Roundtable Day 1: 10:15am - 11:45am

Case Studies

Session 1 – Program and Abstracts

National SAP Roundtable 2021
Hosted by the 21C Student Curriculum Partners

Case Studies Session 1 Program

Click on Case Study Title to View Abstract

Time	Zoom room 1	Zoom room 2	Zoom room 3	Zoom room 4	Zoom room 5	Zoom room 6
10.15am (25mins)	**CS 1** **Issues around students' proficiency in partnership** *Dominique Veerpoorten, BELGIUM*	**CS 4** **How to balance student and staff partners' expectations and experiences?** *Franciele Spinelli et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 7** **Generating Student Engagement Through Peer-To-Peer Empowerment** *Mark Tanner et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 10** **Students as pedagogic consultants: First steps from niche experiences and pockets of good practice towards impactful legacy** *Lia Blaj-Ward et al., ENGLAND*	**CS 13** **Gateway to Student Partnership: A Students Mentoring Staff Program** *Mollie Dollinger, AUSTRALIA*	**CS 6** **From rigid to floppy: Assessment policy transformations, students' friend or foe?** *Aidan Cornelius-Bell et al., AUSTRALIA*
10.45am (25mins)	**CS 2** **The Professionals Competency Assessment: Students as drivers** *Chad Gladovic, AUSTRALIA*	**CS 5** **Our Voices Matter: The Role of a Pedagogical Consultant in the ESL course** *Svetlana Vikhnevich et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 8** **Student as a pedagogical consultant: Overcoming the cultural barrier** *Amrita Kaur et al., CHINA*	**CS 11** **Digital collaboration tools as foundations for postgraduate peer-to-peer support networks at USC** *Belinda Brear et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 14** **Navigating issues of identity, authority and expertise with students as mentors** *Jane Kiddell et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 17** **The boring administrative side of things: Engaging students in decision-making and governance in the University Library** *Imogen Harris-McNeil et al., AUSTRALIA*
11.15am (25mins)	**CS 3** **Is it partnership? Two examples to push our boundaries and test our assumptions** *Kelly Matthews et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 6** **When We Are the University, what is possible? Partnership paradoxes at the learning coalface** *Tai Peseta et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 9** **Navigating Power and Authority across Differences of Age, Race, Gender, and Discipline in a STEM Classroom-Focused Pedagogical Partnership** *Alison Cook-Sather et al., USA*	**CS 12** **#FASSfromhome Students as Partners Communications Team: Building an online community during the COVID-19 pandemic** *Karen Walker et al., AUSTRALIA*	**CS 15** **Can partnership succeed when not actively supported by the institution and/or goes against institutional culture?** *Ketevan Kupatadze et al., USA*	**CS 18** **Decode and Recode: Finding accessibility in policy writing for students** *Matt Brett et al., AUSTRALIA*

Issues around students' proficiency in partnership

Dominique Verpoorten
University of Liège BELGIUM

In recent years, the University of Liège, (Belgium), like many other institutions, has been coping with an ever-increasing number of first-year students, not compensated by an equivalent increase of supervisory capacities. This situation has resulted in both a rather impersonal first-year experience for freshmen and a worrisome level of drop-out and failure, especially in difficult entry courses. To tackle these issues, ULiège has decided to run several SI-PASS (Supplemental Instruction - Peer-assisted study sessions) schemes (Verpoorten et al., 2021). In a few courses recording year after year a high level of failure, groups of freshmen are formed. They meet every week with a 'leader' that is an older student who went through the difficult course and succeeded. Leaders have been trained not to teach (faculty's role) but to stimulate conversations on the material covered during the previous lecture. The schemes generate a fair level of satisfaction and effects on performance have been observed. However, from feedback surveys, it comes out that some participants blame their leaders' insufficient deep knowledge of the material while leaders are trained to activate deep knowledge. This is the paradox we bring to discussion. To what extent is it possible for a student to be considered as a partner while one knows that his/her mastery is lower than faculty's one? Isn't it some form of 'pedagogical romanticism'? This paradox has already been pinpointed by Nilsson & Luchinskaya (2021, p. 95): "Many of the SI-PASS leaders felt that there could be more subject-specific preparatory courses for the new leaders". However, we run here into another paradox. If

a university, in addition to regular 'process-wise' training (how to stimulate and maintain conversations about the topic?), must start delivering 'content-wise' training to the leaders so that their proficiency is warranted, it becomes heavy for the course leader and the program coordinator and expensive for the institution (leaders are paid) to set-up the program. Another related problem is the role of the course leader in these schemes. On the one hand, it is nice to announce to overbooked faculties that the program does not require much time investment from them. So, the 'partnership' is deliberately kept limited. However, if content-related problems occur, their investment should be revised upwards. The 'student-as-partners' aspect would increase (actually, can PASS supplemental instruction be labelled as SAP?) but the program might also simply disappear and this reinforcement would be both more time-consuming and expensive!

