

Medical Education Writing Workshop Report



August 12-13

Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The medical education-writing workshop is one of the essential activities planned by KCMC-MEPI project to enhance research-writing skills focusing on medical education among the KCMU faculty. Prof. Joseph C. Kolars, (M.D.), Senior Associate Dean for Education and Global Initiatives, University of Michigan Medical School conducted a 2 days workshop on medical education writing. The major focus of the workshop was identifying the research idea and research questions basing on the needs assessment conducted earlier on.

During the 2 days workshop, 44 participants (faculty from clinical and basic science departments and administrators) from KCMC partook in the workshops. The facilitator to engage faculty members in the discussions mainly used the participatory approach and group works in identifying research ideas. The participants identified several research ideas during each session of the workshop.

At the end of the workshop, participants provided feedback on the workshop. The feedback has been analyzed and the salient features are presented in Annex 2. The feedback was encouraging and the participants made recommendations that are summarized in Annex 2. Overall, the KCMC-MEPI team successfully organized the workshop.

Background

KCMC-MEPI (a 5-year PERFAR-funded project at the KCMU College) focuses on enhancing medical education at the KCMU College and one of the strategies to attain this being faculty development. Through KCMC-Duke collaboration, the project aspired to increase the capacity of its faculty members in writing and publishing in medical education that will not only assist the faculty in changing the culture of teaching but also enhance their publication skills as part of faculty development plan.

Following the faculty satisfaction survey carried out in November 2012, among 54 faculty members of KCMU College, it was revealed that in the previous 12 months half of the faculty members had not submitted papers for publication, presented papers at conferences, authored books, edited books, other scholarly or creative activities and had not written grant proposals. Moreover, 92% of the faculty members neither authored nor edited books. Also, nearly two thirds (66.0%) have not done any scholarly creative work and written any grant proposal (63.3%) respectively. It was also revealed that senior faculty members do submit more papers for publications and present papers at conferences more than the junior faculty members. These results amplified the need of training the faculty members in publishing in medical education as well as implementing the faculty development plan in order to address the gaps in publishing among the faculty member of KCMC College.

Based on years of experience in writing and publishing, Joseph C. Kolars, (M.D.), Senior Associate Dean for Education and Global Initiatives, University of Michigan Medical School was consulted to conduct this workshop. In order to make the training more efficient, a needs assessment to prioritize area for the training was carried out earlier before the workshop. The main objective of this report is to give an insight of the whole Medical education writing workshop and feedback from the participants.

2. Objectives

The main goal of the medical education-writing workshop was to encourage and enhance KCMU College faculty skills on writing medical education articles.

3. Expected Results of the Workshop

As a result of this workshop, participants were expected to be able to:

- Frame research questions related to MEPI activities that would be of interest to medical education journals.
- Define a process map that will convert their research ideas and educational activities into successful manuscripts on medical education.
- Identify resources that will help them to complete their manuscripts and target them for submission to optimal journals.
- Understand the interests of editors, reviewers, and the readership of medical education journals.

4. Participants

The workshop was well attended with 44 participants while the workshop was planned only for 40 participants. The participants were mainly KCMC faculty from basic sciences and clinical department, administrators and MEPI staff. Most of the participants expected to have gain knowledge and skills to further enlighten their writing skills especially in the medical education filed which was a relatively new concept to some of the participants.

5. Methodology

Prof Egbert Kessi (the Provost of KCMU College) officially opened the workshop and Prof John Bartlett introduced the workshop facilitator Prof Joseph Kolars and his wife to the participants.

Prof. Joseph Kolars used the following approach to conduct the workshop:

- Why publish on medical education
- How you get started and keep going
- Technical aspects preparing medical education manuscripts

Prior sessions, participants were provided with the recommended and optional reading materials. Participants formed four groups namely: ICT, Laboratory, Clinical and community. Each group was given a task identifying a FINER problem statement, outcome measures and the process map. Participants took keen interest in participating in the group work and presented their work in front of their peers. There were very interesting discussions during the workshop. In every session, the facilitator identified research questions in all instances brought up by the participants.

6. Contents

During the workshop, the participants learned about the importance publishing and how to publish a good story that has a wide interest, clear purpose, good quality and novel idea. The presenter discussed on what are journals looking for. Much emphasis was put on how to get started with writing a manuscript and narrowing down the research idea, phrasing of problem statement as a question, aim, goal, or hypothesis, and making the problem statement FINER (Feasible, Interesting, Novel, Ethical and Relevant). Then followed the designing of the appropriate medical education research to answer the problem statement. The presenter highlighted outcome measures commonly used in Education Research using the Kirkpatrick's Hierarchy of Evaluation.

The presenter also taught the technical aspects of preparing medical education manuscripts using a simple plan that works. There were interesting discussions in the components of education research manuscripts, approaches in curriculum innovation using the Kern six-step process, Needs Analysis Manuscripts using the Four minimum requirements.

