Part One - Statistical Information

A)   Name of CETL: e3I CETL

B)   Name of Institution: Sheffield Hallam University

C)   Contact Name: David Laughton

D)   Person submitting self-evaluation: David Laughton

E)   Start date of CETL: 2005

F)   End date of CETL: 31st August 2010

G)   Lead Directors and dates associated with CETL:

- David Laughton - Director (2007 - 2010)
- Nick Nunnington - Associate Director (2005 to 2010)
- Patricia Quinn - Associate Director (2005 to 2010)
- Damien Fitzgerald - Associate Director (2005 to 2010)
- Bridget Winwood - Associate Director (2008 to 2010)
- Jeff Waldock - Teaching Fellow in Employability (2007 to 2010)
- Kent Roach - Seconded CETL Associate (2005 to 2010)
- Dave Cotton - Associate Director (2007 to 2009)
- John Cleak - Employability Fellow (2008 to 2010)
- Gary Taylor - Teaching Fellow in Employability (2008 to 2010)
- Lee Harvey - Associate Director (2005/06; 2006/07)
- Gudrun Myers - Associate Director (2005/06; 2006/07)
- Peter Twomey - Associate Director (2007/08)

H)   Total amount of award: £4.85 million

I)   Capital Spend:

- Refurbishment of 3 CETL rooms
- extension to the Adsetts building (learning centre)
- Virtual reality hardware and software

J)   What will facilities be used for in academic year 2010-11:

- The Adsetts extension remains a learning centre facility.
- The three CETL rooms to become teaching rooms.

K) Average number of persons employed at any one time in FTEs and by type:

- Academic   2.4
- Researchers 1.5
- AP&C   2.78
- **Total**   6.68

L) What will staff employed by CETL do at end of CETL:

- Director, associate directors and employability fellows will return to original academic posts on a full-time basis.
- CETL manager, administrative assistant and 2 researchers will be involved in the university redeployment process.
- 1 student intern and 1 IT assistant will be unemployed as fixed term contracts end.

M) Number of spin out projects funded:

- 05/06 - 7 projects
- 06/07 - 8 projects
- 08/09 - 19 projects
- **Total** - 34

N) Number of peer reviewed outputs published: 8

O) Number of events held: 30

Five events of especial importance:

(i) HEA Evidence-based practice seminar on Employability and Employee Learning: "Graduate Perspectives on the Influence of Higher Education on their Employability." This will take place in May 2010, with approximately 30 participants, and will explore the research findings associated with an e3i project to establish those employability skills former Sheffield Hallam students felt were developed during their courses compared to those they felt were relevant in their early employment, providing recommendations and insights for those involved in course design with respect to employability skills.

(ii) HEA Subject Centre for Languages Conference, "Employability and Professional Learning", hosted and contributed to by e3i, 25-4-08. This involved approximately 50 participants who shared institutional practice around employability skills development in the languages subject area.

(iii) HEA BMAF/HLST Subject Centre Conference: "The International Dimensions of Employability", hosted and contributed to by e3i, 22-3-07. This involved approximately 50 participants who explored and shared

institutional practice around supporting international students in the development of employability skills, and key developments in other countries with respect to employability.

(iv) The Sheffield Hallam University PE, Sport Development and Coaching Conference 2007. This was the inaugural event for this conference, which brings together several hundred SHU students with employers in the sectors, key decision-makers in the organisation of the sectors and SHU academics. It has a major employability focus and encourages students to reflect on their career plans going forward. The conference has run every year subsequently, and was organised initially by an e3 Associate.

(v) e3i Annual Conference 2009: "Student Perspectives on Employability". Although this was the second of the e3i annual conferences, it was the first that had attendees from across the UK HE sector. It was attended by over 100 participants, and as well as having a primary focus on student perspectives, was used also to disseminate employability resources produced by e3i and other organisations/institutions.

P) Details of anyone willing to participate in peer review scheme – none.

e3i CETL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR HEFCE

Question 1 – reflect on how effective your CETL has been in contributing to the objectives set out for the CETL initiative when it started:

(Note, in responding to the objectives below we will be using the summary outcome descriptors: fully achieved, significantly achieved, partially achieved, not achieved).

1 To reward practice that demonstrates excellent learning outcomes for students. Summary outcome – fully achieved. We have recognised excellent practice and rewarded colleagues in a variety of ways. Associate Directors of the CETL were appointed through a competitive recruitment and selection process, based upon their Employability practice and its impact upon students, and rewarded through buy-out time and honoraria to enable them to develop their practice further. Associates of the CETL (project leaders) were provided with buy-out time to further develop their Employability practice, again using a competitive bidding process. We have also made funds available to allow Associate Directors, Associates and other colleagues involved in Employability pedagogy to attend conferences and workshops, either to present their work or engage with the work of others. We have recognised excellent practice as we have discovered it and provided resources to support further development e.g. in developing alumni sites, and we have worked with Faculties to establish Teaching Fellow posts for Employability in two Faculties.

2 To enable practitioners to lead and embed change by implementing approaches that address the diversity of learners' needs, the requirements of different learning contexts, the possibilities for innovation and the expectations of employers and others concerned with the quality of student learning. Summary outcome – significantly achieved. Our modus operandi has been to support and encourage practitioners who were enthusiastic in wanting to lead and innovate in Employability teaching and learning but at the same time we have been keenly aware that a "one size fits all approach" would not have been effective. We have used the SHU Employability Framework as an organising framework for our work and have encouraged colleagues we have worked with to "position" themselves within the framework, thus providing a strategic steer and context for the work, but allowing flexibility in terms of approach and emphasis. We have operated at a number of levels in facilitating, supporting and encouraging colleagues to lead change and advance their practice:

- **Macro level** - university level strategies and processes (e.g. course validation processes, Employability Framework, Graduate Employment Strategy etc.);
- **Meso level** – Faculty employability away days, course planning and validation (e.g. the Employability Pathway in the undergraduate programme in Sheffield

Business School, a programme of career development sessions across all sandwich courses in the Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering and Sciences);

- **Micro level** – individual LTA approaches, Employability elements within modules.