The Professionals Competency Assessment: Students as drivers

Chad Gladovic
Holmesglen Institute AUSTRALIA

One of the critical capabilities students, recent graduates, and professionals in any industry need to master is the capability to evaluate and assess the quality of their own, and the work of others. Within our institution, we are witness to narratives from employers across many industries who continually criticise the educational sector: that graduates they produce are not job-ready and unable to operate efficiently within their chosen professions. Problem-solving abilities alone are insufficient to equip students with capabilities to perform successfully within any industry. Other capabilities such as reflective practices and various judgment-related skills are required to succeed in their professional field after graduation and outside of the educational environment. There are so many capabilities and skills needed from students to develop during their educational journeys. Still, they are hardly provided with the opportunity to be in the centre of their learning and assessment. One of the paradoxes we constantly witness are educators who are saying that students should have the right to make decisions of their learning and assessment, but such opportunity is withdrawn from them.

Therefore, a change of the assessment model that places students in the centre of their learning and in the centre of their assessment, seems like an excellent pedagogical enhancement to help learners develop a variety of necessary skills. The Professional Competency Assessment is a new and life-changing experience for students with the potential to prepare them for the increasingly complex and uncertain world beyond academia. The Professional Competency Assessment model aims to assess and evidence the professional development of students progressively. The model empowers learners by giving them agency in their own assessment, a skill that is required from many industries. It incorporates self-assessment, peer assessment, portfolios and ongoing reflective practice throughout the delivery of units of learning. The process is driven by complex industry problems and includes integrated self-assessment, peer assessment, and portfolios to evidence sound and professional decision-making reflecting a professional practice context. The assessment process closes the loop on students' learning and application in terms of a holistic approach, educating students to be responsive and adaptable professionals; in other words, to find their place of belonging in educational and professional environments.

The primary purpose of this abstract is to expand the discussion about a new type of assessment model with the potential to enforce the belonging of students in the educational and professional words of tomorrow.

Case Study 3

Is it partnership? Two examples to push our boundaries and test our assumptions

Kelly Matthews, Tiahna Addicott, Jennifer Lincoln, Thomas (Nathan) McGrath, Glenys Oberg & Preeti Vayada
The University of Queensland AUSTRALIA

Here is the context: A compulsory second-year subject shaped by COVID-19 with no lectures, self-directed online activities, and weekly workshops (on-campus or online depending on health advice).

Here are the people: 1 subject coordinator (ongoing contract), 50+ students (over 80% working, most studying full-time), a co-facilitator (casual contract), 3 student partners (grant funded), 2 markers (casual contract), and a textbook author.

Example 1: The obvious project-based partnership process (intense and dialogic co-design): 3 students and 1 subject coordinator worked together before the subject started. There were conversations about the subject (the students completed it in the prior year). There were decisions made to enhance learning by co-designing weekly videos from students to introduce each topic. The process was recognised (and compensated) through an institutional Student-Staff Partnership (SSP) project scheme and then other funding (to continue after we reached the limit of the SSP project timeline/funding).

Example 2: The less obvious partnership process (blurring learner-teacher lines in class): Throughout the semester, learners and teachers shared responsibility for learning in the class. The 3 student co-design partners co-facilitated the 1st workshop and introduced the content each week through online videos. The intent was to signal the role of students as both learners and teachers in the class. During the semester, the students in the class:

- engaged in weekly learning activities that started with student-led videos
- stayed connected with the teacher through weekly (online) participation activities including discussion posts and polls
- engaged with the textbook author though weekly readings and open-book online quizzes
- worked together in groups of 4 in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to:
- co-create and share understanding of theory applied to practice in weekly workshops
- co-author a semester-long portfolio of learning using a collaborative online platform
- review each other's assessment tasks and provide feedback before submission of major tasks
- used PLC feedback to revise their assessment tasks
- self-assessed the quality of their work when submitting assessment tasks
- received strength-based guidance to inform ongoing learning from markers
- developed their capacity in judging the quality of their own work, as markers elaborated on their self-assessment to guide future learning

There was no SSP scheme or label of 'partnership' to recognise this classroom process.

The paradox: In both examples, partnership was the inspiration and aspiration. A culture of partnership steeped in the values of recognition (Aquarone et al., 2020) and reciprocity (Cook-Sather & Felten, 2017) to re-shape power dynamics through a commitment to genuine practices (Matthews, 2017) influenced by the vulnerability arising from COVID-19 (Vayada et al., 2020). But do they both warrant the label of partnership? And what does it mean if we stretch the idea of partnership too far or bound it too tightly?

Case Study 4

How to balance student and staff partners' expectations and experiences?

Franciele Spinelli, Seb Dianata & Noriko Iwashita
The University of Queensland AUSTRALIA

While Student-Staff partnership (SSP) is defined differently across the literature, there is an overall agreement of what it entails: a collaborative work between students and staff towards a common educational objective (Matthews, 2016). More than teamwork, SSP embodies the ethos of shared responsibility and mutual learning (Bovill, 2019), in which all partners take ownership of the project, its process and outcomes. Although shared responsibility and co-creation are at the heart of partnership, the implementation of these principles can be quite troublesome. In our context of partnership for the co-design, evaluation, and implementation of learning activities and assessment for four courses of a master's degree program over a three-year period, we came to experience the challenges of embedding partnership from the ground-up of curriculum decision and design. We realised that even though student and staff partners feel eager to experiment the partnership world, they may feel emotional, vulnerable, and even confused in process of working in collaboration with one another. While student partners are enthusiastic about acting as change agents to creatively improve some of the courses they have taken, staff partners may not be able to implement all the students' suggestions due to university requirements and budgeting limitations. Our case study shares the experience of balancing students' and staffs' expectations. We aim to also present some strategies and technologies that have enabled us to create a collegial environment where all partners have the space and opportunity to truly contribute to the project and, at the same time, share their fears and potential doubts about project outcomes. Drawing upon Cook-Sather, Bovill and Felten (2014, p. 6-7), we would like to share how we established partnership as 'reciprocal process' by continuously acknowledging and negotiating all partners' voices.

