

CAHPR Public Health Research and Evaluation Awards Application Guidance notes

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

CAHPR awards are aimed at novice and early career AHP researchers. The judges will be looking for high quality research, service evaluation, clinical audit or quality improvements projects that support 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
- 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's Strategy Committee and PHE).

The review group will select two winning abstracts which demonstrate high quality projects which show Allied Health Professionals contribution to public health outcomes.

In 2020, prizes will be awarded to the winning research project and the best service evaluation, clinical audit or quality review project. Winners will each receive:



In collaboration with:



- Tickets to the PHE conference on 8th and 9th September 2020
- £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

Accepted methodologies:

- Quantitative
- Qualitative
- Mixed methods
- Systematic review
- Service evaluation
- Clinical audit
- Quality review

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.

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

Submitted abstracts will be considered via a blind peer review process. Each abstract will be reviewed by at least three reviewers. All applications will be scored using the scoring guidance attached in appendix one. The review group will moderate any abstracts with a large score variance. 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 25th May 2020.
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 30 April 2020 (09:00). Applicants will be notified of the outcome of their submission in the week commencing 25 May 2020.

For further information or queries regarding the CAHPR Public Health Research and Evaluation Awards please contact: cahpr@csp.org.uk

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

Criteria	Score of 10 or 9	Score of 8 or 7	Score of 6 or 5	Score of 4 or 3	Score of 2, 1 or 0
Relevance to PHE Priorities	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 of the PHE priorities	Topic not of obvious relevance the PHE priorities	Not relevant to the PHE priorities
Purpose	The abstract describes aims and objectives that are appropriate to the topic/research question and are expressed with clarity and explanation of context	Aims and objectives are appropriate to the topic/research question and well explained.	Aims/objectives adequately explain purpose	Aims/objectives do not clearly explain the purpose.	Aims and objectives are poorly explained or cannot be understood.
Methods /Approach	Approach or methods clearly explained, rigorous and appropriate to the topic/research question	Approach or methods explained, and evidently suitable to question/topic	Approach or methods explained with adequate suitability to the question/topic.	Approach/methods not clearly explained	Poor explanation of approach/methods



Results / Outcomes	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
Conclusion	Findings of research/activity discussed well, with clarity about strengths & weaknesses and messages/questions for discussion/further work clearly articulated.	Findings discussed with some interpretation, with indications of questions/topics for exploration	Findings adequately presented with poor inference of further questions	Findings not well explained, with poor inference of further questions	Poor explanation of findings
Impact and Implications	Study has significant potential impact to the general population and likely to be implemented widely	Study is significant and important to the general population and may be implemented.	Study has some potential impact to the general population and likely to be implemented locally	Topic not of obvious importance to the general population although may be implemented locally.	Not significant or important to the general population with little or no local impact.
Presentation	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