We have opted for a summary outcome of significantly achieved here in recognition of the fact that there is still work to be done within the university in terms of the Employability agenda that we have been working to.

3 To enable institutions to support and develop practice that encourages deeper understanding across the sector of ways of addressing students' learning effectively. Summary outcome – partially achieved. We have conducted research and evaluation as part of our work, publicised this via our web-site, our newsletters, our annual conference, and via presentations at external workshops and conferences (see sections m, n and o of part one of this report). We have also engaged in "technology transfer" at a more informal level within the networks and contacts that we have developed e.g. CETL Associate Directors were involved in setting up an Employability Developers network. In this sense we believe we have made a contribution to a deeper understanding of Employability across the sector. However, we have opted for a "partially achieved" outcome in this instance for two reasons: firstly, we believe that some of our own learning has not yet been distilled and made available in the usual academic formats; this, however, may change if we complete an electronic book that we are compiling by the end of the CETL; secondly, we have not been able to capture significant feedback concerning the extent to which our work has been recognised as being useful by other institutions and practitioners.

4 To recognise and give greater prominence to clusters of excellence that are capable of influencing practice and raising the profile of teaching excellence within and beyond their institutions. Summary outcome – Fully achieved. The SHU Employability CETL has been invited to make contributions at many external events in recognition of its expertise and excellence in this area (see section o of part one of the report). This is a direct consequence of the CETL initiative which "badges" and communicates expertise in an easily understood and shorthand way across the sector. We have also been heavily involved across SHU as an institution in influencing practice and raising the profile of teaching excellent e.g. through e3i Away Days (and see responses to question 2 below) as a consequence of the status the centre has and its related expertise. Our Special Interest Groups within SHU encouraged colleagues with similar interests and expertise to operate as communities of practice, and e3i developed as a core team of colleagues who further enhanced their personal expertise and profile.

5 To demonstrate collaboration and sharing of good practice and so enhance the standard of teaching and effective learning throughout the sector.

Summary outcome – partially achieved. Our collaboration and sharing of good practice features on a spectrum of deep collaboration (development of a career management skills resource in the form of software with the University of Bedford and the OU, and the purchase and customisation of a career management skills resource from the University of Reading), to strong linkages with other CETLs involved in Employability (e.g. UCLAN, LJMU and Birmingham City University) used for exchanging ideas and updating on innovative developments, to sharing of good practice more generally (e.g. through our annual Employability conference). We have opted for a partially achieved outcome in this instance as we believe this has not been the main thrust of our work and we have no clear evidence of the impact of our work in raising the standard of teaching and learning across the sector.

6 To raise student awareness of effectiveness in teaching and learning in order to inform student choice and maximise student performance. Summary outcome – partially achieved. We feel our strongest contribution here relates to raising student awareness of effectiveness in learning in the context of Employability skills. Our most direct evidence of this includes the evaluation of 18 projects which were badged under the heading of "student perspectives on employability" and the research we undertook with our alumni. The Maths subject area has also had a number one rating in the employability sections of the NSS (questions 12, 20 and 21) linked to the work of one of our Associate Directors. Where we have less systematic evidence is whether or not our work informed student choice and whether this raised or maximised performance; we have some relevant examples and illustrations but our evidence base is more anecdotal and ad hoc, and therefore we have opted for a partially achieved summary outcome overall.

Question 2 – please set out the aims and objectives specific to your CETL at the start, and for each one reflect on how well these have been achieved.

The specific goals of the CETL are stated below in bold. The narrative that follows reflects upon the extent to which these goals have been achieved and uses the following summary outcome descriptors: **fully achieved, significantly achieved, partially achieved, not achieved.**

1 Increase the number of courses within SHU that incorporate Employability dimensions within their design and delivery. Summary outcome – *fully achieved.* The evidence base to support this conclusion is the employability survey results (four iterations of the survey allowing a time series analysis over 6 years), the number of e3i funded projects that have impacted upon the curriculum or LTA practices, and the analysis of course validation documentation, undertaken for the years 2005-6 and 2006-7. We are not saying here that **all** SHU courses have **significant** Employability dimensions as part of their offer, but that the number of courses with such features has increased.

2 Deepen the impact and imprint of Employability within course curricula.
Summary outcome – *significantly achieved.* This is evidenced by data sources outlined in 1 above, and the fact that SHU courses are now required to describe their employability strategies in detail as part of the validation process. Two informative example here is in the Sheffield Business School, which revalidated all of its undergraduate programmes in 2006 and created and "Employability Pathway" within each UG course focused on employability skills development, and the programme of career development for sandwich students in the Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering and Sciences.

3 *Foster and support innovative approaches to Employability learning and teaching.* Summary outcome – *significantly achieved.* The following mechanisms have been used in this context: support/advice/resources for course planners, buy-out time for colleagues involved in innovative employability projects, funding of Assistant Directors of e3i from each of the four Faculties who have been charged with encouraging innovation in their local contexts, research support and evaluation for colleagues seeking feedback on employability initiatives.

4 Support specific and named individuals and projects that are actively involved in innovative approaches to embedding, integrating and enhancing Employability within provision. Summary outcome – *fully achieved.* See parts M and O in part one for summary details. We were able to allocate a significant proportion of funds to secure this objective (include approximate amount here).

