**Employer Advisory Boards Guidance**

**What employers want (and don’t) from an effective Board**

Employers will typically perceive a group to be worthwhile and effective if:

* There are clear actions and outcomes from meetings
* Most of the content covered is at least partially relevant to them and their roles
* They are active participants - they should be invited to present about their work and challenges
* The group provides a beneficial networking environment with peers from their sector
* They are provided with insights and benefits that they would not be able access if they were not part of the group e.g. access to students, facilities or privileged information
* That meetings have a clear structure and focus on specific issues rather than general state of the nation discussions
* The meeting is combined with other engagement opportunities (e.g Degree Shows, Careers Fairs, Panel events)
* The Chair manages the meeting effectively to ensure that all members can contribute, that the agenda is followed, and the limited time is used effectively

Employers will typically become frustrated and disengage from a group if:

* They perceive the meetings to be a talking shop and it is not explicit how their contributions are acted upon
* Actions from previous meetings are not delivered or are continually rolled-over
* The meeting is dominated by university staff. Employer members have been invited primarily to contribute their expertise, they should do most of the talking
* University staff are not engaged and professionally courteous. For example, arriving late, being unprepared, leaving early, being distracted by their phones or laptops. Time out of their business is precious and given generously to the University, it is critical this time is treated appropriately
* They receive no explicit benefits or recognition for contributing to this strategic initiative
* The scope of the meetings is too broad and most content has no relevance to them or their roles
* They feel the meeting is used as revenue generation activity
* Too much use of institutional jargon plus reference to internal barriers and politics
* The membership is not representative of the sector and a diversity of views are not represented