References

Bovill, C. (2019). Student-staff partnerships in learning and teaching: An overview of current practice and discourse. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 43*(4), 385-398. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2019.1660628

Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Matthews, K. (2016). Students as partners as the future of student engagement. *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal, 1*(1). https://sehej.raise-network.com/raise/article/view/380

Our Voices Matter: The Role of a Pedagogical Consultant in the ESL course

Svetlana Vikhnevich, Yuchen Gao & Linghan Jiang
Wenzhou-Kean University CHINA

This case study was conducted in the English as a Second Language (ESL) course taught at the Sino-Foreign University. Recently, many qualitative studies have revealed positive outcomes of student-faculty collaboration where students become pedagogical consultants (Cook-Sather, 2020; Daviduke, 2018). However, most studies invited sophomores through seniors to form such partnerships and were rarely conducted in the Asian context. Besides, such studies rarely involve feedback from the other students to prove that the suggestions were practical. This partnership involving two freshmen addresses the problem of rarely (a) involving Asian first-year students to give suggestions on existing classroom activities and classroom management and (b) incorporating peers' feedback on consultants' suggestions, via focus group discussions.

The reflection on this partnership allowed the participants to identify two major puzzles. The first paradox involves varying levels of activities' success among different groups of students. For example, one consultant recommended an 'advertisement creation' activity which was among the most engaging activities in her other class. However, it was not identified as successful in the observed ESL classes. Another activity (i.e., vocabulary quizzes) that paradoxically worked well in one section with mixed business majors did not seem to be liked by students of the design majors. These surprising observations were identified during the focused group discussions across three ESL sections taught by the same instructor. This paradox taught the participants that there is no one-size-fits-all successful classroom activity because various factors can contribute to its effectiveness (e.g., students' English level, motivation). The second paradox points out the hidden struggles of the participants. The partnership members all seemed genuinely engaged and excited during the project. However, it was not until the final reflection on the project when the participants discovered that each member, including the instructor, had thoughts of quitting the partnership for various reasons (e.g., busyness, being not confident in giving suggestions, and career plans change). Surprisingly, those hidden struggles did not affect the participants' commitment and the positive outcomes of the project. This project allowed to promote teaching and learning and reflect on various paradoxes met during the partnership.

References

Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Student voice across contexts: Fostering student agency in today's schools. *Theory Into Practice, 59*(2), 182-191. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1705091

Daviduke, N. (2018). Growing into pedagogical partnerships over time and across disciplines: My experience as a non-STEM student consultant in STEM courses. *International Journal for Students as Partners, 2*(2). https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v2i2.3443

When We Are the University, what is possible? Partnership paradoxes at the learning coalface

Tai Peseta, Samanda Tharaki Arachchi, Rayaca Taybally, Jen Alford, Vicky-Rae Reed & Shivani Suresh
Western Sydney University AUSTRALIA

The unit 'We Are The University: students co-creating change' (hereafter WATU) is a third year elective unit, available to any student in any degree at Western Sydney University. It was first presented at the National Students as Partners Roundtable in 2019. At that stage, we were at the beginning of the journey and excited: it was a unit being co-created with a paid group of student partners. In 2020, we presented on WATU at the Deakin Roundtable. It ran for the first time, online, with a small cohort of 4 students whose experience of student-staff partnership ranged from non-existent, to aspiring activist, to long-time student representative. This year, in 2021, WATU has morphed yet again to embed a 3-week Curiosity Pod (Students as Partners: co-creating change) aimed at giving any student a taster of staff-student partnership before later enrolling in the WATU unit itself. With two international students located off-shore and in different time zones, due to COVID, once again we pivoted to being online together.

One of WATU's unique features is the extent of its commitment to partnership pedagogy (Barrie & Pizzica, 2019). First, it has been co-created with the group of student curriculum partners working on the 21C project. They co-developed WATU's aims, learning outcomes, crafted content, recommended an assessment strategy, made resources for students to engage with, are involved in the coaching, and WATU's ongoing evaluation. Essentially, these students are WATU's custodians. Second, WATU is also a partnership with our University's Senate Education Committee who, in commissioning projects for students to complete as part of the assessment, then consider students' projects as a standing item. This helps WATU stay connected with the University's learning and teaching priorities. Third, and most pertinent for this presentation, WATU's pedagogy is negotiated with the students enrolled in the unit. Where we can, we make decisions together that encourage institutional curiosity and questioning (Hunter, 2012), that disrupt and share power (Flint & Goddard, 2020) with the aim of cultivating student agency and responsibility.

The 6 of us in this presentation include 3 students who have completed WATU, 2 students currently enrolled in WATU, and the unit coordinator. As a team, we highlight four partnership paradoxes for further discussion. What happens for students when:

- WATU invites a pedagogy of partnership but the remainder of your units do not;
- Your WATU project is actually implemented and there are growing demands on your time to do more;
- WATU encourages students to think big but Senate Education Committee wants something do-able; and
- You have been a frustrated advocate for change and you realise through WATU what it takes for change to happen in universities.