5 Support the establishment of Employability as a core value of SHU. Summary outcome – **fully achieved.** Employability has been established as one of 3 core values of the university. The university Employability Framework has been updated. The university's LTA strategy incorporates Employability as a key feature, and this is replicated in Faculty LTA strategies. The university corporate plan 2009-2014 identifies Employability as a core value/objective of the university, and e3i has supported the work of a task group charged with producing the employability strategy (Core Minimum Entitlement for Employability) for the university going forward.

6 Disseminate the findings and experiences of activities associated with the work of the CETL both internally within SHU and externally across the national and international HE sector. Summary outcome – *partially achieved.* We have used workshops and staff development events, newsletters, publications, conferences organised by e3i, conference presentations by e3i staff and the e3i website to achieve this goal. We have been most successful internally and then within the national HE sector, with some exposure internationally (e.g. the staff development work we have undertaken in China), hence the summary outcomes of partially achieved.

Question 3 – please add any objectives that emerged as the CETL developed and reflect on these as for question 2.

We developed the idea of an Employability Guarantee midway through our operation (all SHU graduates who attempted to access the labour market will be equipped to do so successfully and will be able to find a job within 6 months of graduation, otherwise they are entitled to discounted further study). This was based upon students undertaking specific employability skills development which would be built into courses opting into the Guarantee scheme, and the confidence that these aspects would equip students for success. We saw this as a highly innovative and radical approach and one that would incentivise SHU courses to focus on employability so as to acquire the Guarantee "badge", as well as demonstrating an approach that would be of interest across the HE sector. Unfortunately, this was seen as relatively risky by the SHU Executive, and an alternative version of this idea in the form of an Employability Award did not receive high level support either. Our reflections upon this experience suggest that there are limitations to what a CETL (and the CETL initiative) can achieve when working against the 'grain' of organisational imperatives.

In addition, we decided to publish an electronic book of our CETL experiences via Lulu, and have been involved in developing relevant detail and a strategy to support the Employability aspects of the SHU corporate plan 2009-14. The former seemed a useful way to capture and disseminate our experiences, something we had not thought about initially, and the latter occurred as we were well positioned to link with a key university initiative arising from the appointment of a new Vice Chancellor.

In the last two years of the CETL we have had more of an internal focus to our work. This has been in response to guidance from our steering group (Quality Enhancement Programme Board), which suggested there was a major opportunity for the CETL to link with and support the work that was taking place to develop the new corporate plan (2009-2014). We saw this as an opportunity to both help shape and implement strategic change within the university and as a way of meeting some of the objectives we had established for the CETL. Clearly we could not have seen the appointment of a new Vice Chancellor at the start of the CETL, so this was an opportunity that 'emerged' over time.

Question 4 – irrespective of your answers to questions 2 and 3 above please reflect on, and draw out the achievements and benefits of the CETL (think about different audiences, types of output, impact internal and external, on professional/staff development, on student learning, work over an extended period, use of money for facilities development etc.).

1 We have supported colleagues (advice, resources and buy-out time) within the university to make changes to their teaching/learning strategies which have a direct

impact upon students: integration of employability teaching within and alongside the traditional curriculum; additional employability teaching within a course; development of resources to support employability skills; innovative teaching practices to foster employability; sharing of approaches to employability teaching and resources across Faculties; encouragement of employer involvement in the learning experience; student centred and activity based approaches to enhance student employability; students as co-producers of knowledge and resources.

2 We have contributed to the university's strategic approach to employability and helped to establish this as a way in which the university perceives and differentiates itself: brand, Corporate Plan, realignment of infrastructure and Faculty priorities.

3 We have raised the profile of employability by our participation in different groupings around the university e.g. core team members have provided a CETL perspective in LTA committees and placement working groups.

4 Colleagues from the Careers and Employment Service has been key members of the e3i team providing a model for how central departments can influence and be involved in decision-making and impacting upon students across the university.

5 We have rewarded colleagues involved in supporting Employability development within the university – honoraria, buy-out, payment for case studies of innovative practice – and established both the principle and these practices within the existing HR system.

6 Capital funds have been used in two ways to provide part of the infrastructure to support Employability at SHU, and these facilities will form part of the legacy of the CETL: to build an extension to the Learning Centre, whose physical construction is based upon the principles of collaborative learning and the role of informal learning spaces, and to equip 3 CETL rooms which can be booked out on a flexible basis by colleagues involved in developing student Employability skills.

7 e3i established and supported a number of Special Interest Groups which have formed communities of practice, involving colleagues within SHU, around specific themes: PDP, Career Management Skills (convened by members of the Careers and Employment Service), work-based Learning and Enterprise skills. Some of these have been more active than others, but the latter in particular has been highly successful in developing an innovative approach to developing student enterprise skills (The Venture Matrix) which is now seen as a crucial part of the university infrastructure.

8 We have involved students in the work of the CETL to ensure the student voice is integrated at an early stage, and given shape and form to the values and principles of student engagement/involvement and partnership in learning within the university – e.g. via the mechanisms of inviting a Student Officer into the e3i management team, having a student intern as part of the e3i team, involving students in our SIGs

(e.g. students produced a guide to PDP for students) and projects e.g. as researchers. One of our former student interns went on to become a full time Student Officer.

9 Our learning and expertise has been drawn upon and deployed by institutions and organisations externally (e.g. the British Council, other UK HEIs, Foundation Degrees Forward, universities in China); we have made our resources available externally (e.g. via the website and the launch of the STARs resource).

10 We have been involved in a number of networks of Employability Developers and have informal contacts with other CETLs with a Focus on Employability, creating a linkages and connections of Employability Developers which can be leveraged in the future.

