

Students as Agents of Change in Curriculum Designing and Implementation: Involvement and Participation Drives

Adupa Stephen¹, Muweesi Charles¹, Disan Kuteesa Mugenyi², Kaweesi Muhamadi¹, Tomusange Robert³,
Isabirye Christopher⁴ & Ochieng Mary T. Kagoire⁵

¹ Faculty of Science and Education, Busitema University

² School of Education, Kyambogo University

³ Faculty of Education, Beijing Normal University

⁴ Department of Pedagogical Studies, Health Tutors's College Mulago

⁵ Faculty of Education, Uganda Christian University

Correspondence: Muweesi Charles, Faculty of Science and Education, Busitema University.

doi:10.56397/RAE.2022.11.01

Abstract

A student as agent of change in the curriculum design and implementation, involvement and participation in the secondary schools is of critical importance. The need to adopt and change to a competency learning approach that meets the needs of the student, and members of the community. To further scholarly understanding of, and appreciation for, students voice in decision making, participation, student participation in participatory design, as well as and student partnership in curriculum design and implementation. This paper clarifies the unique contributions of each, shaped by differing contexts of interaction, and articulate issues arising by confounding and conflating partnership and representation in the name of student voice. Advancing an argument for an ecosystem of student participation grounded in student voice, we warn of the harm in positioning student partners as speaking for other students and the risk of diminishing the importance of elected student representation systems in favor of staff selected student partner models of student representation.

Keywords: student voice, student participation, student partnership, curriculum design & implementation

1. Introduction

Globally, the major emphasis in reform is restructuring curriculum so that it can ably support the shifting learning environment, pedagogy, society and students' expectations as indicated in a study by Acedo, (2002) & Roelofs & Terwell, (1999). Education reforms globally seem to indicate that new curriculum is constructed having put the students at the fulcrum. Educational and curriculum practices are being reconsidered in universities worldwide (Karseth & Solbregge, 2016; Shay, 2015; Yates & et al., 2017).

In policy papers and curriculum reforms, competency-based and interdisciplinary curricula are regarded as more forward-looking and innovative in addressing major societal problems and needs than traditional discipline or subject-based curricula, despite the challenges of academic implementation (Caspersen, Frølich & Muller, 2017; Gantogtokh & Quinlan, 2017; Millar, 2016). Engagement in curriculum change may present challenges for both academics and their communities, given that universities can be characterised as collections of relatively non-hierarchical networks that resist strong top-down control and seek meaningful justifications for changes (Barman & et al., 2016; Broström, Feldmann & Kaulio, 2019). Besides top-down reforms, curriculum change is a staple of academic work in departments and faculties. As curriculum is a key element in defining research-based higher education for future generations, it is important to understand academics' role in

curriculum change. The change was initiated by the university itself. Nevertheless, its elements echoed the contemporary trends in higher education curriculum policy, especially in the European Union (e.g., Handala & et al., 2014), which produced interdisciplinary and competency-based degree programmes.

Practically, curriculum is a platform in which shared understandings of educational ideas are created, developed, and fostered in academic communities (Annala & Mäkinen, 2017; Knight, 2001). Curriculum provides a discursive and structural framework for negotiations on the principles and practices most suitable for the discipline and community (Barnett, Parry & Coate, 2001; Shay, 2015). An example of this is Roberts (2015) study of curriculum decisions in the design of a specific course. However, the present study takes a closer look at the academics' room for manoeuvre in broader curriculum changes in higher education. Student's voice is giving students the ability to influence learning to include policies, programs, contexts and principles. In contrast, Fletcher (2005), Rogers (2005), Richardson (2001) all offer a much broader definition of student voice that includes the active opportunity for students to express their opinions, views, suggestions and make decisions regarding the planning, implementation and evaluation of their learning experiences. Student participation is the active involvement in determining the outcomes formulation and development of a practical curriculum design and implementation policy. Student Partnership is a *process of student engagement*, involving faculty, students, and staff learning and working together with the goal of enhancing learning and teaching. Partnership is marked by high levels of active student participation and contribution, and is a way of doing things, rather than an outcome in itself. (Healey, Flint & Harrington, 2014).

2. Aim of the Study

To examine the role of student as an agent of change in curriculum design and implementation, involvement and participation.