By highlighting these paradoxes, our goal is not to celebrate WATU uncritically. Rather it is to ask what happens when a partnership initiative provides an avenue for students to begin to believe that they ARE the University: what changes about their relationship to the University?

References

Barrie, S., & Pizzica, J. (2019). Reimagining university curriculum for a disrupted future of work: Partnership pedagogy. In J. Higgs, W. Letts, & G. Crisp (Eds.), *Education for employability (Volume 2)* (pp. 143-152). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Murphy, R., Nixon, S. Brooman, S. & Fearon, D. (2017). "I am weary of giving too much power to students:" Addressing the "but" in the Principle of Student-Staff Partnership. *International Journal for Students as Partners, 1*(1), https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i1.3055

Hunter, G. (2012). Students study up the university: Perspectives gained in student research on the university as institution. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, *12*(1), 19–43. https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-1302750

Generating Student Engagement Through Peer-To-Peer Empowerment

Mark Tanner, George Ballas, Stephen Gray, Jennifer Zhang, Brendan Major & Will Sommerville
The University of Queensland AUSTRALIA

The initiative was conceived in response to the disconnect felt by students whose studies were impacted by COVID-19, and feedback from Alumni and industry focusing on the importance of student engagement. This partnership is taking place at the University of Queensland Business School, within the Bachelor of Advanced Finance and Economics (BAFE) program. The BAFE Improvement Committee (IC) comprises four final year students and two academic supervisors. The aim of BAFE IC has been to revive engagement with the student body, within coursework, extra-curricular competitions and career readiness events.

The paradox at the core of the initiative was that students who can potentially provide the most useful program feedback are often the least likely provide feedback. These students and their needs have often slipped through the cracks, and it is their feedback that could shine a light on the key problem areas of program. This paradox is consistent with the literature concerning course evaluations, with Bacon et al (2016) and Goos et al (2017) reporting that often underperforming students are disenfranchised and thus do not engage with feedback surveys. We expected that this relationship was exacerbated by the disconnect generated by online learning through COVID-19. We also expected that other aspects of the student experience were negatively impacted by COVID-19. Experience categories such as peer-to-peer connectivity and career readiness were less accessible in an online format, as these areas are normally administered through opt-in social presentations on campus, which have a less compelling offering when administered virtually.

Our solution was to engage our peers, as peers, and seek actionable feedback that we could utilise to implement change in real time. We were able to ask questions that addressed student concerns beyond academic outcomes, and we used this feedback immediately to demonstrate our commitment to utilising the perspectives of the student body. Response rates were 4 times higher than typical course surveys. Based on the feedback, we worked with our academic partners to improve course work, connect students with industry professionals and host career pathways discussion evenings. The BAFE IC was the most viable solution to achieve this change, as the partnership was able to engage students on a personal level while also being able to navigate the institutional requirements of the university in order to implement the feedback. The student response has been immensely positive, with many indicating their appreciation of a student-led means of engagement.

References

Donald R. Bacon, Carol J. Johnson & Kim A. Stewart (2016). Nonresponse Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching. *Marketing Education Review, 26*(2), 93-104 https://doi.org/10.1080/10528008.2016.1166442

Goos, M., Salomons, A. (2017). Measuring teaching quality in higher education: assessing selection bias in course evaluations. *Research in Higher Education, 58,* 341-364 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-016-9429-8

Student as a pedagogical consultant: Overcoming the cultural barrier

Amrita Kaur & Yusheng Tang
Wenzhou-Kean University CHINA

This case study discusses students' and faculty's experiences of a pedagogical consultancy at Wenzhou-Kean University (WKU) in China. WKU is a Sino-American institute with Chinese students; the faculty members are international and diverse. This partnership collaboration is almost a year long and is currently ongoing.

Grounded in the student pedagogical consultancy model to enhance pedagogical practices, this partnership initiative provides professional development opportunities for the faculty and space for students' voices (Pounder et al., 2016). These collaborations facilitate pedagogical transparency to get honest feedback based on the partnership between staff and students. However, emulating these models across different cultures can pose challenges (Kaur & Toh, 2019). During the initial phase of the current partnership, the student consultant raised several pertinent questions like: should my role as consultant be revealed to other students? Will that revelation make students behave differently than usual? Where should I sit in the classroom to perform my observations?

Often, the student was unsure whether, as a pedagogical consultant, it was appropriate for him to point out deficiencies in teaching. The faculty also faced similar predicaments. It was difficult for her to receive advice from the student consultant that appeared, at times, contradictory to her views of teaching and learning. The faculty could not decide how often she should justify her teaching decisions to her student consultant when he questioned her practice. However, the students and faculty constantly deliberate on these dilemmas, acknowledging their origins are rooted in the social and cultural context of the study, which is built around respect, humility, and hierarchy. They both have also realized that consistent communication, open, honest discussion on such dilemmas, acknowledgment, acceptance of those challenges, and affirmation of each other's actions are the way forward to strengthen these partnerships.