11 We have disseminated our research and evaluation work via conferences, workshops and publications and the e3i website.

12 We have contributed to HEA events (HEA seminars, Subject Centre workshops) and in so doing have actively contributed to the HE community of practice in the UK.

Question 5 – have there been any disappointments in how the CETL has developed/what is has achieved. What are they and why did they happen?

There have been a number of disappointments along the way:

1 e3i has achieved a substantial amount in terms of institutional development, however there is a feeling that more could have been done if the CETL had been involved and integrated more with the executive power and normal business planning processes of the university. The commitment of the CETL team meant they continued to work positively throughout the five years even when it was difficult to create space for Employability initiatives within a crowded university agenda. We were able to use and participate in university decision-making processes to support our work, but until this last year, with the implementation of the new university Corporate Plan, we did find it difficult to link with high level decision-making in the university and to position the work of the CETL more centrally within this.

2 There is a feeling that key decision-makers within Faculties were never really clear of the role of the CETLs and how they could be incorporated and integrated fundamentally in the work of the Faculties. Early meetings and communications with Faculty Heads did not yield a clear Faculty agenda for the CETL and the early work undertaken with Faculties was often on an opportunistic basis, with the e3i team working with enthusiasts in their local settings. More recently there has been a clearer understanding of the work of the CETL across the university, but from a Faculty perspective we have a feeling that we were in the position of making suggestions ourselves rather than responding to requests from Faculties. We would

have liked to have been in a position where Faculties were making more demands on the team, but this did not transpire. It is difficult to explain this situation, but we feel it is related to the business priorities that occupy the time of senior managers and, as a consequence, a (relatively speaking) lack of detailed understanding of Employability skills development at a micro level.

3 We have a specific disappointment that we were not able to convince the university that an Employability Guarantee or inclusive Employability Award were both desirable and feasible and posed a relatively low level of risk. We felt that our plans were innovative, would have helped made manifest the university's commitment to Employability, would have helped to differentiate it from other universities, and would have been of interest across the sector. We were never able to convince the university of the practicalities of these awards, and we explain this by the relatively risk averse nature of institutions when it comes to radical mission specific initiatives.

4 Although we feel the capital expenditure has provided some infrastructure support for employability development, we felt we could have been involved in the relevant discussions at an earlier stage where we may have been in a position to offer alternative views about specific aspects of expenditure. For example, there was a view amongst some members of the core team that a SHU Employability Centre could have been commissioned. To a considerable extent this was due to the fact that a permanent Director for the e3i CETL was not appointed until the latter end of the first year, by which time decisions had already been made about how the CETL expenditure would fit into the development of the university estates.

5 It has been difficult to communicate the impact of CETL work on staff. People have seen and experienced the benefits and outcomes associated with CETL work, but not necessarily ascribed these to the work of the CETL. To a certain extent this is associated with the difficulty of communications in a complex organisation.

6 Although we have strived to create an external profile for the CETL and to become involved in external networks and disseminate our work widely, as an institutional CETL we have been encouraged by our steering group (particularly more recently) to have an internal focus primarily. Whilst this has supported a clear set of priorities and helped to formulate a clear evaluation approach for the work of the CETL, it has not supported some of the original aims of the CETL initiative as fully as might have been expected at the outset. In hindsight this may be associated with the lack of external representation on the steering group, and a clearer steer at an earlier stage of the evaluation approach/priorities from HEFCE.

Question 6 – please reflect on the difficult and easier aspects of getting the CETL going and of getting your message across. For e.g. has action/change followed? Where and why did you meet success or resistance? What worked, how did you discover this, how do you know it worked?

It was difficult to make progress in year one of the CETL. The difficulties focused mainly around the appointment of a permanent Director, turning the bid document into an action plan, and the appropriateness of the change model articulated in the original plan. Time was also taken up in designing role descriptors for Associate Directors and Associates, and on defining the nature of the honoraria CETL Associates were to receive. We also had problems agreeing our branding/livery with the university, and in the location and design of the e3i website. After these issues had been finalised and the related budget for year one agreed, we began to feel comfortable with the progress being made.

The CETL gradually increased the number of colleagues it worked with, the number of projects it sponsored, and the variety of resources it produced directly or sponsored. Enthusiasts within Faculties and Central Departments were keen to get involved with CETL work and benefit from the support that could be provided, and we were very quickly into a situation where e3i funds were oversubscribed, resulting in having to disappoint some people. Adopting an open bidding and adjudication process for the availability and distribution of CETL funds worked well and became the dominant modus operandi.

It has been difficult to steer and co-ordinate the variety of issues and initiatives the CETL has been involved with, to coalesce these into a bigger whole, but we attempted to resolve this issue by using the SHU Employability Framework as an organising and publicising framework.

Communication across the university has been a challenge. At times we have the feeling that some parts of the university felt challenged by the role of the CETL. We attempted to respond by producing a newsletter that came out 3 times per year, and targeted this in particular at colleagues with management responsibilities. We also circulated ad hoc and additional publications e.g. a summary of activities and outcomes for 2008-9. There is a view within the CETL team that a more prominent location for the CETL office could have helped with this. Communication outside of the university has been a greater challenge. We have relied on distributing our newsletter via the Jiscmail list, but we were not successful in getting the university marketing department to take a proactive approach to publicising the work of the CETL externally.

We worked hard to ensure that the work of the CETL was reported periodically via the formal processes within the university (Academic Board, Academic Development Committee, Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committees etc.) and this worked well in that such periodic reports were established in the agendas of these groups. This was an important way by which the CETL both influenced the policy agenda of the university, publicised its work and disseminated outcomes.