3. Objectives of the Study

- i). The relationship between student's voice and curriculum design and implementation in secondary schools in Uganda
- ii). The relationship between student's participation and curriculum design and implementation in secondary schools in Uganda
- iii). The relationship between student as partners and curriculum design and implementation in secondary schools in Uganda

4. Theoretical Framework

This study will be underpinned by the theory of implementation advanced by Rogan and Grayson (2003). The theory of implementation is premised on three main constructs: support from outside agencies, capacity to support innovation, and profile of implementation. The support from outside agencies describes the kinds of actions undertaken by departments of education, to influence practices, either by support or sanction. In Uganda, international development agencies or international NGOs are involved in supporting the transformation of the new current Lower secondary education curriculum in terms of providing material support and non-material support. Material support may include provision of physical resources such as buildings, books, or apparatus, and direct support to students (such as school-lunch programmes). Non-material support is mostly provided in the form of professional development like Secondary Science and Mathematics Teachers' (SESEMAT) programme through Japan International co-operation Agency to improve performance in mathematics and sciences and their attitudes towards science. As one of the most visible and obvious ways in which outside agencies attempt to bring about change in schools.

Teacher professional development has been promoted through co-operation and support among teachers (Karsten & et al., 2000). To bring about change, outside organizations can also exert pressure, such as by way of monitoring. The construct capacity to support innovation is concerned with implementation of new ideas and practices in the new curriculum because schools differ in terms of their capacity to implement innovations. Possible indicators fall into four categories: physical resources, school ethos and management, teacher factors, and student factors. Physical resources are crucial as poor conditions and limited resources can limit the performance of even the best teachers and students. The school ethos and management are not the same, yet they are considered together as they are closely intertwined, particularly in schools in developing countries. Likewise, the background of students, and the kind of strengths and constraints they might bring to the school are crucial. A range of issues influence student attitudes to learning and responses to change, such as their home environments, parental commitment to education, health and nutrition, and proficiency level in the language of instruction. The contribution of these four factors to the capacity of school to support innovation is likely to be dynamic and changing over time. The third construct, profile of implementation assists in understanding, analyzing and expressing the extent to which the objectives of the reform programme are put into practice. It recognizes the fact that there can be multiple ways of putting a curriculum into action.

5. Literature Review

5.1 Curriculum Design and Implementation, Where Are the Learners Voices?

Student representation has been cemented by the state or governing university bodies to provide student voice on policymaking or quality assurance (Klemenčič, 2012a; Naylor & et al., 2020). In Europe, student representation is now considered one of the key principles of the European Higher Education Area (Klemenčič, 2012b). Flint and Goddard (2021) use the term student academic representation systems to describe the current model of student participation in university governance with elected or selected student representatives speaking and acting on behalf of their peers. The benefits of student representation are manifold: the practice of democracy in universities that encourage active citizenship amongst students (Lizzio & Wilson, 2009; Luescher-Mamashela, 2010); enhancement of educational quality through the inclusion of student voice in university governance (Douglas & et al., 2008); and growth of capabilities and skillsets of student representatives (Flint, Goddard & Russell, 2017). Yet the boundaries of what constitutes a student academic representation system differ by country, context, structure, and culture with a fuzzy middle ground between representation and participation. The common thread across the landscape of representation is the idea of collective responsibility.

For Flint and Goddard (2021) in the UK, inclusion is broad ranging from elected student unionism to informally elected or invited class reps at the subject level, and an array of roles in-between whereby students are involved in committee and governance structures with academic or administrative staff focused on improving quality of the student experience, (Flint & O'Hara, 2013). In Spain, that university departments give more responsibility to the students in activities concerning them, involve them in problems related to the budget and physical resources, and have them participate in setting standards is core to how Planas and co-authors (2011, p. 573) framed student representation.