References

Kaur, A., & Yong Bing, T. (2020). Untangling the power dynamics in forging student-faculty collaboration. In A. Cook-Sather and C. Wilson (Eds.). *Building Courage, Confidence, and Capacity in Learning and Teaching through Student-Faculty Partnership: Stories from across Contexts and Arenas of Practice.* Lexington Books.

Pounder, J.S., Ho Hung-lam, E & May Groves, J. (2016). Faculty-student engagement in teaching observation and assessment: a Hong Kong initiative. A*ssessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 41*(8), 1193-1205 https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1071779

Navigating Power and Authority across Differences of Age, Race, Gender, and Discipline in a STEM Classroom-Focused Pedagogical Partnership

Alison Cook-Sather, Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges USA & Ebony Graham, Haverford College USA

Haverford College, Pennsylvania, USA, is part of a bi-college, liberal arts, consortium (with Bryn Mawr College) that houses the Students as Learners and Teachers (SaLT) program, which pairs undergraduate students and academic staff in semester-long, pedagogical partnerships.

Since its advent, SaLT has sought to foster dialogue across differences of position, perspective, and identity (Cook-Sather, 2015) and promote equity and justice (de Bie et al., 2021) through pedagogical partnership. In response to a student-led strike for racial justice at Haverford College in the Spring-2020 term, an academic staff member in the Biology Department requested to work with a SaLT student consultant during the summer of 2021 to redesign an introductory biology course to be more attentive to diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism (DEI/A-R). A white male with tenure, this staff member continued to work with the same student consultant as he taught the course in the Fall-2021 term. The student consultant is a third-year, undergraduate, African-American, cis-gendered female majoring in a non-STEM discipline. This partnership addresses and enacts complexities of power and authority both in the classroom (between the staff member and enrolled students) and in the partnership (between the staff member and his student consultant).

The Partnership initiative addresses the challenge/problem through (a) taking the revision of the biology course as the focus of the partnership work for DEI/A-R and (b) supporting the student consultant, through weekly meetings and ongoing dialogue with the SaLT program director and other student partners, in naming, managing, and challenging the power and authority dynamics noted above.

The Paradox for discussion is how to affirm the DEI/A-R efforts of the staff member while also challenging the ways in which his power and authority "and his positionality" unintentionally reinforce power dynamics across differences of age, race, gender, and discipline. This dynamic threatens to exacerbate the pattern through which female BIPOC students are discouraged from pursuing STEM majors and challenges the student consultant to build on the trusting, generative partnership she and her staff partner have created while also naming and calling for revision of the detrimental dynamics of power and authority.

References

Cook-Sather, A. (2015). Dialogue across differences of position, perspective, and identity: Reflective practice in/on a student-faculty pedagogical partnership program. *Teachers College Record, 117*(2).

de Bie, A., Marquis, E., Cook-Sather, A., & Luqueno, L. P. (2021). *Promoting Equity and Justice through Pedagogical Partnership*. Stylus Publishers.

Students as pedagogic consultants: First steps from niche experiences and pockets of good practice towards impactful legacy

Lia Blaj-Ward, Nottingham University ENGLAND
& Assia Jebali FRANCE

As a staff volunteering activity and as an opportunity to explore a new learning approach, Lia hosted at her university, in June 2019 and February 2020, a teenager from a girls' only school on a week of work experience. To redesign the 2021 iteration, delivered mainly virtually with only one on-campus meeting during the pandemic, Lia enlisted the help of a European exchange semester student (Assia Jebali), who took on the role of pedagogic consultant (see Healey & Healey, 2019). Lia' collaboration with Assia was funded by NTU's Trent Institute for Learning and Teaching as a one-off project and was an extra-curricular activity for Assia.

As someone who was completely new to the NTU campus and only a semester-long visitor herself, Assia was uniquely positioned to empathise with the work experience participant to be welcomed in 2021. The collaboration was informed by design thinking principles (Snelling et al., 2019), applied in an extra-curricular context. Assia evaluated evidence from the 2019 and 2020 iterations, highlighting elements to re-purpose online. She identified a new on-campus component likely to appeal to a teenager and to generate inspirational, transformative learning. Assia's background in Engineering (Lia's is academic writing and pedagogy), her interest in technology and women's health and her experience of mentoring younger

people were of great value. As an outcome of the collaboration, Assia and Lia developed a 15-point checklist for staff-student co-creation during the pandemic, shared in an internal NTU report.

The teenager who participated in the June 2021 work experience week fully benefited from the programme co-created for her. Assia received a glowing recommendation and was a named co-author on the internal report. On the basis of the collaboration, Lia secured further funding to run a co-creation project focused on in-curriculum activities. The paradox to be explored further is how to scaffold and scale up student pedagogic consultancy in a sustainable way, offering reassurance to staff and students about the value and feasibility of co-creation both within and outside the curriculum.

