

Faculty of Health Sciences

Clinical Excellence Awards Scheme 2019 Round

The Nomination Process for the University of Bristol

Introduction and Context

1. The Advisory Committee on Clinical Excellence Awards (ACCEA) launch the 2019 Awards Round on 7th February 2019. Detailed guidance for applicants, employers, nominators, and assessors was published on 25th January 2019 and can be obtained at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/clinical-excellence-awards-application-guidance>

2. The University of Bristol is a nominator within the Clinical Excellence Awards process. The University's role in the process is set out in para. 2.5 of the ACCEA Guide for Nominators

"You should make nominations directly to ACCEA for Bronze, Silver and Gold Awards. The deadlines and process you use should be publicised to all potential applicants early enough to allow applicants to prepare applications, and should provide for self-nomination. You should confirm that your members are aware of processes for determining your ranked nomination list. This is mandatory."

3. Section 2.5 of the Guide for Nominators identifies the minimum requirements to be met by universities for their nominations to be accepted by ACCEA :
 - The deadlines and process for considering applications must be publicised to all potential applicants
 - The publication of the process should be early enough to allow potential applicants sufficient time to prepare their applications
 - Applicants must be allowed to self-nominate
 - Applicants must be aware of the process that will be used to determine the ranked nomination list
 - Nominations for Platinum Awards from universities must follow the process overseen by Universities UK
 - The University must confirm to ACCEA that it has complied with these requirements before the deadline for receipt of application (4th April 2019).
4. This paper sets out the process that will be followed by the Faculty of Health Sciences to meet the University's obligations to applicants and ACCEA.

Publicising the Process

5. On 7th February 2019, the Faculty Manager will e-mail all clinical academic staff holding substantive University contracts, advising that the 2019 round is open for applications and explaining that applicants for National Awards wishing to be considered for support from the University of Bristol need to submit a copy of their application to the Head of HR Business Partnering by email to rachel.shimeld@bristol.ac.uk no later than 9am Monday 18th March 2019.

6. Applications for Bronze, Silver and Gold awards will be considered and ranked by a sub-committee of Faculty Board by no later than 25th March 2019, with resulting nominations and citations ratified by Faculty Board on Monday 1st April 2019, and submitted to ACCEA by the deadline of 4th April 2019.

The local process for ranking National Award applications (Bronze, Silver and Gold)

7. Clinical academics seeking support for their application for a National Award must submit a copy of their application to the Head of HR Business Partnering by email to rachel.shimeld@bristol.ac.uk by close of business on Monday 19th March 2019.
8. Applications will be considered and ranked by a sub-committee comprising qualifying members of the Faculty Board and selected members of Faculty academic staff, by 25th March 2019. The sub-committee will report its conclusions and recommendations for ratification at the Faculty Board on Monday 1st April 2019.
9. Applications will be assessed, scored and ranked in line with the ACCEA Guide for Assessors (2019) but with particular emphasis given to Domain 4 (research and innovation) and Domain 5 (teaching and training). In circumstances where two or more applications have achieved the same overall score, the scores of each application in these domains will be used to determine the final ranking.
10. The sub-committee of Faculty Board considering applications will comprise:

Name	Role in Faculty	ACCEA Awards Committee role
Prof Jonathan Sandy	Dean	Consultant (national award)
Prof Sarah Purdy	Head of Bristol Medical School	Consultant GP (national award)
Prof Peter Robinson	Head of Bristol Dental School	Consultant (national award)
Prof Tim Peters	Faculty Research Director	Non-clinical academic
Prof David Dymock	Faculty UG Education Director	Non-clinical academic
Dr Kate Whittington	Faculty PG Education Director	Non-clinical academic
Prof Ashley Blom	Head of Department, Bristol Medical School	Consultant (national award)
Prof Astrid Linthorst	Deputy Head of School, Bristol Medical School	Non-clinical academic
Andrew Pearce	Faculty Manager	Support Services (lay person)
Rachel Shimeld	Head of HR Business Partnering	Support Services (lay person)

11. Members of the sub-committee who are involved in considering applications for ACCEA awards for another organisation (e.g. a NHS Trust) will be fully disqualified from contributing to the nominations process for the University.

12. Members of sub-committee who are themselves applying for an ACCEA national award in this round will be disqualified from contributing to the nominations process for that Award category.
13. Following the Faculty Board on 1st April 2019, the Dean of Faculty will oversee the completion of the nomination and citation process for each nominated applicant and submit to ACCEA through their website.

Faculty of Health Sciences: ACCEA Nomination Process Score Sheet

Applicant's name		
Current Award Status		
Domain and Indicators	Evidence/Commentary	Score*
<p>Domain 1 : delivering a high quality service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering a service that is safe • Measurably effective clinical outcomes • Good patient experience (with an emphasis on dignity, compassion and integrity) • Identifies and implements opportunities for improvement <p>Evidence should focus on contributions since the last award/renewal (if applicable) or in the past five years (for new Bronze applications)</p> <p>Evidence should be supported by quantified measures wherever possible</p>		
<p>Domain 2 : developing a high quality service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant enhancement of clinical effectiveness locally or more widely • Enhancement may be in terms of quality, safety or cost effectiveness <p>Evidence should focus on contributions since the last award/renewal (if applicable) or in the past five years (for new Bronze applications)</p> <p>Evidence should specify their individual contribution not just that of their team/department</p>		
<p>Domain 3 : leadership and managing a high quality service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial personal contribution to leading and managing a local service and/or a national/international health policy development <p>Evidence should focus on contributions since the last award/renewal (if applicable) or in the past five years (for new Bronze applications)</p> <p>If particular roles are listed, the impact of the applicant in those roles should be described</p> <p>Evidence of the contribution, supporting data and relevant dates should all be included</p>		

Applicant's name		
Current Award Status		
Domain and Indicators	Evidence/Commentary	Score*
<p>Domain 4 : research and innovation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to research • Support for innovation (including development of the evidence base for the measurement of quality improvement) • References (papers and publications etc) • Achievements to date and targets for future achievement (quantified wherever possible/appropriate) <p>Evidence should focus on contributions since the last award/renewal (if applicable) or in the past five years (for new Bronze applications)</p>		
<p>Domain 5 : teaching and training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of teaching, including evidence of student feedback and/or other forms of quality assessment • Leadership and innovation in teaching, including development of new courses, new assessment methods, new teaching approaches etc • Scholarship, evaluation and research in medical education • Teaching or education of the public • Institutional success in quality assessment of teaching where the applicant has played a key role <p>Evidence should focus on contributions since the last award/renewal (if applicable) or in the past five years (for new Bronze applications)</p>		
Total Score for this applicant (maximum 50 points)		

* Guidance on scoring applications	
0	Applicant does not meet contractual requirements or insufficient evidence has been provided to allow a judgement to be made
2	Meets contractual requirements (in broad terms, the applicant has performed at a level which is consistent with the expectations of the role i.e. they are doing the job well and may even be exceeding expected standards in some respects, but overall, they are achieving what would normally be expected of someone in the role)
6	Achieving over and above contractual requirements (this will usually be evidenced by a sustained personal contribution within the Domain, with significant local, and possibly some national, impact)
10	Excellent – usually where there has been a sustained personal contribution leading to local, national or international impacts