Cheng (2019, p. 59) found that student representation in Chinese universities involved a system of committees, unions, and institutional governance with student representatives being either event host or errands runner to fulfill the administrative needs of the university. Regardless of boundaries and scope, there is broad implementation of student academic representation systems across higher education institutions. The tensions between managerialist approaches for quality assurance and socio-political commitments to democracy and citizenship are raised by scholars, typically linking student engagement, student participation, and student representation (Carey, 2013; Holen & et al., 2021). There are growing calls from student unions, who are focused on the relationship of student representatives with university administrations, for student voice and student partnership. In the UK, the national Office for Students has established to meaningfully engage with students as partners across the sector on matters of widening access and participatory activities with students, particularly diverse voices and collaboration with student unions (Islam, Burnett & Collins, 2021, p. 77). Student representation through student unions is a complex political entanglement.

5.2 Learning Environment Versus Student

Student representative as agents of and for quality assurance is common in the current literature and is increasingly formalized in policy. For example, in Australia, with the establishment of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), there began a national effort to mandate (what was an existing practice of) student representation through university governance on academic boards or university councils. Thus, student representative is one component of quality assurance frameworks along with a structure of student feedback via surveys at institutional, degree program, and subject levels (Gvaramadze, 2008). Yet, student representatives often face challenges in their ability to carry out their roles and responsibilities. The design of the learning environment is informed by educational theories. The aim of Design-Based Research (DBR) is to improve both the design of the learning environment and to develop and refine educational theories (Anderson & Shattuck, 2012; Dolmans & Tigelaar, 2012). Apart from researchers and educational practitioners, other stakeholders can be involved in an iterative design process such as students and educational designers.

Students' role is often limited to provide input; they are not put forward as central actors within the design process (Mc Kenney & Reeves, 2012). Benefits of DBR are improving educational practice and theory by testing and refining educational design guidelines about what might work under which conditions and why. Design, collaborative design, student voice and student participation (when only listening to students), and student engagement (Coberetal & 2015). Co-creation is a close collaboration of students and teachers. The aim is to intensify active engagement of students in the educational (design) process and to improve teaching and learning by welcoming students' perspectives (Bovill & et al., 2016). This goes beyond only listening to student voices. The focus within co-creation is on empowering students to actively collaborate with teachers (Bovill & et al., 2011). Within co-creation, students' roles range from being involved with limited influence on decision-making to working in a partnership with teachers (Delpish & et al., 2010). Partnership is characterized by a focus on equality between students and staff (Cook-Sather & et al., 2014). Benefits for staff, students, and institutions include enhanced satisfaction and engagement, motivation and learning, meta-cognitive skills,

improved quality of student–teacher interactions, and development of graduate competencies such as leadership skills (Cook-Sather & et al., 2014).

In Australian research, Lizzio and Wilson (2009, p. 72) found that student representatives frequently suffered from role strain student representatives are unsure what is expected of them (role ambiguity) or hold differing expectations to institutional management (role conflict), which they attributed to lack of university management transparency. In the UK, Ireland and co-authors (2021, p. 3) found that students in governance have the difficult position of being expected to participate both as an impartial individual board member and as a representative of the study body. On the other hand, the ability to extend representative roles into other informal roles, such as pedagogical consultancy, can also be seen as an opportunity, as reflected by Kapadia (2021). The challenges of being a student representative are discussed in terms of training in quality assurance activities, but there is also a role and/or responsibility related to advocacy or activism through student unionism. Islam, Burnett, and Collins (2021) reported that student unions (or student guilds) are present at almost all public universities in the UK with student officers who represent the student body and have various roles, including advice.

5.3 General Responsibility to Enhance Student Partnership

Student partnership is the responsibility of students to contribute to teaching and learning with teachers (and teaching specialist staff), to student life with staff (including teachers), to disciplinary knowledge creation with researchers, and to teaching, learning, and student life with fellow students (Healey & et al., 2014; Matthews, 2017; Matthews, Cook-Sather & Healey, 2018). Thus, the partnership values of shared responsibility, mutual respect, and reciprocity are often evoked by practitioners and scholars. For example, reciprocity and responsibility speak to the give and take of reciprocity and how partnership work changes student and faculty orientation toward responsibility... and through partnership, students now have some responsibility for pedagogy and faculty share some responsibility for learning (Cook-Sather & et al., 2014, p. 5).

Typically framed in pedagogical contexts, with US scholars referring to faculty members, the responsibility of student partners is contributing their individual perspectives as students experiencing the educational curriculum, which are unique to students and could be of benefit to teachers who seek to create more meaningful learning opportunities (Bovill & et al., 2011). Therefore, the shared responsibility of students and university educators collaborating in partnership is attentive to learning that is socially situated.

