

## **Recognising the contribution Allied Health Professions make to Public Health**

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

CAHPR's mission is to develop Allied Health Profession research, strengthen evidence of the professions' value and impact for enhancing service user and community care, and to enable the professions to speak with one voice on research issues, thereby raising their profile and increasing their influence.

CAHPR have been working with Public Health England (PHE) to develop and fund four awards to 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
- Increasing physical activity
- AHP interventions showing an impact on population health outcomes

Applicants are asked to submit an abstract, which will be reviewed and scored by a review committee (the review committee comprises members of CAHPR Strategy Committee and PHE) to determine which four abstracts best demonstrate:

- High quality research\* demonstrating evidence of Allied Health Professionals contribution to public health outcomes

\*Please note service evaluations/reviews are not eligible

Winners will each receive:

- £750
- The opportunity to display a poster at the Public Health England Conference in September 2016
- Up to £250 to cover travel costs to attend the above conference\*.

Expenses will need to be claimed within 3 months of costs being incurred

### **Criteria for submission**

Applicants must be HCPC registered Allied Health Professionals who are members of their professional organisations and work within England

Each application must meet the following essential criteria:

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

The following criteria are desirable but not essential:

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

### **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)

Abstracts should include the following information: Title, names of authors, public health priority it relates to, introduction and aims, summary of methods, summary of findings, impact and implication for practice and ethics approval. Research approaches can include qualitative, quantitative and / or mixed methods.

All abstracts should be submitted using the Abstract Submission Form which is available here <http://www.csp.org.uk/documents/cahpr-public-health-research-awards>.

## **Ethics approval**

Please name the ethics committee that approved your work, where appropriate. If ethics approval was not required, please state the rationale for this (maximum 20 words).

## **Scoring**

All applications will be scored using the scoring guidance attached in appendix 1

## **General information**

1. All abstracts must be made in English and use a font no less than 11pt.
2. All submissions should relate to at least one of the public health priorities as listed in the criteria above.
3. There must be only one submitting author per abstract, other authors may be named as co-authors.
4. Each submitting author may only submit a maximum of three abstracts, but can be included as a co-author 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 June 2016
11. Due to the volume of abstracts submitted, the review committee will not be able to give individualized feedback to each applicant
12. Prize monies will only be awarded to the submitting author



Abstract Submission Forms are available here:

<http://www.csp.org.uk/documents/cahpr-public-health-research-awards>

**Closing date for submissions is 31 May 2016.** Applicants will be notified of the **outcome of their submission by the week commencing 20 June 2016.**

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>Criteria</b>	<b>Score of 10 or 9</b>	<b>Score of 8 or 7</b>	<b>Score of 6 or 5</b>	<b>Score of 4 or 3</b>	<b>Score of 2, 1 or 0</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>Analysis / Evaluation</b>	Method of analysis / evaluation clearly explained and appropriate to the topic/research question	Method of analysis / evaluation explained, and evidently suitable to question/topic	Method of analysis / evaluation explained	Method of analysis not clearly explained	Inappropriate method of analysis used
<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>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
---------------------	--	--	-------------------------------	---	---------------------------