Scoring criteria Chief AHP Officer Awards 2018

Criteria	Score 3 (strong)	Score 2 (good/adequate)	Score 1 (lacking detail)	Score 0 (not explained or included)
1. Does the nomination address a significant issue relating to AHPs into Action?(Q4 & 5)	Interesting, original topic, in relation to 1 or more of the impacts, priorities and commitments in AHPs into Action, and which demonstrates relevance to patient care, quality or service improvement.	Topic of relevance to one or more of the impacts, priorities and commitments in AHPs into Action	Topic only weakly linked to one of the impacts, priorities and commitments in AHPs into Action	Not relevant to AHPs into Action
2. Is the problem/reason for implementing clearly defined?(Q4)	Reason for initiative clearly defined, with use of comprehensive and relevant baseline data and evidence on quality, outcomes and service-user experience	Reason for initiative defined, with some use of relevant baseline data and evidence	Reason for initiative defined but lacks adequate detail	Little or no sufficient definition or reason given
3. Are aims & objectives for the initiative clearly defined? (Q5)	The aims and objectives are clearly articulated, SMART, and appropriate to the topic/area of practice and to AHPs into Action. Clear link between aims and objectives and problem/reason for implementing.	Adequate description of SMART aims and objectives. Weak link to problem/reason for implementing.	Aims and objectives included but lack adequate detail. No clear link to the original problem identified.	Little or no SMART aims and objectives

4.	Method and approach/how implemented (Q6)	Implementation method clearly described and well executed, involving a structured approach, and including a range of stakeholders	Method adequately described, with some description of stakeholders involved	Method described but lacks useful detail	Little or no description of the method/approach used
5.	Results, evaluation and demonstrating Impact (Q7)	Quantitative and qualitative data/findings presented and clearly articulated in relation to one or more of the impacts, priorities and commitments in AHPs into Action. Impact on the quality and cost effectiveness of care/services presented	Data/findings presented adequately, articulated in relation to one or more of the impacts, priorities and commitments in AHPs into Action	Data/findings briefly presented but lack adequate detail	Data/findings insufficiently clear or misinterpreted
6.	Key learning points (Q8)	Comprehensive range of lesson learned that are of importance and relevance to AHPs into Action and similar projects or initiatives	A number of lessons learned, of relevance to similar projects and initiatives and clearly articulated	Some lesson learned of importance and relevance to similar projects and initiatives	Lesson learned not included, or not relevant to other projects or initiatives
7.	Plans for Spread (Q9)	Clear, comprehensive and ambitious plan for spread that identifies key stakeholders	Plan for spread that identifies key stakeholders	Brief plan for spread that does not include key milestones or stakeholders.	No clearly defined plan for spread

Scoring sheet Chief AHP Officer Awards 2018

Criteria	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Assessor 3	Total
1. Does the nomination address a significant issue relating to AHPs into Action?				
2. Is the problem/reason for implementing clearly defined?				
3. Are SMART aims & objectives for the initiative clearly defined?				
4. Method and approach/how implemented				
5. Results, evaluation and demonstrating Impact				
6. Key learning points				
7. Plans for Spread				
8. Total	/21	/21	/21	/63