When students and academics reflect on the process of sharing responsibility, they often talk about the challenges associated with negotiating their new responsibilities and note the change in mindset that occurs. Students who engaged in a pedagogical partnership in a study Scholars are beginning to reframe assessment and feedback practices as a form of partnership that draws on the discourse of shared responsibility (Bovill, Matthews & Hinchliffe, 2021). When practiced outside of the class, mainly through project-based programs, the aims can have a quality assurance bent (to enhance the student experience) or skills building intent (to build student employability by involving students in the work of the university) as student partners with professional or administrative staff (Woods & Homer, 2021). The omnipresent thread running throughout learner-teacher partnership literature is one of seeing responsibility differently imagining new possibilities further reconceptualised through sharing responsibility for the co-creation of learning environments, curriculum, assessment, and more (Cook-Sather, in press). Through partnership processes where students and teacher engage in acts of co-creation through dialogic processes, the role boundaries (labels) blur as teachers become learners, and learners become teachers (Cook-Sather, 2010), well-captured by Cook-Sather et al., (2014, p. 5).

6. Methodology

This study will adopt a case study research design to dig deep into the study inquiry. This particular section indicates how the student as an agent of change will be captured in the larger study by focusing on the research design and methods used. A research design is the broad plan of action of how one intends to go about answering the research questions asked (Amin, 2005). In collecting field data, interpreting, analyzing and making inferences, the study will employ qualitative analysis. In this case, the study is descriptive because the researcher seeks to describe people's views, comments and suggestions on the issue investigated hence Qualitative analysis will consist of classifying and interpreting interviews.

7. Findings of the Study

7.1 Student Voice and Curriculum Design and Implementation

Student voice has emerged as the single term in educational research to encompass a spectrum of initiatives that advocate the redefinition of the role of students in research and educational change. Cook-Sather (2006) describes student voice as having a legitimate perspective, presence and active role. Wolk (1998) argues that everyone has a voice and, therefore, this is not something that can be given, and he asks, "What do we do with it? And to what conscious degree have we developed it and continue to develop it?" (p. 186). Student voice is located within a complex web of school structures and cultures that are shaped by policymakers, school leaders,

teachers, researchers and students themselves. In its most conservative form, voice means having a say when asked but without any guarantee of a necessary response, whereas in its most radical form it calls for “a cultural shift that opens up spaces and minds not only to the sound but also to the presence and power of students” (Cook-Sather, 2006, p. 363).

Thought-through conceptions underpin effective models seeking to capture and reflect dynamic processes and practices in a diversity of educational contexts. Our contribution, responding to the call of Holen and co-authors (2021), is to examine and distinguish two commonly evoked conceptions of student voice, student representation and student partnership to further scholarly understanding of, and appreciation for, the important difference between the two. We draw on two points of difference (from several possible points of difference) responsibility and access to illuminate conceptualizations and discourses of each.

According to Carless (1997) for an innovation to be successful it has to be well resourced with good quality students' materials. Textbooks play an important role in promoting student involvement in lessons and have a major impact on achievement in most subjects as they serve as the main source of authoritative information accessible to most learners (Lewin & Stuart, 1991). According to Ball and Cohen (1999) textbooks can mediate how students engage with the content to be learned. Research has shown that presence of appropriate textbooks, although costly, has positive implications for students' learning (Walberg, 1991; Montero-Sieburth, 1992). However, if materials are not of good quality, or “do not accurately reflect the principles of the innovation, their production may be counterproductive” (Carless, 1997, 361). Lack of appropriate resources, mainly textbooks, has been identified as an implementation problem in many developing countries (Guthrie, 1990; Walberg, 1991; Tabulawa, 1997). In South Africa a review of the new curriculum implemented in 1998 revealed that in some cases old books which were not designed for the new curriculum were being used (Chisholm & et al. 2000).

This is the case in Uganda, most secondary schools are under stocked in terms of textbooks, with fear skilled and experienced teachers motivated to deliver and offer technological and training support to the students has limited students' participation hence poor performance in the area of science subjects.

