

Scoring Procedure

ANZAED Peter Beumont Early Career Investigator Award

Terms Used in this Document

- ANZAED: Australia and New Zealand Academy for Eating Disorders
- Peter Beumont: founding President of ANZAED
- Early Career Investigator: Investigators currently enrolled in Honours/4th year or postgraduate study, or within 3 years of their highest qualification at those levels. Further detail below.
- Career disruption: prolonged interruption to an applicant's capacity to work, due to: pregnancy, major illness/injury, or carer responsibilities.
 - Interruptions must involve either a continuous absence from work for periods of 28 calendar days or more and/or a long-term partial return to work that has been formalised with the applicant's employer/university/training institute.

Purpose of the Award

The Peter Beumont ANZAED Early Career Investigator Award (hereafter referred to as the Peter Beumont award) is an award for early career investigators who have an Abstract accepted and will present their research as an oral presentation at the upcoming ANZAED Annual Conference. The purpose of the award is for ANZAED to support the development of and opportunities for emerging researchers in eating disorders in Australia and New Zealand to present their research findings.

Eligibility Check

Eligibility requirements for each application will be checked by ANZAED prior to confirming the finalists for the award.

1. *Applicants must be members of ANZAED*

A place in the final for the Peter Beumont award will only be confirmed for applicants who are current ANZAED members.

2. *Applicants must be honours/fourth year students, postgraduate students, or within 2 (2019 award) 3 (2020 onwards) years of their highest awarded degree. Career disruptions that result in an applicant being > 3 years post their highest awarded degree will be taken into consideration and should be explained in the application.*

Check that the application includes a document or statement from an organisation with authority to confirm that the applicant is within the stipulated timeframe (≤ 3 years post-training). Where applicants are > 3 years post-training, check that a career disruption statement has been provided and that the applicant has demonstrated that the career disruption fully explains their inability to meet the duration of post-training criterion (e.g., career disruption period subtracted from years post training is ≤ 3 years).

3. *Applicants must have abstract(s) for an oral presentation submitted for consideration at the upcoming ANZAED Annual Conference, for which they are first author*

Check that the application has been submitted, and that the Applicant is the first author.

4. An Applicant cannot have previously received ANZAED Peter Beumont Young Award.

Check whether the Applicant has previously received the awarded.

5. Current members of the ANZAED Executive Committee are not eligible to apply

Check that the Applicant is not a current ANZAED Executive Committee member.

Selection Process

Six finalists will be selected for the Peter Beumont award. Selection for the final will be based on the scientific abstract submitted for the conference and will be scored according to criteria used by the Scientific Committee for the upcoming ANZAED conference to score all abstract submissions to the conference. The six applicants for the award with the highest scores will be selected as the finalists.

The six finalists for the award will present their research in a dedicated oral presentation session at the conference. The winner of the award will be determined following judging of the presentations.

Selection Criteria for Judging Oral Presentations

70% - Research Quality

The quality of the research presented at the conference will be evaluated according to the following: strength of the rationale for the study, the appropriateness of the research design to address the aims/research question, including methodology and analyses, the accuracy of interpretation of findings, and the significance (e.g., the importance or impact of the study to the field of eating disorders) of the research.

30% - Presentation Style and Delivery/Engagement and Communication

The quality of the presentation will be evaluated according to the following: organisation and cohesion of the presentation, presentation style and engagement of the audience, and visual and audio materials used in the presentation.

The scoring rubric below provides more detail on the scoring criteria for the award.

Scoring Procedure

- A panel of no fewer than 3 reviewers, who are deemed to have no conflicts of interest with any of the Applicants, will be selected by the ANZAED Conference Chair(s).
- Each panel member will score every presentation independently, and will base their scores on the presentation only
 - It is recommended that panel members be provided with the scoring rubric in advance of the day of the presentations and that a one minute break between each presentation is provided for the members of the review panel to finalise their scoring of each presentation.
- Each panel member will provide their scores, based on the scoring rubric below, to the Conference Chair(s), or their nominated official for collation.
- The ANZAED Conference Chair(s), or their nominated official, will then rank the finalists from lowest to highest scoring, and the finalist with the highest ranking will be identified as the winner.