The university has gone through a significant restructuring during the life time of the CETL (moving from schools to faculties and a new Corporate Plan); this has meant

that senior managers and colleagues more generally have had more immediate issues to devote their time to as opposed to employability development work.

We were clear at an early stage that we needed a well developed view of how we would evaluate the work of the CETL and the nature of the data that would be required. This was a difficult intellectual exercise, and there was little guidance on this matter in the early stages from HEFCE, but by the time of the interim evaluation we had a clear idea of our chosen evaluation strategy and framework and have collected data systematically to this end.

Turnover of CETL staff over the five years has meant that momentum has been lost on occasions, but we attempted to respond to this by the quick recruitment of replacements which on the whole was accomplished, with the exception of one occasion when we were without a resources developer for several months.

We have made funds available for large Faculty staff development initiatives over the last few years. These have often been in the form of day and overnight workshops aimed at producing a specified outcome, but one which the Faculty themselves have decided upon. These initiatives have worked well in that they have involved a considerable number of colleagues and the Faculties have been able to customise the focus of the sessions to their specific needs. The sessions have been used to develop aspects of Employability strategy in the Faculties, or have been focused on educational development and innovation; they have been useful to provide momentum and a critical mass of people working on the Employability agenda.

We have experienced resistance to our idea of an Employability Guarantee/Award which we were disappointed about, and have commented upon in question 5. We experienced some resistance when we were working with colleagues who had been 'volunteered' but did not opt in to participate in certain initiatives e.g. course development workshops. We experienced some resistance via apathy or opposition from some colleagues who were ideologically opposed to the Employability agenda in HE, or who did not understand or have empathy with the language of employability. We responded to the latter resistances in two ways: by establishing Employability as a key element of the SHU identity and thereby making this a non-optional issue for colleagues to engage with; and by suggesting and demonstrating that Employability teaching, learning and assessment need not be at the expense of teaching disciplinary knowledge and skills - that these could be achieved at the same time.

Question 7 – has your CETL adopted/used/been based around any specific theories e.g. of change, or of student learning? If so, to what extent have these underpinned your work, have they been useful?

The original change model as outlined in the CETL bid document was evaluated in an internal report by Abbi Flint, Lecturer in Education, Learning and Teaching Institute, SHU (available from author). The key findings were:

Type of change – multiple metaphors were used in the bid document to indicate the nature of change. The type of change envisaged can be seen as cultural development (improvements within an existing cultural framework) as opposed to transformational (step changes in practice and the cultural framework itself. Four excellent courses (in terms of Employability) were identified in the bid document, and the idea was to use these to leverage change across Faculties, using the roll on – roll off process of Centre membership (a number of course leaders would work with the Centre for one year, and these would then give way to another group of course leaders in the ensuing year, and so on...). Change was to be enacted through existing structures, processes and departmental practices.

Communication and dissemination – the Centre had a core team charged with its development and dissemination activities. This was envisaged as fixed and stable, based upon the experts who had contributed to the bid document.

Membership of wider team (project leads sponsored by the e3i CETL were given the title of CETL Associates) – this was clearly specified as being for two years. The work of the wider team members was outlined in the bid document, but there was no discussion of exit strategy and support for colleagues who would relinquish links with the Centre after this period. In addition, new members were nominated by the Heads of Learning, Teaching and Assessment from within the Faculties, limiting the possibilities for some colleagues of participating in the activities of the Centre.

Course planning/validation – the SHU six yearly course planning cycle was perceived as a key opportunity for engaging course teams with the employability agenda. Whilst the logic of this was apparent, the course planning process is problematical from the point of the widest possible engagement of staff and internal politics of Faculties, both of which may act to narrow the possibilities for genuine discussion and deep engagement. In addition, this mechanistic approach to course planning reinforces the notion of developmental as opposed to transformative change.

Rewards – to staff involved in the CETL included honoraria, buy out of time, conference/dissemination support. Members received higher honoraria if they engaged as individuals rather than as teams, which could act as a disincentive to collaborative activity.

The language of change – the metaphor of journey is used in the bid document as a way of describing the nature of change envisaged. Useful as this was in terms of denoting movement and progression, it was also circumscribing in terms of future possibilities, and limiting in terms of pre-specifying the nature of movement from A to B. Other metaphors used included horticultural ones (e.g. organic change), and sporting ones (e.g. club atmosphere), and prestige and pride imagery. Such language proposes a certain status for the CETL and the people who work in it, but there was a danger that this can be perceived as elitist and exclusive.

Outputs – tangible outcomes arising from the work of the CETL in the form of tools, products and processes were identified as key outputs from the CETL. Useful as these may well be, this language is rooted in mechanistic notions of organisations which may not sit well with HEI's, and a deficit model of educational provision, where aspects of provision are deemed in need of fixing.

Post bid implementation

Within the first year of operation, a view emerged for the need to adopt a more organic and inclusive approach to change, one that encouraged transformational change and challenged existing structures and practices, without jettisoning all of the structural mechanisms identified within the bid document. These discussions were informed by debates about the nature of change and change in HEI's (see for example Stacey (2000), Henkel (2000) and Jackson (2005) and theory and research relating to curriculum, pedagogy and employability more generally.

