IMPERIAL

2026 President's Award for Excellence in Societal Engagement

The Achievement Award for Societal Engagement

1. Award Guidelines

This Award is open to **individuals or teams** who have taken the initiative to deliver high-quality engagement activities with the public, schools, community groups and/or patients, **demonstrating an outstanding contribution to societal engagement at Imperial College.** This could include:

- Developing innovative approaches to engagement
- Developing a collaborative approach to engagement with other departments and/or external partners
- Implementing high-quality engagement activities, programmes, or events
- Sharing advice and experiences in engagement with others

To be considered for this Award, the nominee(s) should have been integral to the delivery of the activity, i.e. it is unlikely that the activities would have happened without their involvement.

The engagement should have achieved **one or more** of the following:

- Improved the learning opportunities of less-advantaged young people, as part of our widening participation and schools' engagement aims.
- Engaged the public with research through a process of two-way engagement.
- Worked in close partnership with local community and/or patient groups in response to a social and/or research challenge.

All nominations should be underpinned by an aspiration to better connect the work of Imperial and our research with society, championing a positive approach to change and opportunity by consistently role modelling Imperial's expected values and behaviours, Respect, Collaboration, Integrity, Innovation and Excellence.

There are two awards available for this category, individual and team, and the winning nominations will receive a prize of £250.

2. Eligibility

- This Award is open to all Imperial staff.
- Nominations can be made by any Imperial staff member.
- In exceptional cases, nominations can be made by external partners. Please refer to the 'entering the nomination' section for guidance on how external partners should submit nominations.
- This Award is open to individual nominations and team nominations.
- Self-nomination is not permitted unless it is the team leader of a team nomination (however, nominators are encouraged to involve nominees in the proposal process).

A team nomination must include a team of two or more members led by an Imperial member of staff. If students are also named, this is fine.

3. Entering the nomination

- A single nomination form should be completed for individual nominations and team nominations.
- When nominating a team, the team leader's name should be used in the 'nominee' field. Please include the name of the project or team, and the names of each team member, in the 'nomination type' field of the nomination form. Please only include team members that actively contributed to the activities outlined in the evidence submitted.
- It is **strongly recommended** that you notify the nominee(s) of your intention to propose them for this Award. They will be able to provide you with valuable information and evidence that you can include in your nomination.
- All nominations must be seconded before the deadline. Please refer to the online awards system user guide for more information.
- There is a 4000-character limit for each free text section.
- There is a strict limit of two supporting documents allowed per nomination, and each supporting document must be no more than two pages. Supporting documents can be attached at the end of the nomination form in the online awards system.

In exceptional cases, external partners can nominate Imperial staff members for this Award. The online awards system will only accept Imperial College email addresses for nominations. Therefore, the nominator must contact societal_engagement@imperial.ac.uk to request a manual application form.

4. What makes a good/bad nomination

	
Ensure a good case is presented within your submission, as the selection panel will only draw on the **evidence presented within the nomination.**	Nominations **without evidence** for the relevant criteria will not be as competitive.
The submission should be written for a non-expert audience and **specific examples given where appropriate.**	Without detailed **examples** of their work, the selection panel can't review how the nominee has demonstrated an outstanding contribution.
Detail positive attitudes and behaviours the nominee has exhibited, in line with Imperial's.	Make clear the role of the individual nominee; a **common error** is to focus on the work of a team rather than those who are being nominated specifically.
Showcase the real and tangible improvements and **outcomes** of the nominees' work. What has changed as a result of their involvement/initiative? **Include evaluation data** as evidence.	The nomination should not be a CV, instead highlight information on the benefits achieved and how these were **evaluated.**
Feedback from audiences, students or colleagues can provide additional support for a nomination – this can be included as two extra documents (no longer than two pages each) and can include comments and endorsements from others.	Have you entered your nomination for the right award? Does it constitute societal engagement? There are many award categories – ensure you have the best fit!

For guidance on how to evaluate engagement, please refer to our online Engagement Toolkit

5. Questions to complete

1. Is this an individual nomination or a team nomination? If this is a team nomination, please include the name of the project or team, and the names of each team member.

2. Please **describe** your relationship to the nominee(s) (i.e., colleague, project partner) and how you became aware of their contributions to societal engagement.

3. Please **describe and evidence** how the nominee(s) has been integral to the delivery of high-quality engagement activities that delivered one or more of the following:

   a) Improved the learning opportunities of less-advantaged young people, as part of our widening participation and schools' engagement aims.

   b) Engaged the public with research through a process of two-way engagement.

   c) Worked in close partnership with local community and/or patient groups in response to a social and/or research challenge.

   If this is a team nomination, please be sure to describe the role of all team members.

4. Please **describe and evidence** how all the parties involved in the activity benefited from taking part, including:
   - the public groups who participated
   - the nominee(s) (and their research if appropriate)
   - Imperial College London

   Where possible include information on the benefits achieved and how these were evaluated. If you have feedback from audiences, students or colleagues please attach it to this nomination if possible.

5. Please **describe** how the nominee(s) developed innovative and/or collaborative approaches to engagement (including working with internal and/or external partners).

6. Please **describe** how the nominee(s) promoted and communicated their experience and shared their lessons learnt with others, for example, internal and/or external colleagues, students, the media and other collaborators.

7. Any additional comments from the nominator.

***If you have any questions about the nomination process or need any further guidance**, please do not hesitate to write to us. We also offer 1-to-1 public engagement advice sessions, where you can ask your questions about the nomination process.*

6. Selection criteria (for information only)

Please see below examples of the type of criteria that the selection panel will use to assess and score nominations. (1 = lowest score, 5 = highest score)

Quality of Engagement	
1	**5**
The activity described was low quality engagement, e.g., it was entirely didactic or did not target a particular public audience.	The activity was high quality. For example, the activity had a clear purpose, it enabled two-way engagement, it targeted new defined public audiences for Imperial, the engagement influenced research in some way, was innovative and collaborative.
Level of involvement of the nominee(s) and how this demonstrated an outstanding contribution	
1	**5**
The nominee added little value to the overall activity. It could have proceeded effectively without their input	The activity would not have happened without the involvement of the nominee. The nominee demonstrated an outstanding contribution to deliver the engagement activity.
Benefits achieved and evaluation	
1	**5**
There is very little description about the benefits to the audiences, the nominee and/or Imperial. No evidence/evaluation has been presented as to how they know these benefits were realised.	A clear and realistic description of benefits achieved for audiences, the nominee and Imperial was presented, with evidence/evaluation provided in all cases to back this up.
Extent of collaboration	
1	**5**
There was very little detail about the collaboration. There was no clear purpose for the collaboration. The collaboration was not mutually beneficial or appeared unproductive or ill-balanced. The collaboration was not focused on societal engagement.	The nature of the collaboration and role of partners was very clearly detailed. The purpose of the collaboration was clear and appropriate. The collaboration developed new relationships for Imperial and aims to be a sustainable collaboration that continues into the future. The collaboration is mutually beneficial and well-balanced.
Extent of dissemination and sharing good practice	
1	**5**
There was very little effort to publicise the engagement activity before or after the activity. Lessons learnt from the experience were not detailed or shared with internal or external colleagues and stakeholders.	The nominee attempted to promote the engagement activity before and after the experience. They demonstrated lessons learnt and how they disseminated these to colleagues internally and stakeholders externally.