

2025 President's Award for Excellence in Societal Engagement The Partner Award for Societal Engagement

1. Award Guidelines

This Award is for **individuals or teams** outside Imperial who have made **outstanding contributions that inspire and support us in the achievement of one or more of our societal engagement aims:**

- 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

This could include:

- Delivering exceptional engagement related to our education and research
- Being a role model or inspiration for our own approaches to engagement
- Implementing exceptional engagement with audiences we are seeking to engage
- Sharing advice and best practice with us and other external partners

Partners might include **patients, residents, community members and partner organisations in the public, private and third sector.**

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 any external individual, team or organisation.
- Nominations can be made by any Imperial staff member.
- This Award is open to individual nominations and team nominations.
- The nominee is acting as the representative for the external partner throughout the process (see below for further information).

IMPERIAL

3. Entering the nomination

- The online awards system will only accept Imperial email addresses for nominees. Therefore, the nominating staff member should select the 'self-nomination' option and use their own email address to act as the representative for the external partner. This is a requirement for both individual nominations and team nominations for this award category.
- 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.

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 (including endorsements) can provide additional support for a nomination – this can be included as two extra documents (no longer than two pages each) | 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) and how you became aware of their contributions to societal engagement.
3. Please **describe and evidence** the societal engagement initiative, illustrating which of the goals below it achieved and the nature of the partnership with Imperial.
 - 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** the role that the individual(s) or organisation played to help us achieve our societal engagement goals. Where possible provide information on the benefits that the partner brought to Imperial College London (staff, students, research) and/or the schools, public, local communities or patients that were involved. 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. 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 was high. 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, the engagement is sustainable, the engagement has a legacy |
| Level of involvement of the nominee(s)/partner(s) | |
| 1 | 5 |
| The nomination does not clearly describe the purpose of the partnership and the aims it was intended to achieve. The nominee added little value to the initiative. | The aim of the partnership is clearly described, and the involvement of the partner/nominee made the activity possible. |
| Benefits achieved and evaluation | |
| 1 | 5 |
| There is very little description about the purpose of the relationship with the partner and the benefits achieved for audiences, the nominee and the goals of 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 the Imperial, as a result of the role that the partner played, was presented. There was evidence/evaluation provided to back this up. |