Public Health England

National Cancer Registration and Analysis Service

Project proposal process

This document describes the process to be used for proposing any new analytical project within NCRAS, including partnership work:

1. Applicants are expected to discuss their project with the relevant lead analysts and Clinical Leads within NCRAS, including the appropriate Functional Team leads; **REDACTED** and **REDACTED** can provide contact details

2. A project proposal form (see page 2) is completed describing a fully worked up project. This has information on the background to the proposal, the rationale, analytical approach, resources needed, timelines and anticipated publication model, including expected outcomes or deliverables – this should include the impact that the project will have for practice, policy or patient care.

3. We expect the proposal to be led by the person who has overall ownership of the project, this will not necessarily be an NCRAS analyst if the drive for the project is from partner organisations

4. We expect proposers to ensure that individuals named within their proposals as being members of the project team should be aware of the plans and have provided appropriate input to the proposal

5. Projects must show if they have considered patient / carer involvement or if they intend to, and how

6. The proposal is submitted to the NCRAS Project Review Panel via **REDACTED**. The panel will assess the proposal on: fit with NCRAS priorities; current gap in evidence / knowledge; the legacy of the project; whether data are available / suitable; and whether there is resource to undertake the work.

7. Panel outcomes are: approval; ask for resubmission; piloted (a lower priority); suggest joining up with another project; rejected

8. Feedback will be provided to applicants (see page 4), usually within one week

9. Approval may not mean the project is started immediately and ongoing work will need to be completed first

REDACTED, Head of Cancer Analysis, 27th November 2017

National Cancer Registration and Analysis Service – analysis proposal

Name of project

Version control, date, author

Background

Project aim – include hypotheses if relevant

Relevance to NCRAS strategic priorities and functional teams

Specific project objectives

Analytical approach

To include use of existing Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and/or how the project will generate new SOPs that can be used by others

Expected outputs or deliverables

Publications that include interpretation or are likely to be politically sensitive will need to be flagged with the PHE publication standard team (excluding press releases, blogs, academic papers, posters, presentations and data/spreadsheets).

Breakdown of project timescales

To include realistic expectations of planning, analytical time, QA, write up etc. as well as any externally driven timescales e.g. relevant conferences.

Comms planning

To include how the comms planning will be managed and who intended audience is for the work. Comms plan to be drafted at early stages of project.

Risks

Geographical scope i.e. regional, England, UK, International
National outputs should be accompanied by a geographic breakdown of results

Equality aspects included e.g. sex, age, ethnicity etc

Costs (if relevant)

Project Team and roles
To include for each person involved (internal and external) who would be undertaking which aspect of the work

Analysts including QA:
Project advisors:
Clinical lead (external):
NCRAS Clinical Lead:
Other relevant people including patients / carers:

References and literature review

Public Health England

NCRAS Analytical Project Proposal – Feedback Form

The purpose of this form is to offer constructive feedback on project proposals submitted to the project review group. It lists comments from the group against the scoring criteria.

The criteria act as a guide for the group, and the final decision is necessarily subjective; bringing to bear the combined experience of the group. The final decision of the group will be one of the following:

- Yes – this project is seen as a priority and must be incorporated into the analysts' work
- Pilot – the project is strategically aligned, and interesting, but may require some basic analysis to allow a full decision to be made
- 'Friday afternoon' – the project is worthwhile, but sits further outside the NCRAS core priorities. This could be undertaken for a couple of hours per week for staff/infrastructure development.
- Resubmit – the proposal has some strong features, but there is not enough detail to be sure the project will be successful or fit with our objectives. For example there may be a weak literature review; or the team may not be well-considered.
- Join up – the proposal overlaps significantly with other projects. For efficiency there should be alignment between the projects' aims and team.
- No – the project does not align well with the key deliverables, nor answer a significant clinical question

Title

Criteria 1 – Is this a mandatory piece of work? e.g. National Statistics, contracted work

Criteria 2 – Is this a strategic fit? Does it relate to a Taskforce recommendation; is it a key deliverable; is there significant political interest?

Criteria 3 – Is there a knowledge gap? Does the literature review identify a lack of evidence which will be addressed by this work; will it have clinical impact?

Criteria 4 – Is there a legacy from the project? Will there be a new technique developed which can be used for other projects; will it lead to new data being utilised?

Criteria 5 – Are the data and tools available? Is this a new dataset; will linkages have to be derived?

Criteria 6 – Is the correct team in place? Does it have the capability to do the work; are the correct advisors in place; is there appropriate clinical input?

Ethical considerations – does the project constitute medical research? Is the proposal for service evaluation, clinical/non-financial audit or usual practice in public health? Does the proposal need to be considered by a Research Ethics Committee?

PHE publication standard – Does the proposal need to be submitted to the publication standard team? Are the outputs likely to include interpretation; could they be politically sensitive?

Final decision and notes