References

Healey, M., & Healey, R.L. (2019). *Students as Partners Guide*. Advance HE. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/essential-frameworks-enhancing-student-success-student-engagement-through-partnership

Snelling, C.A., Loveys, B.R., Karanicolas, S., Schofield, N.J., Carlson-Jones, W., Weissgerber, J., Edmonds, R., & Ngu, J. (2019). Partnership through co-creation: Lessons learnt at the University of Adelaide. I*nternational Journal for Students as Partners, 3(*2), 62-77. https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v3i2.3799

Case Study 11

Digital collaboration tools as foundations for postgraduate peer-to-peer support networks at USC

Belinda Brear, Daniela Medina Hidalgo, Donna Thompson & Nathan Wellington
University of the Sunshine Coast AUSTRALIA

The University of the Sunshine Coast's (USC) model of student partnership is underpinned by a Student Governance Framework that enables students and the university to work towards authentic partnerships. The Postgraduate Student Association (PSA) is one of 16 groups within the Framework, and represents Higher Degree by Research and Masters by Coursework Students at USC. A central component of the activities and advocacy work of the PSA is to promote collaboration among postgraduate students. Collaboration for the PSA aligns with an expanded definition which includes group work, networking (formal and informal), social collaboration and community collaboration (Dytham, 2019).

The USC student governance structure relies on effective collaboration and communication channels to ensure that representatives can advocate for collective priorities. However, without effective communication and collaboration tools to fulfil their role, student representatives felt restricted in their ability to engage in meaningful initiatives with their peers. As a result, the PSA executive team led a project to implement Microsoft Teams to help students connect and collaborate. It was envisaged that a student-led digital space could assist in building community across the postgraduate cohort, enabling connections across campuses and disciplines in order to counter the isolation often described as being endemic to the postgraduate experience (Hortsmanshof & Conrad, 2003).

The implementation of a student-led online collaboration platform was the solution proposed by the PSA to solve a collaboration paradox where representatives were tasked with connecting with their peers, however felt restricted without integrated systems in place to support this. Students negotiated and partnered with several units across the University throughout the pilot stage. In this case study, we will discuss challenges the project faced, and how the established partnerships within existing governance structures were critical to the success of the launch. We will explore how the use of Microsoft Teams has proven critical to support the efforts of the PSA to connect, build and grow their online community, providing a safe student-led place to connect, communicate, collaborate, commiserate and celebrate.

References
Dytham, S. (2019). A framework of postgraduate collaboration: postgraduate collaborative space in a UK university. *Studies in Higher Education, 44*(3), 446-458. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1371688

Hortsmanshof, L., & Conrad, L. (2003). Postgraduate peer support programme: enhancing community *Proceedings of HERDSA (Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia), Learning for the unknown future: research and development in higher education,* University of Otago. Christchurch, New Zealand.

#FASSfromhome Students as Partners Communications Team: Building an online community during the COVID-19 pandemic

Karen Walker & Caitlyn Sinclair
The University of Sydney AUSTRALIA

Students as Partners has been vital to the University of Sydney Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences' (FASS) response to disruptions in community engagement, health and wellbeing and social connection caused by our rapid transition to online teaching in the wake of COVID-19. Through our Communications Team Program, a partnership of staff and students aimed to develop an online community, reduce social isolation, and promote peer-to-peer connections and student-staff interaction in an informal digital environment called #FASSfromhome.

Students co-created communication activities including Facebook, Instagram and Twitter takeovers sharing 'a day in the life of studying', study tips, photo collages, staff interviews, and online promotion of social and academic activities. The #FASSfromhome campaign was highly successful reaching 180,000+ people. With the sub-campaign #FASSfirstyear welcoming first year students to the university reached 25,000 people. 100% of student partners reported that peer-to-peer student communications were an important part of our institutional response and enabled students to connect with vital information about studying online. 80% of student partners reported developing skills in written communications, digital literacy and leadership.

Sharing my perspective on how to handle online learning via Facebook and other platforms was a really valuable aspect of volunteering for the FASS Communications Team… it was especially rewarding to see many of my friends at USyd… respond with enthusiasm, thanks, and their own advice/tips!

I was part of the FASSfromhome Collage which really shared and instilled a sense of solidarity between students and wider community. It was a positive impact as students were given the message 'you are not alone, we're all in fass together.

The program demonstrates the importance of Students as Partners in forming "communities which foster a culture of partnership" and transcending physical barriers to meet the challenges imposed by the pandemic (Mercer-Mapstone et al. 2017, p.19) while empowering student partners' through extra-curricular skills-building opportunities readying them for a digitised world.

Communications campaigns often aim to engage students, but commonly do not trust students with the keys to their development. Articles, hashtags and social media content are often about and for students, but students are not involved in their creation – despite peer-to-peer content fostering genuine organic student engagement. On the flip-side students should not be exploited for unpaid work. Our program works to find a mutually beneficial Students as Partners co-led program in which both parties feel agency to initiative, contribute, guide, grow, learn and deliver meaningful communications content to build a genuine sense of community online.

Reference
Mercer-Mapstone, L., Dvorakova, S. L., Matthews, K., Abbot, S., Cheng, B., Felten, P., Knorr, K., Marquis, E., Shammas, R., & Swaim, K. (2017). A Systematic Literature Review of Students as Partners in Higher Education. *International Journal for Students As Partners, 1(*1), https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i1.3119

Gateway to Student Partnership: A Students Mentoring Staff Program

Mollie Dollinger
Deakin University AUSTRALIA

The Students Mentoring Staff program previously hosted at La Trobe University and now at Deakin University, is designed to be a gateway program for staff and students interested to try students-as-partners. The program matches students and staff in a 1:1 relationship and requires pairs to meet three times over the duration of the program (online or in-person and 30 minutes to 1 hour each meeting). During each session, the participants are provided a list of questions or design-thinking activities that will support reflection and enable students to share their expertise of what it's like to be a current student. Students' contribution of their expertise is recognised through a $50 voucher for each mentoring session.