Empirical studies in student voice research (Mitra, 2001; MacBeath & et al, 2003; Flutter & Rudduck, 2004; Morgan, 2006; Pedder & McIntyre 2006; Rudduck & McIntyre, 2007; Thompson, 2009) have demonstrated the important practical contributions of student consultation for school improvement among those teachers who have seriously considered students' perspectives. Listening and learning from student voices necessitated a shift from the ways in which teachers engaged with students and how they perceived their own practices.

7.2 Student Participation and Curriculum Design and Implementation

Student representation by design is selective and exclusive. Through student unionism, students have the authority to elect the students who will speak to the interest of the student body in formal governance structures. As Jasmine Xu (in Holds worth, 2021) lamented, there will be students keen to be involved who will not get elected, and that is par for the course. That the highly engaged students participate in elected and selected systems of student representation is assumed.

The skillset student representatives possess also matters as Meeuwissen and co-authors (2019, p.671) in the Netherlands found that representatives with.

A proactive and critical attitude, particularly those who had a long-term perspective were seen as the ones who fared best.

Second, the importance of student representatives being elected by students, as opposed to selected by staff, is diminished when student partnership is seen as being superior or interchangeable with systems of elected student representation. Holen and co-authors (2021) articulated how internal and external pressures motivating student participation can lead to forms of student representation grounded in a democratic stance (internal) that advocates elected students and forms of followership participation (external) initiated by university leadership.

Our analysis of access to student representation, particularly when framed as a form of partnership, signals a move away from elected students on committees toward staff-selected students. Holen and collaborators (2021) called for further research about democratic forms of partnership moving toward a followership model. Extending that call, we offer a question to guide research: how might conflating student partnership and student representation undermine systems of elected student representation?

By focusing on only student representation and student partnership with the aim of distinguishing them, the fuzzy and middle ground between them was not the focus. This presents an opportunity for researchers to further conceptual clarity in the name of student voice in higher education. Furthermore, systematic reviews of literature and research capturing the lived experiences of students can extend collective scholarly understanding. While bringing together two sets of literatures presents challenges, doing so works against increasingly fragmented research in higher education (Matthews & et al, 2021) while allowing scholars to stand back, engage more

critically with discourses, and map systematically at intersections of literatures.

Flexibility approaches in curriculum implementation took care of the diversity of students; thus, encouraged individuals to have increased participation and access to learning thus removing restrictions on the way knowledge was accessed. This approach benefited students as it breaks bureaucratic mechanisms that usually exist in the acquisition of knowledge and accreditation of the past experiences. This is in agreement with other authors (Sankey & Osborne, 2006) who explain that using flexible approaches as a curriculum implementation practice enables individual students to actively participate in the teaching and learning process; given that it removes restrictions on the part of students in the process of accessing knowledge. This is often referred to as active learning and may lead to the development of lifelong learning skills. This is in agreement with the views of Houston Macune and Osboner (2011), Morgan-Klein and Osborne (2007), Sankey and Osborne (2006) and Percy and Ramsden (1980) explain that application of flexibility in learning benefits students in breaking the bureaucratic mechanisms that usually exist in acquisition of knowledge and accreditation of the past experiences.

The curriculum implementation process encouraged group and individual studies as strategies to promote the development of lifelong learning skills among students. Furthermore, the use of a variety of educational practices during curriculum implementation made the teaching and learning process more friendly and interesting. As such, many students experienced a good mastery of the subject content.

In a study done by Tabulawa (1997) in Botswana, the Education Department had advocated that teachers should shift from their usual practices as providers of information to a learner-centred approach. In this study Tabulawa found that teacher-centred teaching persisted with teachers emphasizing correct answers and ignoring wrong answers. Mass teaching occurred, with teachers asking close-ended questions which were said to alienate students. Most importantly, students and parents expected teachers to impart knowledge to the learners in preparation for the examinations. This rendered dysfunctional the interactive, flexible practices that characterize learner-centred teaching, which was the intention of the reform. Tabulawa attributed the reasons for failure to the imported bureaucratic-authoritarian model of education imposed on Botswana prior to independence. This was further compounded by lack of adequate human resource development and lack of physical resources which seemed to have been overlooked by the reformers (Tabulawa, 1997).

