

2022 President's Award for Excellence in Societal Engagement

Individual Award Guidelines

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

This Award is open to all Imperial undergraduate and postgraduate students who have taken the initiative to deliver high-quality engagement activities with the public, schools, community groups and/or patients. This could include:

- Developing innovative approaches to engagement
- Implementing high-quality engagement
- Providing excellent support for engagement
- Being considered as a role model by peers
- Sharing advice, best practice, and experiences in engagement with others

In order to be considered for this Award, the nominee 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:

- 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 are up to two awards available for this category – individual and team.

Eligibility

- This Award is open to all Imperial undergraduate and postgraduate students
- Nominations can be made by any Imperial staff member or student
- 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
- A team nomination must include a team of three or more members. If academics and/or staff are also named, this is fine.

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 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 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, and should be written for a non-expert audience with 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.

Important: External partners only

In exceptional cases, external partners can nominate Imperial students 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.

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. peer, project partner, student) and how you became aware of their contributions to societal engagement.
3. Please describe 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 how all the parties involved in the activity benefited from taking part.
 - 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 Imperial staff please attach it to this nomination if possible.

5. Please detail how the nominee(s) promoted their experience and shared their lessons learnt with others, for example, fellow students, Imperial staff, the media and other collaborators.

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 activity described was low quality engagement, e.g. it was entirely didactic

Score of 10 = The activity was high quality. For example, the activity had a clear purpose, it enabled two-way engagement, it targeted new audiences for Imperial, the engagement influenced research in some way.

Level of involvement of the nominee(s)

Score 1 = The nominee added little value to the overall activity. It could have proceeded effectively without their input.

Score 10 = The activity would not have happened without the involvement of the nominee.

Benefits achieved and evaluation

Score of 1 = There is very little description about the benefits to the audiences, the nominee and/or Imperial College. 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 Imperial was presented, with evidence/evaluation provided in all cases to back this up.

Extent of dissemination and sharing good practice

Score of 1 = There was very little effort to publicise the engagement activity before or after the experience. Lessons learnt from the experience were not detailed or shared with fellow students, Imperial staff or external stakeholders.

Score of 10 = The nominee attempted to promote the engagement activity before and after the experience. They demonstrated lessons learnt and how they disseminated these to fellow students, Imperial staff and external stakeholders.