Lastly the presenter stressed on the editors/Reviewers guide of Educational Papers and the common sins /problem we make in submission of articles in journals. He further emphasized on choosing the appropriate journal for publication and responding to reviewers comments. All the sessions were designed in such a way that all the participants participate in the discussions and the facilitators engaged the participants well in the discussions.

Several research areas were identifies as follows:

- How can we get faculty to use ICT? What did the college do to make the faculty use ICT and how did it happen?
- What are the minimum competencies for faculty to use ICT in teaching?
- What incentives are needed for faculty to use ICT?
- How do we teach in order to bring better patient care?
- How can we improve competencies among our graduates in improving clinical care?
- How can we improve therapeutic communication among our graduates from patients perspective
- Integration of basic science competencies into the medical curriculum for improved patient-care through the use of enhanced information computer technology system
- Enhancing the use of RDTs for POC treatment using ICT
- To improve clinical anatomy learning through IT in cooperation.

Pen ultimately, there was constructive feedback from the presenter and the participants on a manuscript prepared by one of the workshop participants. At the end, all the participants also responded to a feedback survey.



Prof Joseph Kolars facilitating the medical education writing workshop



The community health group immensely discussing the way forward in their group assignment



The laboratory group heavily working on group assignment



The ICT group deeply discussing the group work assignment



The clinical group seriously contemplating heavily on their assignment

EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Feedback from the participants was sought using the evaluation forms distributed to the participants during the workshop. The feedback forms inquired information on participants' perceptions on the usefulness of the training, the presenter, the content and the likelihood of participants attending the second session and likelihood of writing articles on medical education. Participants perceptions on the strengths and weaknesses of the workshop were also inquired.

About the participants

Total number of participants was forty four (44) and 66% of the participants provided feedback.

Usefulness of the workshop: All the participants perceived the workshop being useful during both days of the workshop.

Organization of the workshop- Most of the participants (93% and 100%) felt the workshop was well organized in both day 1 and day 2 respectively.

Presenter- Almost all participants perceived the presenter being appropriate for the workshop.

The workshop content- The majority of the participants felt the content of the workshop was appropriate and informative.

Interest in medical education writing - Participants were asked whether the workshop had increased their interest in writing on medical education. The majority of the participants (96%) in day 1 and (93%) in day 2 felt that the workshop had indeed increased their interest in medical education writing and 57% of the participants strongly agreed that they plan to write manuscripts on medical education.

Strengths of the workshop

1. Excellent, competent, experienced, and intelligent presenter.
2. The presenter used day-to-day examples, gave an insiders view of editors. The presenter also used a simplified approach on how to narrow down from a big problem statement and had good explanations. The presenter also used the informal way of bringing out ideas across the room.
3. The workshop was interactive, participatory and very practical with time for reflection and practice.
4. Group work was very contributive in framing research questions related to medical education.
5. The workshop increased my competencies in writing and provided writing skills knowledge to all carders.
6. The workshop demonstrated to beginners how they should start/think on writing manuscripts especially to design research questions, aims, hypothesis and the goals.
7. The workshop was relevant in the context of research practice.
8. Time and duration was perfect.
9. The workshop enhanced networking and helped to understand the interests of editors and reviewers.
10. Overall the training was good and useful.

Weaknesses of the workshop

1. More time (> 2 days) is needed and such workshops should be conducted annually/biannually.
2. The workshop should be broken into 2 workshops i.e. writing and submission.
3. The organizers should disseminate the information to all clinical academic staff.
4. Morning hours are very difficult for faculty that are also clinicians.
5. The training should be done after completion of University Examination.
6. The organizers should encourage participants to prepare tailored ideas beforehand.
7. The presenter should spend a bit more time in the team exercise with members to fully utilize the training contents.
8. Emphasis on why one must publish needs to be pointed out more.
9. Early dissemination of reading materials.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The medical education research workshop for the KCMU faculty members.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

No	Name
1	Eva P Muro
2	Mramba Nyindo
3	Oneko Olola
4	Sabina Mtweve
5	John Bartlett
6	Oresto Michael
7	Deogratius Msanya
8	Julius Kauki
9	Pendo Mlay
10	Declare Mushi
11	Titus Msoka
12	Aisa Shayo
13	Blandina Mmbaga
14	Siya Temu
15	Gloria Temu
16	Charles Muiruri
17	Sarah Urassa
18	Bernard Njau
19	Patrick Francis
20	Innocent Mboya
21	Neema R Mosha
22	Samuel Geoffrey Chigulu
23	Rev Albert Mongi
24	Hassan O Mbega
25	Pius R Tarimo
26	Cynthia Joel
27	Andrew Hellar
28	Swai E.N.W
29	Agustine Musyoka
30	Francis Karia
31	Egbert Kessi
32	Balthatazar Nyombi
33	Elton Kissanga
34	Elimsaada Kituma
35	Ahaz Kulanga
36	Gibson Kapanda
37	Herieth Lyimo
38	Ndimangwa Fadhili
39	Lucy Mimano
40	Dativa Tibyampansha
41	Glory Ibrahim
42	Esther Lisasi
43	Iman Israel
44	Cresto Michael