Similar results were obtained in the studies done in Nigeria by Adeniyi, cited by Walberg (1991) where implementation was found to be unsuccessful because of foreign language barriers, inadequate resources and lack of trained science teachers (Walberg, 1991). Inadequate training of teachers to meet the needs of the innovation in developing countries seems to be a common problem (Beeby, 1966; Guthrie, 1990).

7.3 Student Partnership and Curriculum Design and Implementation

Through an analysis of the current literature on student partnership and student representation in the largely practitioner-focused and applied research orientation of teaching and learning scholarship in higher education, we clarify the unique contributions of each by articulating issues arising by confounding and confiding partnership and representation. While student partners engage in ongoing communication and navigate forms of hierarchical power dynamics, being able to capture data and report in formal committees is rarely a requirement. Instead, student partners with particular knowledge of a subject (prior completion of a subject to be re-designed) or who bring a unique lived experience (first in family student in pedagogical partnership to enhance inclusive practices) could be the basis for selection. The context of student partnership enables broader inclusion of students with a clear commitment in the scholarly literature for partnership with students who have been least well-served in educational systems and therefore less likely to participate in partnership activities.

Yet, access to student partnership and student representation can be limited by staff gatekeepers when student representatives are not elected by students and when student partnership is enacted as an out-of-class project-based model. The power that rests in the decision to select who is a student partner has come into question by scholars (Kehler, Verwoord & Smith, 2017; Yahlnaaw, 2019). Opportunities for students to initiate and invite staff partners in project-based partnership programs are one response to the question of who has the power to select whom. However, elected student representatives versus selected by staff student representatives who sit on university decision-making committees raise complex questions that we have yet to see taken up seriously in the literature, although recently called for further research answering the question, do partnership models based on democratic ideals run the danger of pushing students into being political followers? where political followership involves staff selecting students.

Enright and colleagues (2017, p. 468) reflected:

We share responsibility for making this work. It's not all on [the academic] if an idea fop.... It makes us more likely to turn-up for class prepared to work. (Derek) We got listened to about our perspectives on the [course] and I think we were more involved and learned more because of it. (Ann)

First, the potential for student partners to speak for and as themselves, to have their unique voices recognised in

conversation about teaching and learning, is diminished when they are perceived and received by university staff as representing (or speaking for) other students. The harm of student partnership being conflated as a form of student representation occurs in reducing the humanising ethos of student partnership as a relational pedagogy that values difference and works through dialogic processes connecting students and teachers (Bovill, 2020). Cook-Sather and Graham (in press) make this clear in asserting that student partnership means not assuming that any individual student perspective is representative of all but rather embracing differences as sources of insight, which is of particular importance for students historically unheard and underserved in educational systems.

Learning Experiences were more of student-centred than teacher-centred. The results of the investigations into the common learning experiences encountered by students during curriculum implementation indicated that the experiences in theoretical subject contents was predominantly student-centred (69%) and in practical teaching and practicum attachment the tendency was at 59%. These tendencies provided the learning experiences during curriculum implementation. The results of the study also indicated that various educational practices were applied during the implementation of the curriculum. The implementation process included providing flexible learning opportunities for trainees during individual projects and in all areas where student-centered approaches were applied and is the current norm in Uganda as per the recent strategy to promote the science subjects, Vocationalization policy strengthening.

8. Conclusions

Empirical studies in student voice research (Mitra, 2001; MacBeath & et al, 2003; Flutter & Rudduck, 2004; Morgan, 2006; Pedder & McIntyre 2006; Rudduck & McIntyre, 2007; Thompson, 2009) have demonstrated the important practical contributions of student consultation for school improvement among those teachers who have seriously considered students' perspectives. Lack of appropriate resources, mainly textbooks, has been identified as an implementation problem in many developing countries (Guthrie, 1990; Walberg, 1991; Tabulawa, 1997). In South Africa a review of the new curriculum implemented in 1998 revealed that in some cases old books which were not designed for the new curriculum were being used.

The context of student partnership enables broader inclusion of students with a clear commitment in the scholarly literature for partnership with students who have been least well-served in educational systems and therefore less likely to participate in partnership activities. By recognizing the important differences between, and valuable roles of both, student representation and student partnership, they can work together across the strategic and every day levels shaping educational life for students. Ultimately, a culture of student voice is more likely to be realized when students see that they can actively shape and participate in their everyday educational experiences and that elected student representatives are taken seriously in formalized governance structures of the institution.