Engagement of staff and departments with the work of the CETL was to be achieved in a number of ways, based on the principles of emergent and organic change, and based on an understanding of HEIs as complex adaptive systems:

- **Communication and positive engagement** with, for example subject groups, Heads of LTA and LTA co-ordinators, Student Support Services, Hallam Volunteering, Course Leaders, PDP co-ordinators, Quality co-ordinators, etc.
- **Course Planning and Validation** with course and subject teams.
- **Incentivising of activity** through buy-out time for projects, allocation of resources to develop tools etc.
- **Facilitation of projects, creation of tools and production of resources** through a Special Interest group network.
- **Collapsing of boundaries between CETLs, Faculties, Departments and Teams.**

This refined approach broadened the scope of activities the CETL would be involved in, broadened the range of people it would be involved with and was perceived as more inclusive and less 'corporate' than the one initially proposed. It was less directional at the outset and placed significant emphasis on a 'bottom-up' approach to educational development which encouraged the 'buy-in' of a greater number of colleagues than initially envisaged. We attempted to maintain our support for course planners and validation, albeit in a different manner. There is some discussion within the CETL team as to whether a the more structured emphasis on course validation (as envisaged in our initial bid document) would have been beneficial.

Question 8 – Reflecting upon the last 5 years what other important messages are there that you want to convey about your CETL – its successes, difficulties, impact etc.

In addition to the points made elsewhere in this report, we would like to suggest the following based upon our experiences:

Successes:

1 It is clear that the achievements/developments made by the CETL would not have been experienced without the resources that were allocated as part of the CETL initiative. It simply would not have been possible to devote the time, build the

expertise and broaden the commitment to Employability development without access to such large resources. An obvious point perhaps, but one we feel it is important to make.

2 We have been working with the 'grain 'of the institution (mission, brand, corporate plan) in terms of our focus upon Employability; we do believe that progress/impact would have been less if we were working against the 'grain' of the institution, something that other CETLs might have experienced.

3 The e3i core team dynamic has been excellent and the efforts to build a cohesive team in the early stages of the CETL and to add to the team over the years in an organic fashion, bringing in additional colleagues with particular strengths and deep links within Faculties, has been an important factor in realising outputs.

4 The internal impact of the CETL, in terms of bringing together groups of colleagues from across the university in various activities, has been an important development. A consequence of this, in addition to raising awareness and producing a focus on employability, is that people have attended events and conferences they might not have had it not been for their CETL involvement.

5 We feel it was important to have a change model that underpinned our work and modus operandi. This has been discussed in response to question 7. Emphasising the principles of emergent, organic change in situations of organisational complexity, viewing the university as a complex adaptive system, meant that it was not always possible to have a detailed road map laid out to guide our work, but we asserted an element of managerial co-ordination by annual action planning, involving objectives, milestones and individual accountabilities.

6 SHU has 3 CETLs and we have adopted joint approaches where this has made sense and shared our experiences and approaches to educational development and leading change. We have found this to be a very positive and energising experience which suggests the power of collaboration in educational development projects.

7 Members of the Careers and Employment Service have been key members of the CETL team, and CETL resource has been important in supporting some of the work of the C&ES over the period.

Difficulties

1 We have undertaken work to digest, summarise and publicise the findings of research and evaluation studies that attempt to establish which Employability skills are desired by employers. We have not undertaken new primary research ourselves in this area due to the way in which we have prioritised our resources and activities. However, this might have been an expectation held by some stakeholders in the CETL, and something we had to explain on a number of occasions.

2 We have not developed significant new links with employers as a CETL. We perceived our role as educational development i.e. working principally with those involved with student learning. However, it was clear that at times some colleagues/managers within the university had a different perception of what role and purpose of the CETL and were surprised to find that we did not have direct links with employers ourselves, or were promoting an employer engagement strategy for the university. Within this context it is also relevant to mention that we have been keen to stress the difference between employability and employment, as the latter has become more dominant as a performance indicator within the university.

3 We have been drawn into the discussion within the university recently about graduate level employment and have been asked to demonstrate how we (as a CETL) are contributing to SHU performance in this area as measured by the Destination of Leavers in Higher Education Survey. Whilst clearly we believe there is an impact of the work of the CETL on this measure we do not believe our work can be authenticated by reference to such a summary and problematical instrument and its findings. We have had difficulty in explaining this position on occasions within the university.

4 In summary, the above difficulties relate to perceptions from within the university concerning the role and purpose of the CETL, which did not resonate with the raison d'etre explained in the bid document and the central objectives adopted by the CETL.

Impact:

1 Our central aim has been to expand the opportunities that students have to develop their Employability skills as part of their SHU learning experience. To this end we developed an evaluation strategy that would provide data on the extent to which we have met this aim. However, it has been much more difficult to establish whether the (particularly) SHU learning experience has prepared students well for the workplace or benefited them directly in this context **after** graduation. We have some research evidence to this effect but it is from a relatively small sample, plus some anecdotal evidence. There is therefore a real need for research to be undertaken which investigates the linkages between Employability pedagogy and graduate employment/initial workplace experiences which brings forth changes and developments to pedagogy over time.

2 It is also the case that the impact of the CETL has been experienced more by some students and some courses than others i.e. that there has been differential impact across the university. We do believe, however, that there is now greater awareness of employability amongst students generally. The CETL has helped to promote this through conferences, projects and encouraging student involvement.

3 Although we have devised an evaluation strategy and made an assessment of the work of the CETL, having reviewed approaches to evaluation in education settings and some of the empirical work undertaken, we feel this is a relatively underdeveloped aspect of educational development. Our expectation is that there would be more guidance and shared experience that could be called upon and used in our own evaluation but that this was not the case in practice. This is something that would be useful for both HEFCE and the HEA to consider further.

Question 9 – Reflecting on the last 5 years what important messages are there that you want to convey about the experience of being part of a wider 'movement'/experience of other CETLs.

