



## **CAHPR Public Health Research Awards Application Guidance notes**

The CAHPR Public Health Research Awards were established to recognise the contribution allied health professions make to public health. The Public Health Research Awards are delivered by CAHPR in collaboration with Public Health England (PHE) and AHPs4PH.

CAHPR awards are aimed at novice and early career researchers. The awards recognise AHPs contribution to high quality research that supports one or more of the following PHE priorities:

- Tackling obesity, particularly among children
- Reducing smoking and stopping children starting
- Reducing harmful drinking and alcohol related admissions
- Ensuring every child has the best start in life
- Reducing the risk of dementia
- Tackling the growth in antimicrobial resistance
- Promoting workplace wellbeing
- Promoting mental wellbeing
- Increasing physical activity
- AHP interventions showing an impact on population health outcomes and / or wider determinants of health

Applicants are asked to submit an abstract, which will be reviewed and scored by a review group (comprising of members of CAHPR Strategy Committee and PHE). The review group will select three winning abstracts which demonstrate high quality research and show Allied Health Professionals contribution to public health outcomes. Service evaluations and systematic reviews are eligible.

Winners will each receive:

- Tickets to the PHE conference on 10-11 September 2019
- £500 towards associated expenses; travel, conference costs, poster design costs.



## Criteria for submission

Applicants must be:

- An Allied Health Professional, registered with HCPC or GOSC
- A member of one of CAHPR's 13 member organisations (visit: <https://cahpr.csp.org.uk/about-cahpr>)
- Work within England

Each application must demonstrate the following essential criteria:

- Evidence of Allied Health Professionals contribution to public health outcomes
- Alignment to one or more PHE priorities (listed above)
- Relevance to practice
- Ability to generalise
- Approach or methods clearly explained and appropriate to the topic/research question
- Future research plans (service evaluations only)

The following criteria are desirable but not essential:

- Inclusion of economic impact (Desirable)
- Ability to use for modelling of impact (Desirable)

Accepted methodologies:

- Quantitative
- Qualitative
- Mixed methods
- Service evaluation
- Systematic review (new for 2019)

## Pre-application support

CAHPR Hubs can offer advice and support to submit your application. To access this simply visit: <https://cahpr.csp.org.uk> to find contact details for your local hub.

Please include brief details of where you are based and details of your planned submission.

## Submission format

Each submission must be made by completing the CAHPR Public Health Research Award Application Form and sending it to [cahpr@csp.org.uk](mailto:cahpr@csp.org.uk).

## Submissions must include the following:

1. Details of submitting author and any co-authors
2. Methodology
3. Relevance to public health priorities
4. Ethics approval: Please name the ethics committee that approved your work, where appropriate. Guidance can be found via the Health Research Authority:  
<http://www.hra-decisiontools.org.uk/research/> If ethics approval was not required, please state the rationale for this.
5. An abstract of 500-600 words in length, including:
  - Relevance
  - Purpose
  - Methods
  - Results
  - Conclusions
  - Impact and implications
  - Funding acknowledgement

## Scoring

All applications will be scored using the scoring guidance attached in appendix one. Author names are removed from applications before review. Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

## General information

1. All abstracts must be made in English and use a font no less than 11pt.
2. All submissions should clearly explain how results will be translated into AHP practice / management / education / policy.
3. There must be only one submitting author per abstract, other authors may be named as co-authors.

4. Each submitting author may submit a maximum of three abstracts, but can be included as a co-authors on any number of abstracts.
5. All abstracts must adhere to the use of “people-first” language. A person must not be referred to by disability or condition, and terms that could be considered biasing or discriminatory in any way should be removed (e.g. use “person with a stroke” instead of “stroke patients”).
6. Any source of funding or support for the work being presented should be acknowledged.
7. Up to five references can be included in Vancouver style. The references will not contribute to the overall word count.
8. All abstracts should ensure that reference is made to the methods / approaches for ensuring that the research was carried out ethically (i.e. ethics approval, subject consent).
9. Selection will be based on the abstracts’ conformance to the stated criteria.
10. Applicants will be informed of the outcome of the submission in the week commencing 20<sup>th</sup> May 2019.
11. Due to the volume of abstracts submitted, the review committee will not be able to give individualised feedback to each applicant.
12. Prize monies will only be awarded to the submitting author.

**Closing date for submissions is 29 April 2019 (09:00). Applicants will be notified of the outcome of their submission in the week commencing 20 May 2019.**

For further information or queries regarding the CAHPR Public Health Research Awards please contact: [cahpr@csp.org.uk](mailto:cahpr@csp.org.uk)

**Appendix 1: Scoring criteria for CAHPR Public Health Research Award Applications**

<b><u>Criteria</u></b>	<b><u>Score of 10 or 9</u></b>	<b><u>Score of 8 or 7</u></b>	<b><u>Score of 6 or 5</u></b>	<b><u>Score of 4 or 3</u></b>	<b><u>Score of 2, 1 or 0</u></b>
<b>Relevance to PHE Priorities</b>	Interesting, original topic, of strong relevance to one or more of the PHE priorities.	Interesting topic of relevance to one or more of the PHE priorities	Topic of relevance to one or more of the PHE priorities	Topic not of obvious relevance the PHE priorities	Not relevant to the PHE priorities
<b>Purpose</b>	Aims and objectives expressed with clarity and explanation of context	Aims and objectives clearly explained	Aims/objectives explained	Aims/objectives not explained clearly	Poor rehearsal of aims/objectives
<b>Methods /Approach</b>	Approach or methods clearly explained and appropriate to the topic/research question	Approach or methods explained, and evidently suitable to question/topic	Approach or methods explained	Approach/methods not clearly explained	Poor explanation of approach/methods
<b>Results / Outcomes</b>	Results / Outcomes explained and interpreted with clarity and insight	Results / Outcomes explained and interpreted clearly	Results / Outcomes explained, with some interpretation	Results / Outcomes poorly explained & lacking interpretation	Results insufficiently clear or misinterpreted

<b>Conclusion</b>	Findings of research/activity discussed well, with clarity about strengths & weaknesses and messages/questions for discussion/further work clearly articulated	Findings discussed, with indications of questions/topics for exploration	Findings presented	Findings not explained, with poor inference of further questions	Poor explanation of findings
<b>AHP Impact and Implications</b>	Excellent explanation of how results will be translated into AHP practice / management / education / policy	Clear explanation of significance for AHPs	Adequate explanation of significance for AHPs	Poor explanation of significance for AHPs	Does not address significance to AHPs, no obvious link.
<b>Wider Impact and implications</b>	Highly significant and important to the general population.	Significant and important to the general population	Important to the general population	Topic not of obvious importance to the general population	Not significant or important to the general population
<b>Presentation</b>	Well presented/conveyed overall, with good use of language/terminology	Clearly explained, with appropriate use of terminology	Presentation reasonably clear	Lack of clarity in presentation and use of language	Poor presentation overall