

## 2022 President's Award for Excellence in Societal Engagement

### Individual Award Guidelines

#### The Leadership Award for Societal Engagement (Deadline – 21 March 2022)

This Award is for staff who have demonstrated an on-going commitment to societal engagement over time; bringing enthusiasm and innovation to this area and actively supporting other staff and students to get involved above and beyond what is expected of their job role. 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:

- 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

All nominations should be underpinned by an aspiration to better connect the work of Imperial and our research with society.

There is one award available for this category, and the winning nomination will receive a prize of £250.

#### 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 for this award category

## Entering the nomination (please additionally refer to the user guide document for the online awards system)

---

**Important:** The selection panel will **ONLY** draw on the evidence presented in the nomination form when making their decision, so please ensure a good case is presented for submission.

- A single nomination form should be completed for each nominee.
- It is strongly recommended that you notify the nominee of the intention to propose them for this Award.
- All nominations must be seconded before the deadline. Please refer to the online awards system user guide for more information.
- Evidence should be provided for each of the award criteria, **particularly how this extends beyond the expectations of the nominee's job description**. This should be written for a non-expert audience and specific examples given where appropriate.
- There is a 300-word limit for each free text section.
- **There is a limit of two supporting documents allowed per nomination**, and each supporting document should be no more than two pages. Supporting documents can be attached at the end of the nomination form in the online awards system.

## 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 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 the key benefits they have brought to all parties involved.
  - the participants and partners
  - the nominee (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 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 how the nominee has improved engagement practice for Imperial College London and how they have shared their experiences and lessons learnt externally with partners, the wider public engagement sector and the media.

## Selection criteria (for information only)

---

Please see below illustrative examples of the type of criteria that the selection panel will use to assess nominations:

### Quality of engagement

Score of 1 = The activities described were low quality engagement activities, e.g. entirely didactic.

Score of 10 = 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 audiences for Imperial, it influenced research in some way, it had a legacy.

### Directing a portfolio of activities

Score of 1 = The nomination details a low level of activity with no evidence of leadership experience demonstrated.

Score of 10 = The nomination detailed a portfolio of engagement activities that demonstrate a longer-term commitment to societal engagement. The nomination demonstrated that the nominee went above and beyond the expectations of their role to deliver a portfolio of high-quality engagement activities.

### Benefits achieved and evaluation

Score of 1 = There is very little description about the benefits to the audiences, the nominee and/or the Imperial College community. No evidence/evaluation has been presented as to how they know these benefits were realised.

Score of 10 = A clear and realistic description of benefits achieved for audiences, the nominee and the Imperial College community was presented, with evidence/evaluation provided in all cases to back this up.

### Leadership and supporting others

Score of 1 = There is little description or evidence provided that the nominee has helped other colleagues and students to carry out societal engagement activities.

Score of 10 = 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

Score of 1 = 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.

Score of 10 = The nominee promoted 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 the College.