The program is designed to be a low stakes, minimal commitment program that provides an opportunity for students and staff to have a dialogue that is separate from the traditional teacher-student power dynamic (Matthews, Dwyer, Hine & Turner, 2018). As literature on student-as-partners has highlighted (Curran, 2017), the maximum three hours required of participants, also means that students and staff who are busy, can participate in the program. While activities are provided, staff and students are also encouraged to discuss topics that they are passionate about including accessibility or online learning design that could later serve as a basis for a larger project. However, while the barrier to access student and staff partnership is lowered through the program, other challenges can arise. For example, students and staff who apply may not be as committed to see the program through, with dropout rates routinely recorded of approximately 30%. Interim findings have also found that some students and staff express dissatisfaction with their match, expressing unpreparedness or lack of passion.

The paradox in this initiative therefore is balancing the aim to support greater numbers of students and staff to try partnership with the necessary authenticity and ongoing commitment that is critical to support successful students-as-partners approaches. Questions for reflection through the initiative include: 1) are quality student-staff partnerships scalable? 2) how can gateway partnership programs be designed to adhere to the good practice principles of partnership, and thus, encourage ongoing engagement of students and staff?

Navigating issues of identity, authority and expertise with students as mentors

Jane Kiddell, Liza Marsh & Kathryn Hill
Deakin University AUSTRALIA

Seeking student-led insights on how to support more inclusive learning and teaching, three staff members (two Academic Developers and a Senior Learning Designer from the Faculty of Health) each applied to be mentored by an equity student through an innovative program sponsored by the Office of the Dean of Students at Deakin University.

Designing engaging, inclusive and accessible learning experiences is a focus of the Deakin teaching capability framework. Sharing our practice, questions and approaches from academic development and learning design perspectives, we started by considering how we could work together with our Student Mentors to explore, share and feel what they consider is important for inclusive learning and support. We also considered how we might go about sharing these insights with academic staff to promote more inclusive learning and teaching for students.

We decided to use a human-centred design approach (British Design Council, 2005; Morris & Warman, 2015) to create spaces for open-ended conversation. Staff Mentees initially met one-on-one with their Student Mentors. This was followed by two group meetings with the expectation that the group format would promote a more dynamic interaction, generating co-created insights and suggestions. All meetings were conducted via Zoom and recorded. The Staff Mentees met before and after each session to debrief, plan and/or reflect.

Students as partners initiatives have the potential to develop students' sense of agency (Cook-Sather 2018) and identity as "holders and creators of knowledge" (Delgado-Bernal, 2002, p. 106). During initial planning the Staff Mentees deliberated on how to avoid the asymmetry typifying staff-student relations and Mentees and Student Mentors shared their perspectives on their respective roles and identities as a part of the process. While Student Mentors expressed appreciation for the authentic, relational approach of the interactions, the Mentees were conscious of a residual power imbalance, stemming from their identity as staff and their role in the process; planning and scheduling meetings, posing questions, etc. Hence, while satisfied that the process yielded rich conversations around the nature of inclusive learning and teaching, we wondered if we could have done more to strengthen students' sense of agency and identity as experts in the mentorship process.

Paradox - How can we support students and staff to navigate issues of authority and expertise and engage in an authentic mentor-mentee interactions?

Can partnership succeed when not actively supported by the institution and/or goes against institutional culture?

Ketevan Kupatadze & Eric Hall
Elon University USA

Ours is a medium-sized liberal arts university in the South-Eastern part of the US, with strong support for student engagement, undergraduate mentoring and research, and the development of students as globally engaged citizens. While these priorities might seem to be a perfect ground for developing student-faculty partnerships, the university does not have a centralized program or office which would support Student-as-Partners initiatives, something that has made the implementation of such pedagogy difficult.

Based on our experience with trying to implement or develop student-faculty partnerships at our institution, the absence of institutional culture and institutional support for partnership has created some hurdles, out of which the following two have been the hardest to overcome:

a) It is well researched that implementing partnership pedagogy takes time. The lack of sustainable funding sources for faculty and students who wish to engage in partnership in teaching and learning, either in the form of course releases for faculty and course credit for students or of financial compensation, has been the main deterrent of partnership initiatives.

b) The absence of an institutional culture that views equality and equity in the relationship between students and faculty as a value is another challenge. Both students and faculty have a very clearly defined hierarchical view of the teacher-student relationship and altering this view can be a lengthy, as well as a transformative process. When such transformation is advocated by peripheral elements in the institution, there is apprehension from faculty, as well as students. We have seen firsthand that the dominant paradigm of a professor as an expert and student as a consumer is extremely hard, if not impossible to break.

As a result, when we piloted the partnership program, starting small, inviting faculty to submit proposals for the teaching and learning projects on which they wished to partner with student(s), the interest was solid and the outcomes were promising. But, in the absence of sustained funding or equivalent support, this initiative could not move any further. While there are faculty and students who practice partnership pedagogies on an individual level, the aforementioned challenges have prevented many from experimenting with it.