And doing so, as Holds worth (2021) and many others advocate, involves a willingness to shift power relationships and practices by taking seriously the contributions of students in all roles in all spaces and places where learning, teaching, assessment, student life, and decision about such activities unfold

9. Recommendations

Listening and learning from student voices necessitated a shift from the ways in which teachers engaged with students and how they perceived their own practices. When the voice of students is heard, it will open up space for effective dialogue and participation in the decision-making process hence facilitate effective curriculum design and implementation process. As opposed to where the voices are ignored. The need to provide adequate up to date study materials inform of textbooks for students and continual engaging them in practical subjects will promote innovativeness and the growth of the entrepreneurial class as a fundamental pillar in nation building and development.

The government should put emphasis on process, relationships, and reciprocal learning, partnership represents a sophisticated and effective approach to student engagement, as it positions students as collaborators in the academic mission of the University and offers the potential for a more authentic engagement with the nature of learning. Pedagogical partnerships allow the possibility for genuinely transformative learning experiences for all partners. Through partnership, all partners benefit from the process of learning and working together.

Ensure Partnership learning communities are at the centre of the model to highlight the importance of the *process* of partnership. The concept of partnership learning communities draws on existing models of community, including learning communities and communities of practice, which focus on social learning by, developing partnership learning communities among faculty and students strengthens and sustains engagement through partnership. Policy makes should ensure that student's engagement is active learning is appreciated within higher education, there is growing recognition of the importance of students' active engagement in their learning. In parallel, educators are increasingly inviting students to contribute to teaching and learning through a myriad of roles, including as partners. This is in part due to recognition of learners' expertise of what it means to be a

learner, and recognition of the potential to apply this knowledge to enhance teaching and learning.

References

- Ashwin P., & McVitty D., (2015). The meanings of student engagement: Implications for policies and practices. In: Curaj A., Matei L., Pricopie R., Salmi J., Scott P. (Eds). *The European Higher Education Area*.
- Bindra, G., Easwaran, K., Firasta, L., Hirsch, M., Kapoor, A., Sosnowski, A., & Vatansever, G., (2018). Increasing representation and equity in students as partner's initiatives. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(2), 10–15.
- Bovill, C., (2017). A framework to explore roles within student-staff partnerships in higher education: Which students are partners, when, and in what ways? *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(1), 1–5.
- Bovill, C., (2020). Co-creation in learning and teaching: The case for a whole-class approach in higher education. *Higher Education*, 79(6), 1023–1037.
- Bovill, C., Cook-Sather, A., & Felten, P., (2011). Students as co-creators of teaching approaches, course design, and curricula: Implications for academic developers. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(2), 133–145.
- Bovill, C., Matthews, K., & Hinchclife, T., (2021). Student partnerships in assessment. London, United Kingdom: Advance HE.
- Carey, P., (2013). Student engagement: Stakeholder perspectives on course representation in university governance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(9), 1290–1304.
- Cheng, S., (2019). Student engagement with institutional governance in contemporary Chinese universities: An internationalisation process. Master's thesis, University of Victoria, Canada.
- Cook-Sather, A., (2018). Tracing the evolution of student voice in educational research. In R. Bourke, & J. Loveridge (Eds.) *Radical Collegiality Through Student Voice*.
- Cornelius-Bell, A., (2021). Student activism in higher education: The politics of students' role in hegemonic university change. Doctoral thesis, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia.
- De Bie, A., (2020). Respectfully distrusting Students as Partners practice in higher education: Applying a Mad politics of partnership. *Teaching in Higher Education*. Advance online publication.
- Douglas, J., McClelland, R., & Davies, J., (2008). The development of a conceptual model of student satisfaction with their experience in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(1), 19–35.
- Dwyer, A., (2018). Toward the formation of genuine partnership spaces. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1), 11–15.
- Enright, E., Coll, L., Ní Chróinín, D., & Fitzpatrick, M., (2017). Student voice as risky praxis: Democratising physical education teacher education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 22(5), 459–472.
- Flint, A. & Goddard, H., (2021). Power, partnership, and representation. In L. Mercer-Mapstone and S. Abbot (Eds.). *The Power of Partnership: Students, Staff, and Faculty Revolutionizing Higher Education*. Elon University Center for Engaged Learning.
- Flint, A., & O'Hara, M., (2013). Communities of practice and student voice: Engaging with student representatives at the faculty level. *Student Engagement and Experience Journal*, 2(1).
- Flint, A., Goddard, H., & Russell, E., (2017). Architects of their experience: The role, value and impact of student academic representation systems in Higher Education in England. The Student Engagement Partnership (TSEP).
- Fraser, J., & Usman, M., (2021). Dreaming to learn together: Lessons in decolonial and anti-racist partnership practices. *The Journal of Educational Innovation, Partnership and Change*, 7(1).
- Freeman, R., (2016). Is student voice necessarily empowering? Problematising student voice as a form of higher education governance. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(4), 859–862.
- Godbold, N., Hung, T. Y., & Matthews, K. E., (2021). Exploring the role of conflict in co-creation of curriculum through engaging students as partners in the classroom. *Higher Education Research & Development*.
- Gvaramadze, I., (2008). From quality assurance to quality enhancement in the European Higher Education Area. *European Journal of Education*, 43(4), 443–455.
- Healey, M., Flint, A. & Harrington, K., (2014). Engagement through partnership: Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education. York: HEA.
- Holdsworth, R., (2021). Give me a place to stand and I'll move the earth: Some reflections on 42 years of

