



## **MENTORSHIP TRAINING REPORT**



**16<sup>th</sup> October 2012**

**Moshi, Tanzania**

**Hosted by KCMUCO/KCMC**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Executive Summary 4

1. Background .....	
2. Objectives.....	
3. Expected results of the workshop.....	
4. Participants .....	
5. Methodology.....	

### Annexes

A -1 List of Participants.....	
A- 2 Evaluation by Participants.....	

## ACRONYMS

HRSA	Human Resource and Service Administration
M RTP	Mentored Research Training Program
KCMU College	Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The mentorship training is one of the essential activities planned in the implementation of MTRP program. The main objective of the mentorship training is to enhance mentorship skills to KCMC college faculty who mentor students at KCMU College and to assist the faculty to comply with the donor specifications in the MTRP.

The long term expected result of this training is enhanced good mentorship to students in research hence produce graduates who are knowledgeable in research.

During the mentorship workshop, 27 faculty from clinical and basic science departments from KCMC were trained on mentorship. The training consisted of topics such as Mentors Vs advisors and supervisors, why mentoring, qualities of a good mentor, professional ethics, sexual harassment, mentor as a role model and expected deliverables from the mentorship plans.

At the end of the workshop, each participant was given a mentorship book titled “Adviser, teacher, role model, friend. On being a mentor to students in science and engineering; National Academy Press” which provided background information on the mentorship. It was recommended that these books are read so as to enable the faculty to have a deeper understanding of the mentorship and also to use them as tools to support their work of mentoring students.

The participants also provided feedback on the workshop. The feedback has been analyzed and the salient features are presented in Annex A-2. The feedback was encouraging and the participants made recommendations which are summarized in Annex A-2. Overall, the workshop was successfully conducted by the KCMC-MEPI team.

## **BACKGROUND**

The KCMC- Duke Medical Education Partnership Initiative (MEPI) is a 5 years project funded by the US government and administered by HRSA. The project started in August 2010 following the approval from the research ethics committee. The KCMC-Duke MEPI is guided by the following 3 major themes; To increase the number of well-trained health care workers, To retain health care workers in Tanzania, and To invest in regionally relevant research.

In order to invest in regionally relevant researches, Mentored Research Training Program (MRTP) was initiated by KCMC-MEPI project with the aim of providing research mentorship to students on competitive basis. Faculty and students who show interest in the program submit their regionally relevant research proposals with a well defined mentorship plan to the MTRP committee which selects research proposals for funding. Students are then mentored by the KCMC faculty throughout the proposed period of the selected researches.

The quality of mentorship offered to students required for MRTP is substantial for the project. KCMC has about 120 faculty who are involved in mentoring students but it is unknown whether they have received formal training in mentorship or they mentor students basing on their teaching experience. Therefore, the training of faculty on mentorship will not only enhance faculty's knowledge and skills in mentorship but also ensure the quality of the mentorship provided to the students which is among the donor requirements.

## **2. Objectives**

The main goal of the mentorship workshop was to encourage mentoring habits that are in the best interests of the faculty and students at KCMU College who showed interest in the MRTTP program.

The workshop specifically aimed the following:

- To enhance participants' understanding of the context of mentoring
- To discuss the steps to improve mentoring
- To strengthen participants ability in developing of mentorship plans

## **3. Expected Results of the Workshop**

The expected results of the workshop are enhanced quality mentoring of students in MRTTP program and development of comprehensive mentorship plans that are in line with donor requirements.

## **4. Participants**

The workshop was well attended with 33 participants while the workshop was planned only for 40 participants. The participants were mainly KCMC faculty who showed interest in the MRTTP program including principal investigators of the submitted MRTTP proposals. The participants were purposely selected because they are directly involved with mentoring students.

## **5. Methodology**

The workshop was formally inaugurated Mr Ahaz Kulanga (DPA KCMU College) and the sessions were facilitated by Prof. John Bartlett (Duke University) and Charles Muiruri (Duke University).

In every session, the participants were asked to share their own experiences of mentoring with reference to the topic at hand. In general, the workshop covered most aspects of mentorship. Participants took keen interest in mentorship styles in different case scenarios. There were very interesting discussions during the workshop on building student-faculty relationship during mentorship in the realistic situations at KCMU College.

At the end of the workshop, each participant was given a mentorship book titled "Adviser, teacher, role model, friend. On being a mentor to students in science and engineering; National Academy Press" which provided background information on the mentorship. It was recommended that these books are read so as to enable the faculty to have a deeper understanding of the mentorship and also to use them as tools to support their work of mentoring students.

## 6. Contents

During the workshop, the participants learned about the differences between mentoring, supervising and advising. The facilitator reviewed the qualities of a good mentor, professional ethics, sexual harassment and responded to questions of the participants. There were interesting discussions in between the sessions. 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. At the end, all the participants also responded to a feedback survey.



Prof John Bartlett stressing an important point in the qualities of a good mentor during the mentorship workshop



Participants of mentorship training keenly listening to the facilitators



Participants of the mentorship training actively discussing during the mentorship workshop

## ANNEX A-1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

No	Name
1	Sarah J Urassa
2	Sia E Msuya
3	Joseph J Obure
4	Godwin Machiku
5	Elizabeth F Msoka
6	Bernard Njau
7	Reginald Kavishe
8	Emmanuel Nunas
9	Petro Paulo
10	Declare Mushi
11	Rachel Manongi
12	Mramba Nyindo
13	Franklin Mosha
14	Sky Vanderburg
15	Catherine Lynch
16	Kateguka Debora Charles
17	Elichilia Saho
18	Sravanam Praveen
19	Jaffu Chilongola
20	Isaac Lyaruu
21	Egbert Kessi
22	Samuel Geoffrey Chigulu
23	Elton Kisanga
24	Balthazar Nyombi
25	Kien Mteta
26	Ahaz Kulanga
27	Gibson Kapanda
28	Herieth Lyimo
29	Ndimangwa Fadhili
30	Lucy Mimano
31	Dativa Tibyampansha
32	Glory Ibrahim
33	Esther Lisasi

## **ANNEX A– 2: 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 books provided, the duration of the workshop, the need for more courses. Additional topics to be addressed and any other comments from the participants were also inquired.

### *About the participants*

Total number of participants was 33 (27 faculty and 6 MEPI staff) and 70% of the participants provided feedback.

*Usefulness of the book:* All the participants received a copy of the “On being a scientist: A guide to responsible conduct in research” book. The majority of the participants (65%) found the book very informative, while 22% found the book somewhat informative while 13 % did not read the book.

*Length of the workshop-* Most of the participant (91%) felt the course duration was right, while 9% thought it was too short.

*Frequency of the course-* Participants were asked to comment on how often the course should be offered. The majority of the participants (78%) commented that the course should be offered annually while 9% preferred the course being offered once in every other year. 13% suggested other time (every month and biannually).

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The topics discussed should be built in post graduate curriculum to give enough time for digestion
2. To have few students/mentees during the workshop to give their experiences in mentorship they receive from faculty.
3. Introduce an introduction session for mentors on their roles and responsibility
4. By having mentee in the workshop would be helpful so that they know what to ask or discuss with their mentors
5. The mentorship training should be institutionalized in the college system
6. Link mentorship with supervision policy of the college

### **Additional topics**

1. How are mentors identified and selected
2. Qualification of mentors
3. Developing the templates for project plan
4. Mentorship templates