Notification Procedure

- The award will be presented at the awards ceremony of the ANZAED conference, held on the Saturday of the conference.

Scoring Rubric	Poor (0 - 3)	Average (3.1 - 5)	Good (5.1 - 7.5)	Excellent (7.6 - 10)
1. Research quality: Rationale (Score /10; 20% weighting) <input type="text"/>	The rationale was weakly supported by the background literature and the link between the two was not well communicated, the need for the research as presented was weak.	The rationale was somewhat supported by the background literature although the link between the two could have been communicated more strongly, and the need for the research as presented was somewhat weak.	The rationale was well supported by the background literature. The rationale and link to background research was clearly conveyed by the presenter and demonstrated a need for the research.	The rationale was strongly supported by the background literature. The rationale and link to background research was very clearly conveyed by the presenter and demonstrated a strong need for the research.
2. Research quality: Research design (Score /10; 20% weighting) <input type="text"/>	The scientific design and analysis were inadequate and the ability to address the aims were impeded by significant flaws in design and or analysis.	The scientific design and analysis were to some extent adequate and appropriate for the research question and allowed the research aims to be addressed, however there were some errors/oversights in design and analysis.	The scientific design and analysis were reasonable and appropriate for the research question, but is missing some elements that would have allowed for the aims to be more fully addressed.	The scientific design and analysis were excellent and highly appropriate for the research question allowing the research aims to be addressed appropriately.
3. Research quality: Interpretation of findings (Score /10; 20% weighting) <input type="text"/>	Interpretation of findings contained many important errors or omissions. The conclusions drawn from the findings were either absent or inappropriate (i.e., overreach, misinterpretation).	Interpretation of findings contained some important errors or omissions. The conclusions drawn from the findings were appropriate, but weak, or lacking in insight.	Interpretation of findings contained minor errors or omissions. The conclusions drawn from the study were appropriate and offer useful insight into the impact of the findings.	The presenter interpreted the findings appropriately. The conclusions drawn from the study were appropriate and offers significant insight into the relevance and impact of the findings.
4. Research quality: Significance/Impact (Score /10; 10% weighting) <input type="text"/>	The research findings will have a negligible impact on the field of eating disorders.	The research findings will have a small impact on the field of eating disorders.	The research findings will have an important impact on a specialized area within the field of eating disorders.	The research findings will have a very important impact on the field of eating disorders.
5. Presentation: Organisation and cohesion (Score /10; 10% weighting) <input type="text"/>	The delivery of the presentation was choppy and disjointed; the development of ideas was vague; no apparent logical order of presentation	The delivery of the presentation was somewhat cohesive; ideas developed throughout the presentation but to a limited extent; a somewhat logical order of presentation of elements	The presentation flowed well and components were connected with attempts made to transition between; the development of ideas was clearly communicated; a logical order of presentation was apparent.	The presentation flowed very well; components were well connected with appropriate transitions; development of ideas was very clearly communicated; a highly logical order of presentation was apparent.
5. Presentation: Style and materials (Score /10; 20% weighting) <input type="text"/>	The presenter appeared disinterested and did not attempt to capture and maintain audience attention with vocal skill or eye contact; focused on the screen rather than the audience; the pace of presentation was too fast/slow. Visual and audio materials were disorganized, disconnected from the presentation, and distracting or irrelevant.	The presenter attempted to capture and maintain audience attention, attempted to use some inflection although speech was a little disjointed and eye contact was inconsistent as was attention to the audience; the pace of presentation was inconsistent. Visual and audio materials lacked preparation, were slightly disconnected from the presentation, and somewhat distracting or irrelevant.	The presenter conveyed interest in the research, captured and maintained audience attention with some vocal skill (tone and fluency) and some eye contact; attended to the audience, although with some focus on the screen; the pace of presentation was mostly appropriate. Visual and audio materials were well prepared, informative, communicated effectively, and enhanced the presentation.	The presenter conveyed enthusiasm for the research, captured and maintained audience attention with advanced vocal skill (tone and fluency) and appropriate eye contact; attended to the audience, not the screen; the pace of presentation was steady. Visual and audio materials were very well prepared, highly informative, communicated highly effectively, and strongly enhanced the presentation.

