

# Conference Awards | Oral Award Category: PEN Practice-based Evidence in Nutrition Prize

## RATIONALE AND PURPOSE

The *Practice-based Evidence in Nutrition* (PEN) Conference Prize recognises Dietitians Australia members who have demonstrated strength and commitment to application of evidence-based practice in any setting of dietetic practice (other than full time research). The prize will be determined by a panel judging the oral presentations at the Dietitians Australia Conference.

## PRESENTATION FORMAT

A standard 10 minute (8mins + 2mins Q&A) oral evidence-based presentation by one speaker at Conference in a Theatre format, reporting on:

- original research or project findings that demonstrates the implementation of evidence into practice
- determining barriers and enablers to evidence-based practice and providing practical recommendations to improve evidence-based practice
- leading high-level processes to improve standards

Key feature:

- Sharing findings from high-quality research that supports evidence-based practice

## FORM OF THE PRIZE

The successful prize winner will receive:

- The prize presented at the Dietitians Australia Conference Awards Ceremony
- A *Practice-based Evidence in Nutrition* (PEN) Prize certificate
- A voucher to attend a Dietitians Australia Education Centre CPD event or Centre for Advanced Learning course (other than the Conference) to the value of \$120
- An invitation to present at the PEN workshop at the following Dietitians Australia Conference
- Their name listed in the Annual Report together with a summary of their case for their prize
- Their name listed in the Prizes section of the Dietitians Australia website
- Highly commended certificates will be issued to the second ranked paper, and in the event of a tie, two certificates may be issued
- Their name promoted through various member communication channels as part of overall award promotions (I.e., social media, Share Plate and/or direct email)

## SELECTION CRITERIA

Applicants must address the following points to be considered for the PEN Prize:

- Nominate for PEN Prize on conference abstract submission.
- Current APD status for submitting author.
- Conference abstract submission to include application of evidence-based practice in any setting for dietetic practice (other than full time research) e.g. implementation of evidence into practice; determining barriers and enablers to evidence-based practice; or leading high-level processes to improve standards.

## METHOD OF SELECTION

1. Following conference abstract scoring, the abstracts selected for oral presentation, who have ticked the PEN prize box, will be short listed for the prize. A minimum three and a maximum of six (6) abstracts will be short-listed provided there are three suitable abstracts.
2. The Education and Professional Services Manager will check the eligibility of the abstract for the prize.
3. The Education and Professional Services Manager and the Journal Editor in Chief and Editor will score oral presentations against the Evaluation Criteria (Appendix 1)
4. In the event of a tied score, the Education and Professional Services Manager will decide the winner based on the generalisability of the findings to wider practice.
5. No award will be presented if the standard of abstracts and presentations is considered unsatisfactory by the panel.

## AWARD PRESENTATION

- The successful presenter will receive the prize in an official presentation at the Dietitians Australia Conference Awards Ceremony on the final day of the Conference.
- The Dietitians Australia President or representative will present the awards.
- If present, the recipient may collect their prize; otherwise, it will be posted to them.

## Appendix

1. Conference Awards Evaluation Criteria

## APPENDIX 1: CONFERENCE AWARD EVALUATION CRITERIA

Presenter's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Presentation Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Presentation # \_\_\_\_\_

Presentation format: \_\_\_\_\_ Presentation Session (Theme/Date/Time/Room): \_\_\_\_\_

	Fair = 1 point	Good = 2 points	Very Good = 3 points	Excellent = 4 points	Score
1. Background, statement of problem and aim/s	Topic is introduced but the significance of the topic is not entirely clear. The aim presented but lacks some details	Topic is introduced and the significance is mostly clear. The aim is presented in some detail	Topic is mostly introduced succinctly, there is clarity about its significance and the aim is mostly clearly articulated	Topic is introduced succinctly, there is clarity about its significance and the aim is very clearly articulated	
2. Explanation of Methods and Results	Fair overview using mostly justifiable methods and appropriate results. Level of detail and timing may be improved	Good overview using mostly justifiable methods and appropriate results in a mostly succinct format	Very good overview using justifiable methods and appropriate results in a succinct format	Excellent overview using justifiable methods and appropriate results in a succinct format	
3. Appropriate Discussion and Conclusion	Mostly relevant discussion and conclusions; Draws in some relevant literature and limited discussion of relevance to practice	Insightful, mostly relevant discussion and conclusions; Draws in some relevant literature and provides some relevance to practice	Very insightful, mostly relevant and articulate discussion and conclusions; Regularly draws in relevant literature and provides relevance to practice	Highly insightful, relevant and articulate discussion and conclusions; Readily draws in relevant literature and provides relevance to practice	
4. Audio visuals, Presentation Skills and Response to Questions	Audio-visual aids are too busy/or brief; limited audience engagement and some attempts to respond to some questions	Good audio-visual aids, some engagement via presentation skills; including responding well to most questions	Very good audio-visual aids, mostly engaging presentation skills; including response to questions	High quality audio-visual aids, highly engaging presentation skills; including response to questions	
5. Clarity of overall presentation, internal consistency and time keeping	Fair level of clarity and/or time keeping needs improvement	Mostly good clarity of presentation and close to time	Very good clarity of presentation and kept to time	Excellent clarity of presentation and kept to time	
Reviewer's Name: _____					<b>TOTAL</b>