appropriate for a variety of classrooms and learning environments. Furthermore, further research can be conducted on HDP training handbook evaluation using the localized training material evaluation checklist to assess the appropriateness and quality of the training material that can be well suited for particular departments’ context, further survey research will be done to assess all HDP trainees’ needs before training material evaluation is made so as to build on and add to the developing knowledge bases of the trainees, and additional research on the particular department’s belief of and the satisfaction trainees get from the HDP training will be assessed.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Semi-structured interview
This is a semi-structured interview to evaluate the needs as English Language Teacher in HDP training module evaluation. The purpose of this interview is to collect data and write a mini case study. The interview consists of items related to trainees needs, the appropriateness of the general content in the module and its design and delivery. You have been chosen for this purpose since you took the HDP training previously, and have adequate knowledge on the training. Thus, please answer the following questions guided by the instructions provided for each. Thank you for your time and patience.

Discipline specific training needs
Think that HDP training was introduced with an official examination on the needs of the overall teacher educators in Ethiopia (MOE, 2011).

1. Do you think that various fields of study have common needs?

2. What is your opinion if HDP training is designed according to particular discipline/department’s needs? For instance, HDP for English language teachers

General content
Since the aim of HDP training is to bring improvement of the quality of teaching and learning and development of reflective practitioner:

1. Did the general contents help you get the desired ability?

2. Did the topics and contents contribute for your current classroom practice?

3. Did the material train you how to monitor your teaching?

4. Did the material hold good qualities of interesting, compressible activities to promote communication?

5. how did you get the field-based learning you were assigned by the HDP leader?
Design and delivery
1. Could the training help you find a better way for:
a. managing your classes?
If yes, How?
If no, what was wrong?

b. using appropriate techniques and methodologies for teaching?
If yes, How?
If no, what was wrong?

c. using different types of assessment techniques for your students learning?
If yes, How?
If no, what was wrong?

Appendix B
Training Material Evaluation Guide
The following is a rubric for evaluation of training modules developed by California Adult Literacy Professional Development Project (CALPRO), A Project of the California Department of Education in March 2002. The rubric uses a four-point rating scale—Exemplary, Adequate, Marginal, and Unacceptable—to help State staff assess training modules.

KEY: Exemplary=4, Adequate=3, Marginal=2, Unacceptable=1

| No. | Criteria                                                                 | Scale |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1   | Appropriateness of General Content                                       | 4     |
| 2   | Is the content aligned with the learning goals?                          | 3     |
| 3   | Is the content aligned with the State and/or district standards?         | 2     |
| 4   | Does the content contribute to or enhance the knowledge base?            | 1     |
| 5   | Appropriateness of Design and Delivery                                   |       |
| 6   | Are instructional strategies appropriate to target audiences?            |       |
| 7   | Are materials culturally and ethnically sensitive, free of bias, and reflect diverse audiences? |       |
| 8   | Are the goals and objectives clear, challenging, and appropriate for the audience? |       |
| 9   | Do the materials include a discussion of how new skills and knowledge can be applied to individual learning environments? |       |

Quality of Research Base

X
|   | Question                                                                 |   |   |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Has a research study been conducted that applied rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge? |   |   |
| 9 | Is the content knowledge-based?                                          | X |   |
| 10| Has the module been field-tested with target audiences in actual context?| X |   |
| 11| Does the module contain an evaluation plan that is linked to training objectives? | X |   |
| 12| Do the materials provide some evidence of effectiveness?                 | X |   |
| 13| Ease of Adoption/Adaptation                                              | X |   |
| 14| Can the materials or training curricula be replicated in a variety of classrooms and learning environments? |   |   |
| 15| Is the information well organized, easy to understand, and easy to use? | X |   |
| 16| Are the materials well written?                                          | X |   |
| 17| Is the layout aesthetically pleasing to the reader?                      | X |   |
| 18| Is the text legible and easy to read?                                    | X |   |
| 19| Are references correctly cited?                                          | X |   |
| 20| Do the production values of the video and audio images enable audiences to understand the content? | X |   |
| 21| Are the principles of Web design followed?                               | X |   |
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