At the roundtable, we would like to address these difficulties and explore the ways in which student-faculty partnerships can successfully develop from individual to institutional initiatives and practices.

From rigid to floppy: Assessment policy transformations, students' friend or foe?

Aidan Cornelius-Bell, University of South Australia AUSTRALIA
Piper Bell, Student Voice Australia AUSTRALIA

Australian universities are transforming their assessment policies to meet the changing needs of students, disciplines, and industry. In recent times, these changes have become increasingly focussed on the latter 'the needs of industry'. While some policy changes may place students at the heart and centre of design and intention, it is often done in an 'everything about them without them' role. We contend that these decisions are not always made through robust, open and democratic 'voice' arrangements, but rather by appealing to a student-as-consumer approach in a risk-averse governance setting. In these contexts, student input into the design and transformation of assessment policy is tertiary, following academic and industry consultation. Moreover, the genuine opportunities for students to engage with bona fide design of assessment policies and procedures are tragically scant despite governance frameworks which may support students' engagement in policy development. Our presentation challenges the thinking around contemporary assessment policy transformations, positing that doing the work to provide opportunities for pluralistic, transparent and democratic input into development of new policies creates an ultimately robust framework for engaging with (and assessing) students, designed with students. Through active inclusion, co-design and development, assessment policy can become less a foe, and a disengaging space, and transform into a friend and positive space for students and staff alike, while addressing the necessary requirements to maintain academically robust university 'core business'.

The boring administrative side of things: Engaging students in decision-making and governance in the University Library

Imogen Harris-McNeil, Maddison Battese & Ashfaad Namirani
University of Newcastle AUSTRALIA

The University Library is fundamental to the student experience at the University of Newcastle. We have developed a University Library Students as Partners Framework, which outlines the Library's approach to engaging and collaborating meaningfully with our students through partnership and employment, in order to achieve our strategic aims of enhancing the student experience and contributing to the life-readiness of our graduates. The Framework identifies three distinct pillars which underpin our approach:

- Employed and upskilled
- Informed and heard
- Included and empowered

This case study focuses on the work the Library is doing in the 'included and empowered' arena. This pillar involves valuing student representation in decision-making and Library governance processes and seeking to work directly with our students as co-creators and co-designers of Library services, spaces and activities. The Library's approach to student partnership is informed by Matthews' (2017) work, in particular the Five Propositions for Genuine Students as Partners Practice. Our approach also draws on O'Shea's (2018) work on equity and inclusiveness in students as partners and the need to pro-actively seek diverse representation. Our work is also informed by Salisbury, Dollinger and Vanderlelie (2020) which highlights 'students in library governance' as one of the six key six domains of practice where student partnership can flourish. This work highlights the potential value of and opportunities for engaging in student partnerships across multiple areas of library practice, while also acknowledging that there are differences between the domains in terms of the enthusiasm and momentum which contribute to partnerships thriving. In some domains, while others may require more effort and commitment to embed partnership approaches (Salisbury, Dollinger & Vanderlelie, 2020). How to empower students as decision-makers in an institutional context, within existing hierarchies of power and authority, and existing mechanisms for decision-making and approval?

Rather than endorsing a single stand-alone student advisory group, the Library is actively bringing students into Library committees, projects, working groups and communities of practice to work alongside Library staff. These students are integral members of each group with their voices influencing outcomes for the Library, and our student cohorts, as they collaborate with us to identify opportunities for improvement, develop options, solve problems, or implement solutions. For example, we have a student representative on our Auchmuty Refurbishment Project Committee and project team, Maddison Battese. As the student representative on this Committee, Maddison has played a vital role in providing an invaluable student perspective, advocating on behalf of her fellow students and contributing to decision making around changes and improvements to a number of key library spaces.

Decode and Recode: Finding accessibility in policy writing for students

Matt Brett, Cas Baptist & James Wigg
Deakin University AUSTRALIA

Students in Australia have a diverse background, with Victorian universities seeing a rise in students accessing disability and mental health support. There has further been an increase in initiative to make higher education accessible for students with language and learning difficulties, but no aim to include students in the decision-making process. Despite the introduction of programs across Australia such as Students as Partners and organisational student association groups, no real efforts have been made to include students in the policy-making process in higher education, and limited awareness of student councils and committees is found in both undergraduate and postgraduate students. Allowing student input on the policies that will directly affect them can greatly improve the quality of learning and teaching activities offered in a variety of disciplines, and can potentially let students feel equally viewed and included in the education community.

From the student perspective, policy is yet another obstacle to overcome when finishing assignments and navigating day-to-day life in higher education. Current written policies are targeted primarily at an English-speaking, domestic level and are more associated with staff and government use in punishments for students rather than for students to access as a resource to aid their learning. Whilst it is understood that certain steps must be taken in formal policy writing to be as inclusive of different procedures and allowances for organisations to have individual input, the vast majority of current policies are still only ever written in complex, legalese English with minimal available resources for the wider student body in higher education.

Deakin University is active in trying to find the balance between student involvement and policy writing conventions, hoping that in creating resources for students to more directly associate to and in the rewriting of vague, ambiguous wording in current policy decisions, that accessibility for students is greater increased. The largest gap in understanding comes from the student academic integrity and academic progress policies, where limited student input on the necessary functions of the policies have been made, despite them being directly responsible for the continuation of a students' education.