The CETL initiative and CETL movement have provided opportunities, resources, networks, information, institutional linkages and personal contacts that have been invaluable in supporting educational development and impacting upon the student experience. This is an unprecedented initiative which has produced unprecedented outcomes and outputs across the sector. The visibility and transparency of CETL activities (e.g. through events organised by HEFCE and the HEA Subject Centres, through events organised by individual CETLs and the websites and information that has been disseminated) has made it easier to identify and establish leading and innovative thinking, the colleagues involved, and created a rich resource base on which to draw from.

 Much of the above has developed in an organic fashion and it is probably the case that more could have been done to "project manage" the CETL initiative as whole to further support and maximise the gains from showcasing, communication and collaboration. Whether this be in the form of central directories, data bases, web sites, events or more formal and frequent reporting and CETL-wide dissemination activities, we feel that an opportunity has been missed to some extent to leverage the learning and insight from the CETL initiative as a whole by the lack of a more structured project management steer.

We do however feel that the CETL initiative has contributed significantly to raising the profile of teaching and learning in HEIs, has been motivating for colleagues involved with CETL work, and has been important in building confidence about the importance and acceptance of a learning and teaching career track in HEIs.

We also feel that the initiative has brought institutions closer to their students, given the focus on student learning, and that the myriad ways in which students have been involved in CETL work has given practical manifestation to the notions of student centred learning and student centred institutions. In this sense the initiative has contributed to the ongoing culture change in UK HEIs.

Being part of a wider movement builds status, confidence and power for those involved, which have been used to enhance learning, teaching and assessment at a time of increasing accountability of HEIs. In this sense there is a clear linkage between the work of the CETLs the high levels of student satisfaction recorded in the National Student Survey, and the international reputation of the UK HE sector.

Question 10 - Please reflect on the work emerging from your CETL that has been 'transferable' i.e. useable beyond the home audience for which it was originally developed (you may wish to comment in terms of materials produced, a community created, understandings that CETL work has illuminated and which are useful to others, etc.). It would be useful to hear 'messages' and lessons learnt that you would like to continue to be disseminated.

Resources – we have:

- Produced a career management skills resource (STARs) in conjunction with the University of Bedford and the OU which received considerable interest from across the sector at its launch at the e3i annual conference in 2009.
- Produced a memory stick resource "What Next" (which could also be delivered via a website) for final year students to help them in the transition into work in the current economic climate– this again of interest when launched in the same way as STARs.
- Produced a case study booklet which is available in both hard copy and via the e3i website which includes exemplars of Employability pedagogy.
- Supported the design and use of two alumni websites and contact systems (in real estate and hospitality) which we think will be of interest across the sector as HEIs become increasingly proactive in developing alumni communities.
- Developed a website of official publications relating to Employability which has been made available to the sector as a whole.
- Produced a career management skills CD Rom for education studies students, the design and template of which could be of interest to other subject areas.
- Produced a PDP card game which can be run in a number of guises and which has been well received by academics who have used this with students.
- Produced a Career Development Learning module guide and tutor pack, which has informed the design of credit bearing career management skills modules in SHU and other HEIs as well as providing source material for the teaching and assessment of CMS in SHU.

The Venture Matrix – we have supported the development of a unit within the university that facilitates, supports and organises opportunities for students to engage in work-related and work-based learning with a particular emphasis upon enterprise skills. Students engage in this process in a variety of ways e.g. student

groups offering and providing a particular service, student groups undertaking work for outside clients. Students gain academic credit for participating in the VM. The design of the VM plus the knowledge gained in building engagement from all four Faculties of SHU could be of interest to other institutions in the sector.

Graduate Consulting Unit in the Sheffield Business School – e3i has supported the development of a graduate consulting unit in SBS where employers are invited to pay for high quality consultancy services provided by PG students. The design of the GCU plus the knowledge gained developing its modus operandi could be of interest to other institutions in the sector.

Research on alumni perspectives on their employability skills – we have conducted research with our alumni investigating their perceptions of how well their courses prepared them for the world of work in terms of their Employability skills. The research provides insights that will be of interest more broadly across the sector, particularly in relation to those skills which are seem to be more important and those more difficult to facilitated in a convention educational setting.

Approaches to embedding Employability in the curriculum – we have considerable experience in "designing Employability into the curriculum", including Employability modules, holistic course design, supporting processes such as PDP, that could be of interest to colleagues interested in "how to do Employability".

Employability Guarantee/Employability Award – We have researched Employability Awards in other institutions and the notion of an Employability Guarantee used by one institution in the US. Following on from this we have designed our won Employability Award, the template for which might be of interest to HEIs wishing to develop their own scheme.

Employability survey instruments – we have developed a survey instrument and an audit instrument to help developers understand the extent to which Employability is incorporated in curriculum design which would be of interest to programme planners and reviewers.

Validation pack – we have produced a pack, both electronically and in hard copy to inform and support course planners when they are either designing or re-designing courses. This is not SHU specific and would be useful to colleagues in similar roles outside of the institution.

Alumni schemes – we have supported two alumni schemes (in real estate and hospitality) which use a customised version of the SHU alumni software to maintain contact and communication with alumni; the design of these web-based systems and the broader alumni strategy that has been designed would be of interest in universities which have similar alumni objectives.

Question 11 – How will the work and achievements of your CETL continue after HEFCE funding ends? Please reflect on how far you think CETL work has become embedded in your institution or discipline and indicate if any structures have been put in place to ensure its legacy is not lost.

Over the last 18 months we have been considering how the work of the e3i CETL can be made sustainable. In this last academic year we have been working as part of a university initiative to pursue a new corporate plan. The plan identifies Employability as a key university priority, and a working group (the Graduate Employment Working Group) has been established to produce an action plan going forward and the oversight of these actions. The e3i Director has been appointed as the assistant to the PVC in charge of this project, which provides the opportunity to link the work and learning produced by the CETL directly to the strategic and operational decision making of the university in this field. The working group has commissioned 3 task groups for 2009-10, one of which, with a focus on curriculum development, is effectively the e3i CETL team in another guise. This task team has been tasked to design a Core Minimum Entitlement for Employability Skills for SHU students, which will form part of the SHU offer and student learning experience over the next 5 years. In this sense the e3i CETL will continue to influence the university approach to Employability over the next few years.

