CPD Awards 2021
CPD Awards Timeline

17th May 12pm  
Nominations Open

4th July 11:59pm  
Nominations Close

12th July - 26th August  
Shortlisting and judging period

14th September  
Final judges meeting

21st September  
Shortlist announced

CPD Awards Week  
Results will be announced on:
  9th Nov - RSciTech
  10th Nov - CSci
  11th - CSciTeach
  12th - RSci

from 20th September  
Results communicated to entrants
Guidance for Judges

Recruitment of Shortlisting and Judging Panels

Shortlisting Panel
The Science Council will ask previous CPD Awards winners and CPD assessors to join our 2021 shortlisting panel. The shortlisting panel will undergo a short CPD Awards shortlisting training before participating. All on the shortlisting panel must have undertaken GDPR training within the past 2 years; the Science Council can arrange GDPR training for those who do not fulfil this.

Judging Panel
Judges must have already attended CPD assessor training and have experience of assessing CPD. All on the judging panel must have undertaken GDPR training within the past 2 years; the Science Council can arrange GDPR training for those who do not fulfil this criteria.

The eligibility criteria, role responsibilities and time commitment requirements for a CPD Awards Judge are further detailed in the role description found in Appendix 1.

If you would like to be a judge for the CPD Awards contact please contact Mary Murray, Registration and Licensing Team Administrator at the Science Council.
Email: m.murray@sciencecouncil.org
Phone: 0203 434 2028

Shortlisting and Judging Process for the CPD Awards 2021

May-June: The Science Council will contact those on shortlisting and judging panels to set up their online reviewer accounts on Survey Monkey Apply (SMA).

12th – 26th July: 2 week shortlisting period. The shortlisting panel will be asked to shortlist entries based on a pre-defined criteria (decided in collaboration with experienced CPD Awards judges). The number of entries that each individual will look at is dependent on the number of CPD Awards entries received.

29th July – 26th August: Judging period. Judges will independently complete a detailed CPD assessment on the SMA system for shortlisted entries. Each entry will be assessed and scored by 2 different judges. Judges will not assess entries from registrants from their own Professional Body. An example of the judges’ form can be seen in Appendix 2 but note that this is formatted better when viewed online!

14th September: Judges will meet virtually to come to a decision regarding final winners and commendations for each professional registration category.
May - June
Recruit and welcome shortlisting and judging panels
Set up reviewer accounts

12th-26th July
Two week shortlisting period

29th July - 26th August
Judging period

14th September
Judges Meeting
CPD Awards Week

This year we cannot be together in one room to celebrate outstanding professional development in science but we continue to celebrate the success of our registrants online.

From 9th November 2021, join the Science Council on our website and social media channels for our online CPD Awards Week. Here is what you can expect!

- **Hear from guest speakers and join live Q&As**
- **Enhance your future CPD with our top tips and tricks**
- **Interviews with our CPD Awards winners**
  - 9th Nov - RSciTech
  - 10th Nov - CSci
  - 11th - CSciTeach
  - 12th - RSci
- **Photographs from our commended registrants**

All 2021 winners and commended registrants, alongside those from our 2020 Awards, will be invited to attend the CPD Awards ceremony in 2022 with the option to bring 2 guests.
Appendix 1 - CPD Awards Judge Role Description

Role Purpose
The role is to assess submissions of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) against Science Council CPD standards as part of the yearly CPD Awards. The role can take place in either the shortlisting phase or the judging phase of the awards process.

Role Responsibilities
In your role you will be expected to:

- Always act in the best interests of the Science Council to support our charitable aims and achieve our strategic objectives.
- Respect and trust fellow CPD Awards judges and Science Council staff.
- Independently assess CPD submissions in accordance with the CPD awards timeline.
- Complete the required documentation in detail to show how the submission does or does not meet the Science Council CPD standards and to justify the given score.
- Demonstrate the highest level of integrity, accountability and honesty in the action of judging.
- Attend meetings with other judges to discuss outcomes.
- Attend the awards ceremony.
- Encourage applications

Experience, skills and knowledge
Individuals will bring expertise from their own discipline together with an ability to assess scientists with a whole range of backgrounds, to a common standard.

