

ACTIVITY COMPLETION REPORT¹

ACTIVITY FACTS		
Name of Platform	BSU Platform on Human Health	
South Partner Institution	Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre	
Activity number (from LFA)	4 (4.1)	
Activity name (from LFA)	4. Conduct a research proposal writing workshop and finalize 3 research proposals 4.1 Plan and implement a proposal writing workshop	
Main responsible resource person(s) for activity from Danish university and South partner institution²	Thor G. Theander, UCPH Christentze Schmiegelow, UCPH Dirk Lund Christensen, UCPH Peter Furu, UCPH Gibson Kibiki, KCMC Frank Mosha, KCMC	
Start and end of implementation (dd/mm/yy)	08/10/12-12/10/12	
BUDGET DETAILS		
Original Budget (DKK)	DKK 90.000	
Actual expenses (DKK)³		
ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION		
Brief description of planned activity⁴	Purpose	An enabling research environment built around the scientific focus areas in place (according to LFA)
	Content	The activity which is part of broader BSU efforts to strengthen an enabling environment for research at KCMC, consisted of three separate, consecutive sub-activities: 1) A two-day workshop on Research Proposal Development; 2) A two-day “Kilimanjaro International PhD Symposium” and 3) a half-day session on “Personal Development Plans”. (See attached time table)
	Contribution to research capacity building	It is considered essential that PhD students, early carrier researchers as well as senior faculty staff have a good knowledge of

¹ Must be filled and submitted to Platform Secretariat (and other designated staff as outlined in agreement to the assignment) no later than 2 weeks upon completion of activity.

² All responsible parties must sign Activity Completion Report before submission.

³ If actual expenses (per budget line) deviate from original budget, this must be thoroughly explained and approval from Platform Secretariat attached to the Activity Completion Report.

⁴ Use LFA (and/or Monitoring Matrix) as a point of departure, where relevant

		<p>theoretical and practical aspects of proposal development processes. The workshop aimed at providing theoretical and hands-on skills in proposal writing. This was intended to enhance the quality of new research proposals as well as providing a forum for improving existing pre-submission research proposals. Following introductory updates on BSU (G. Kibiki), MEPI and MTRP (J Batlett) a series of presentations and sessions on generic aspects of proposal writing were delivered by UCPH staff (P. Furu, D.L. Christensen, C Schmiegelow) and KCMC staff (J. Chilogola, J. Renju, J. Todd, F. Mosh, J. Batlett). Furthermore a number of project proposals were reviewed and strengthened based on comments and suggestions from participants.</p> <p>The subsequent International PhD seminar with 11 presentations provided a good opportunity for Tanzanian and Danish PhD students to practice presentations skills and participate in academic discussions. A final presentation was delivered by C. Holm-Hansen (Norwegian Institute of Public Health) on development of rapid serological screening tests for TB.</p> <p>The session on Personal Development Plans (PDP) conducted by (MCDC, H. McCullough) allowed the junior researchers to define their own research goals and provided them with tools that will enable them to create an ambitious and realistic plan of reaching these goals. This will ultimately lead to improve research capacity.</p>
	Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop conducted • Research proposals submitted • PDP Programme working <p>(From LFA matrix)</p>
	Other relevant details/comments	<p>Apart from relevant theoretical and hands-on skills in proposal writing, the workshop also dealt with ethical issues of research, such as ensuring safe data storage , usage of post-study (left-over) drugs, and how to avoid misconduct of ethical protocol, i.e. holding back information in protocol and/or lack of information of potential harm in use of drugs.</p>
Number of participants	Target	Pending information from KCMC
	Result	Pending information from KCMC
Describe/explain deviations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planned activity was logistically well prepared with 	

<p>from planned activity (timing, number of participants, content of activity, etc.)</p>	<p>workshop materials at hand for all participants and satisfactory conditions for presentations, group work and plenary discussions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some deviations from the planned activity were experienced with last minute changes to workshop content creating some confusion among participants. • The aim was only partly fulfilled and therefore future similar workshops would benefit from a change in approach based on learnings from this activity. • The flow of sessions was not totally logical from the outset but was corrected along the way. • The UCPH partners were not involved in the detailed planning of this event. • There was no workshop evaluation done by participants. • Group work during the two-day Research Proposal Writing workshop focused on all the participants' project proposals. However, the time did not allow for a thorough evaluation of all the proposals and the possible need for revisions. Three specific proposals were therefore not available for submission at this stage. However, the work on the proposals has continued after the end of the workshop with collaborations between the Tanzanian researchers and the Danish representatives at the workshop.
<p>Main lessons learned (list 3-5 issues)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activity appeared to be well justified responding to needs expressed by partners. • The activity would have benefitted from more pre-workshop interaction and involvement of both KCMC and UCPH partners – thereby ensuring a coherent, logical flow of activities. • There was not enough time to cover all relevant theoretical aspects of research proposal writing. • There was not enough time set aside for satisfactory scrutiny and improvement of existing research proposals (some proposals not reviewed due to lack of time and last-minute changes in workshop programme). However, as mentioned above some post-workshop follow up is ongoing.
<p>Suggestions for follow up activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close interaction in a process towards making the workshop a recurrent activity – possibly converted to a compulsory training course in proposal development (held early in the PhD project formulation process). • Development of generic learning materials for use at future workshops and courses (e.g. presentations on research theory, ethics, problem analyses, stakeholder analyses, literature review, objective development, budgeting, research management, research communication strategies, etc.). • The workshop may be followed up by one or more workshops

	for joint development of research proposals responding to concrete calls by funders.
--	--

Activity Completion Report submitted by:

NAME	CONTACT DETAILS ⁵	SIGNATURE
PETER FURU	FURU@SUND.KU.DK 353 26055	
CHRISTENTZE SCHMIEGELOW	CHSCH@SUND.KU.DK 353 27685	
DIRK L. CHRISTENSEN	DIRKLC@SUND.KU.DK 353 26846	

Where relevant please enclose:

- a) List of participants/attendance register
- b) List of materials (Means of Verification)⁶

⁵ Minimum e-mail address and phone number for all signatories.

⁶ (Scanned) copy of all written output (e.g. Power Point presentations, course materials, list of reading materials, course curriculum, etc.)