The GEWG has also suggested a structure to support the implementation of its plans, and this involves having an Employability Champion in each Faculty. It is expected that some of the existing Associate Directors will be involved in these roles. The GWEG has also secured a financial commitment from the university to support its work over the next 5 years, clarifying the ever thorny issue of resource.

As the Associate Directors return full time to their Faculties and Central Departments, we expect them to continue to lead, support and be called upon with respect to Employability initiatives in their local contexts, and to use the experience and learning they have obtained whilst being members of the CETL team.

It remains to be seen whether or not the university will maintain a separate Employability policy document outside of the Core Minimum Entitlement statement, but if it does this will be the 2004 Employability framework which has been revised by the e3i team.

Much CETL work has been focused on changing teaching and learning practices, curriculum design and generating a supportive infrastructure. These will continue at least in the short term as an "imprint" on organisational practices which will be reproduced as part of the educational cycle. As colleagues who have been involved in the CETL remain in the institution, it can be expected that they will continue to be agents of change in relation to Employability skills and pedagogy.

In terms of resources, we are aiming to put as many of these as possible on the recently upgradede3i website (which now has a top level domain name within SHU)

and ways of accessing these resources outside of the website. We do not envisage a dynamic website from the end of the CETL but we aim to maintain the site with a basic level of housekeeping so that it is still attractive to use and accessible. Discussions are ongoing at present about this particular responsibility.

In terms of embededness, we feel that the work of the CETL is *significantly* part of the fabric of the institution. We have commented on this in our response to question 2 and can see how our work has impacted at the different levels we have identified: macro, meso and micro.

Question 12 – Do you think there are any emerging aspects of your CETL activity that will have greater importance in the future?

We feel there are a number of aspects of our work that will have greater importance in the future:

1 Many HEIs have statements about Employability and the skills they expect students to develop; however, there is less confidence across the sector that students within institutions benefit from a uniform or base-line experience in this context. Indeed, many investigations find this aspect somewhat patchy, dependent on subject, course, the enthusiasm/interest of tutors etc. We feel the work we have undertaken to support a Core Minimum Entitlement will be of interest and of greater importance to the sector in the future, as universities are challenged to evidence their commitment in practice and at a level of detail (note here the possibilities contained in the Higher Education Achievement Record).

2 Although we have not successfully implemented a SHU Employability Award, we feel our prototype design will be of interest to other HEIs. Such awards are no longer a rare phenomenon in the UK HE sector, but the e3i design was based upon the possibility of a large number of students being able to achieve the award – within existing schemes at other universities only a fraction of the student population has any reasonable chance of obtaining such an award. The issue of scalability will continue to challenge HEIs and we feel our own thinking in this context will have greater salience in the future.

3 Universities obtain large amounts of feedback from existing students on the different aspects of their learning experience. However, they are relatively poor at securing feedback from alumni. If Employability within universities is to be given a new lease of life it is just such feedback that is required. We feel our two alumni schemes show great promise in this context and provide approaches that have generated valuable insights from alumni that can be reflected upon in course and module design. As such we feel that alumni feedback will be of increasing importance to universities in the future.

4 We have generated some interesting discussions over the last few years on the difference between skills for employment and employability more generally. We have been very clear in our work that we have been interested in increasing the *opportunities* that students have to develop their employability skills. We have also attempted some measure of this in our evaluation work. At the level of the HE system, the Destination of Leavers in Higher Education survey results (employment after 6 months of graduation, graduate level employment etc.) are being used as a proxy for the Employability performance of institutions. We believe this is a mistake as it measures the wrong thing in misleading way. We hope and believe that in the future a more sophisticated approach to measuring the Employability performance of HEIs will emerge.

5 We feel the evaluation challenge that all CETLs, including our own, have wrestled with has demonstrated the general difficulty of undertaking robust evaluation in educational contexts, and perhaps a lack of general expertise or confidence in this area. We feel this aspect will be of greater importance in the future, with probably a reduced amount of funding for educational development in HE, and the way in which capability could be built in this context will be a continuing issue.

Question 13 – Any other comments?

We feel the CETL initiative overall has made a major contribution to raising the profile of teaching and learning across the sector, has supported innovation and dissemination of innovative approaches to learning and teaching, and has generated resources to support learning and teaching and a cadre of individuals who have much to offer the sector in this context. Within our own university, we believe CETL activities have left a clear imprint upon the values and everyday practices of colleagues and students and have helped the institution to "make real" some of its espoused aims and objectives. Although we recognise that funding will be much tighter in universities over the next few years due to the government's fiscal deficit, we feel it is important that the energy and initiatives delivered by CETLs continue to be encouraged and supported. We recognise that HEFCE has made it clear to institutions that they are responsible for the sustainability dimensions of CETL work. However, in addition, feel there is a role for HEFCE to play here, in terms of future reporting requirements for universities, and future events/conferences where the legacy of CETL activities can be featured, debated and built upon. We look forward to being able to make a contribution to such initiatives.

Bibliography

Henkel, M (2000) "Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education," Jessica King Publishers Ltd.

Jackson, N (2005) "Understanding how we accomplish complex change in higher education institutions," HE Academy UK.

Stacey, R.D. (2000) "Strategic Management and Organisational Dynamics: the Challenge of Complexity." London: Routledge.