

2026 President's Award for Excellence in Societal Engagement

The Leadership Award for Societal Engagement

1. Award Guidelines

This Award is open to **staff** who have demonstrated an on-going commitment to societal engagement over time; bringing enthusiasm and innovation to this area and **demonstrating an outstanding contribution to actively support other staff and students to get involved with societal engagement**. This could include:

- Delivering a portfolio of high-quality engagement activities
- Being recognised as a well-established champion and/or leading practitioner for engagement
- Supporting colleagues and students to achieve their own societal engagement endeavours, including providing advice and guidance
- Improving engagement practice and impact for Imperial
- Creating a stimulating environment for engagement, providing, and sharing opportunities for others to get involved in engagement and develop skills
- Encouraging staff and students to innovate and push boundaries

Nominees will have delivered a long-standing portfolio of high-quality engagement activities that 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 is one award available for this category, and the winning nomination 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
- This Award is open to individual nominations only
- Self-nomination is not permitted (however, nominators are encouraged to involve nominees in the proposal process).

3. Entering the nomination

- A single nomination form should be completed for each nominee
- It is **strongly recommended** that you notify the nominee 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.

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. Please **describe** your relationship to the nominee (i.e., colleague, project partner) and how you became aware of their contributions to societal engagement
2. Please **describe and evidence** what the nominee has done to merit the Leadership Award, describing their portfolio 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.
3. Please **describe and evidence** the key benefits they have brought to all parties involved, including:
 - the participants and partners
 - the nominee(s) (and their research if appropriate)
 - their colleagues and students
 - Imperial College London

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

4. Please **describe and evidence** how the nominee has inspired and created opportunities for others to get involved with societal engagement activities and provided on-going support, ensuring others achieve in this area. If you have feedback from colleagues, students and collaborators please attach it to this nomination.
5. Please **describe and evidence** how the nominee has improved engagement practice for Imperial and how they have shared their experiences and lessons learnt internally with colleagues and externally with partners, the wider public engagement sector and the media.
6. 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	The quality of engagement across the portfolio of activities was high. For example, it had a clear purpose, it enabled two-way engagement, it targeted new public audiences for Imperial, it influenced research in some way, it had a legacy.
Directing a portfolio of activities	
1	5
No evidence of leadership experience demonstrated.	The nomination detailed a portfolio of engagement activities that demonstrate a longer-term commitment to societal engagement. The nomination demonstrated that the nominee has led an outstanding contribution to deliver a portfolio of high-quality engagement activities.
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.
Leadership and supporting others	
1	5
There is little description or evidence provided that the nominee has helped other colleagues and students to carry out societal engagement activities.	There was clear evidence provided to demonstrate that the nominee has helped other colleagues and students carry out societal engagement activities, exceeding what is expected as part of their role.
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 shared these widely to a variety of stakeholders internally and externally. Their expertise in engagement has helped to improve practice in other areas of Imperial.