Individuals will:

**Essential**

- Have attended CPD assessor training and have experience of assessing CPD.
- Have an understanding of the context in which the Science Council works (and a willingness to learn more).
- Have the ability to express independent judgement but also work effectively with peers and Science Council Staff.
- Have good Interpersonal style.
- Be reliable and punctual
- Have the time required to fulfil the role
Desirable

- Hold Science Council Professional Registration

Term of appointment

The time commitment will be from the date of appointment to that year’s CPD Awards ceremony.

Commitment

Judges are likely to spend 20 hours judging for the CPD awards including attendance at meetings. This may be flexible depending on the number of nominations received in the given year’s CPD Awards. A judge will have also undertaken 1 hour of GDPR training before judging for the CPD Awards.

Remuneration

There is no remuneration for this role. However, we will reimburse reasonable expenses incurred in carrying out the role in line with the Science Council’s external expense policy.
Appendix 2 - CPD Awards Judging Form (from 2020 example) Please note that this is the exported copy and the form is formatted differently when viewed online.

Judging Form

Please note that your comments may be provided to the entrant as feedback if requested.

Standard 1 Based on the information provided by the entrant in support of standard 1, how well do you think that they meet this standard? Please note that a timeline of CPD activities can be detailed in the answer box or uploaded as a separate file. Scale 0-5

Score 0/1 No dates or not many dates are given for activities. Not enough evidence that activities are spread over the 1-2 month period. The period does not cover any part of 2019.

Score 2/3 Some dates are given, but these are not specific (e.g. many activities are inappropriately described as Jan to Dec). Activities are typically described at a too general level (e.g. read journals).

Score 4/5 Dates indicate that activities span the 12-month period (which includes part of 2019) and are precisely defined.

Comments (why did you give this score?)

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

Standard 2 Based on the information provided by the entrant in support of standard 2, how well do you think that they meet this standard? To assist with the judging of this question, if there is an exceptional case where entrants’ CPD activities only fulfil 2/5 learning categories they have been encouraged to explain why in their answer. Scale 0-5

Score 0/1 Activity categories not given, or wrongly ascribed, and it is not obvious that they cover 3 or more categories. Activities in only 1 or 2 categories and no explanation provided (judges interpretation).

Score 2/3 Activities cover 3 or more categories, but several appear not to be directly relevant to current or future practice. Some activities are wrongly categorised and/or are focused on only a small part of the role.

Score 4/5 Activities cover 3 or more categories and have been correctly categorised. Activities are directly relevant to current/future role and cover most aspects of the role.

Comments (why did you give this score?)

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

Standard 3 Based on the information provided by the entrant in support of standard 3, how well do you think that they meet this standard? Scale 0-5

Score 0/1 For most activities, no reflection or poor reflection given on benefit to quality of practice. Reflection focused on describing the activity, rather than learning outcomes.

Score 2/3 Some reflection provided, but at a general level and is non-specific. Benefits given, but some not linked to the entrant’s role.

Score 4/5 Good level of reflection. Specific benefits in terms of skills/knowledge gained are provided.

Comments (why did you give this score?)

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________
**Standard 4** Based on the information provided by the entrant in support of standard 4, how well do you think that they meet this standard? Scale 0-5

**Score 0/1** No reflection on benefit to users of service given for most activities. Reflection focused on describing the activity, rather than learning outcome. **Score 2/3** Reflection provided, but at a general level and is non-specific. Benefits given, but the value to the users of service not made clear. **Score 4/5** Good level of reflection. Specific benefits to the users, of skills/knowledge gained by the registrant, are clearly articulated. Description focuses on the benefits to the users rather than the registrant.

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Comments (why did you give this score?)

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________

**Overall Impressions** Based on the information in the entire submission, and now including the ‘case for nomination section’, what is your general impression of this CPD submission? How much do you feel that the entrant should receive an award for their registration category? Scale 0-5 5 = I think that this CPD is outstanding and should receive an award

Things you may consider when deciding your score: Is this CPD submission inspiring? Is there evidence of future planning? Has the entrant gone beyond what is sufficient with their CPD? If the entrant has chosen to include extra evidence, does this help to demonstrate that their CPD is outstanding?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Comments (why did you give this score?)

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________