



## UROLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

ABN 64 880 438 690

### KEITH KIRKLAND PRIZE

The Keith Kirkland Prize is awarded annually by the USANZ to the Trainee presenting the best research undertaken during a period of clinical training. The selected Trainee receives a prize to the value of \$1000, and the achievement is recorded in the archives of the Society. All submissions are evaluated on behalf of the USANZ by a sub-committee of the Board of Urology using a fair and consistent process.

#### ELIGIBILITY

The applicant must;

- have been in a clinical training position when the research was undertaken
- have been a registered urological trainee during the time of undertaking the research
- be a Trainee Member of the Urological Society of Australia and New Zealand
- be available to present the research at the Annual Scientific Meeting (ASM)

#### PROCESS OF APPLICATION

An application consists of an abstract accompanied by a full manuscript in journal publishable form **OR** an abstract accompanied by a detailed overview of the research. The detailed overview will be accepted as a substitute for the full manuscript **ONLY** when the research is currently incomplete **AND** it is reasonably expected to be completed by the ASM presentation date. All applications are due by the abstract closure date notified by the Convener of the relevant ASM. They must be submitted to the **Education and Training Manager** of the USANZ, **not** the scientific committee for the relevant ASM. The Board of Urology has no control over closure dates for abstracts, or changes of closure dates for abstracts for the ASM.

Where relevant, a detailed overview of the research should include

- an outline of the nature and structure of the study
- an outline of the size and nature of the proposed study group/s
- the proposed analysis methodology
- the reason for undertaking this study
- what the applicant hopes the study will determine

The above must be no more than 2 typed pages.

Each **Written submission**, as outlined above, is evaluated using the following guide;

Criterion	Descriptor	Value
Originality	Very original subject – quite 'cutting edge'	3
	Quite topical	2
	Dated, often revisited subject	1
Structure	Aim, Method, Results, Conclusion present & valid	4
	Most of the above	3
	Sound proposal but inconsistent method or conclusion	2
	Lacking logic or structure	1
Study Type	Prospective comparative	5
	Prospective	4
	Retrospective with comparison to published literature	3
	Retrospective literature review and educational conclusions	2
	Retrospective review without evidence-based conclusion	0
	<b>Total submission score</b>	

The sub-committee undertaking the assessment will consist of 3 current or recent Board members. Any real or perceived conflict of interest will be taken into account when selecting this sub-committee. All reasonable effort must be made to exclude from this sub-committee any member who has a significant involvement or interest in any of the research submissions. The Chairman of the Board can, but need not, be a member of any scoring sub-committee.

Each member of this sub-committee must independently score each submission. The sub-committee will then, through discussion, reach a consensus score for each submission. This consensus score will be the final **Written submission score** recorded.

Submissions will be accepted or rejected for presentation on the basis of the written submission, and the score awarded. The outcome must be notified within 4 weeks of the closure date for submissions.

There is no "quota" of presentations. All submissions of appropriate quality will be accommodated in the session. All submissions of inadequate quality will be rejected.

For those who initially only submitted a detailed study overview, their full manuscript must be received by the Education and Training Manager no later than 6 weeks before the first day of the Annual Scientific Meeting. If the required manuscript is not received by this date, the study will be excluded from presentation. It is the responsibility of the Trainee to be aware of this date, and comply with this requirement.

The **Presentation** delivered at the ASM is evaluated using the following guide;

Criterion	Descriptor	Value
Presentation Slides	Appropriate in number and content	2
	Too many slides <b>OR</b> too cluttered and confusing	1
	Too many slides <b>AND</b> too cluttered and confusing <i>(typically a maximum of 2 uncluttered slides per minute)</i>	0
Presentation	Clear, engaging and completed within time	3
	Two of the above	2
	One of the above	1
	None of the above <i>(presentations will be stopped after the allocated time)</i>	0
Questions	Demonstrates understanding of subject, and elaborates	3
	Handles questions on presentation, but not extension questions	2
	Haltingly answers questions	1
	Little understanding of subject or questions	0
<b>Total Presentation score:</b>		

The **Panel** for this session at the ASM shall consist of 2 Board members who need not be of the sub-committee that scored the written submissions.

These panel members will individually score each presentation, then reach a consensus score for each presentation at the conclusion of the session. This consensus score will be the final **Presentation score** recorded.

The winning submission will be the one with the highest total combined **Written submission score** and **Presentation score**. This result is generally announced by the Chair of the Board of Urology at the ASM annual dinner.