- publishing Connect. *Connect*, 250, 6–10.
- Holen, R., Ashwin, P., Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B., (2021). Student partnership: Exploring the dynamics in and between different conceptualizations. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–12.
- Islam, M., Burnett, T. L., & Collins, S. L., (2021). Trilateral partnership: An institution and students' union collaborative partnership project to support underrepresented student groups. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 5(1), 76–85.
- Kapadia, S., (2021). Academic representation and students as partners: Bridging the gap. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 5(2), 169–173.
- Kehler, A., Verwoord, R., & Smith, H., (2017). We are the process: Reflections on the underestimation of power in students as partners in practice. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(1).
- Klemenčič, M., (2012a). Student representation in Western Europe: Introduction to the special issue. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 2(1), 2–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2012.695058>.
- Klemenčič, M., (2012b). The changing conceptions of student participation in HE governance in the EHEA. In Curaj, A., Scott, P., Vlasceanu, L. & Wilson, L. (Eds.) *European Higher Education at the Crossroads*. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Klemenčič, M., & Ashwin, P., (2015). New directions for teaching, learning, and student engagement in the European Higher Education Area. In R. Pricopie, P. Scott, J. Salmi, & A. Curaj (Eds.), *Future of Higher Education in Europe*. Springer.
- Liang, Y., & Matthews, K. E., (2021). Students as partners in China: Investigating the potentials and possibilities for growing practices across universities. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 5(2), 28–47.
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K., (2009). Student participation in university governance: The role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(1), 69–84.
- Luescher-Mamashela, T. M., (2010). From university democratisation to managerialism: The changing legitimization of university governance and the place of students. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 16(4), 259–283.
- Marquis, E., Jayaratnam, A., Mishra, A., & Rybkina, K., (2018). I feel like some students are better connected: Students' perspectives on applying for extracurricular partnership opportunities. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1), 64–81.
- Matthews, K. E., (2017). Five propositions for genuine students as partners practice. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(2).
- Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., & Healey, M., (2018). Connecting learning, teaching, and research through student–staff partnerships: Toward universities as egalitarian learning communities. In V. Tong, A. Standen, & M. Sotiriou (Eds.), *Shaping Higher Education with Students: Ways to Connect Research and Teaching*. London, United Kingdom: UCL Press.
- Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L., (2019). Toward theories of partnership praxis: An analysis of interpretive framing in literature on students as partners in teaching and learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(2), 280–293.
- Matthews, K. E., Dwyer, A., Hine, L., & Turner, J., (2018b). Conceptions of students as partners. *Higher Education*, 76(6), 957–971.
- Matthews, K. E., Tai, J., Enright, E., Carless, D., Rafferty, C., & Winstone, N., (2021). Transgressing the boundaries of students as partners and feedback discourse communities to advance democratic education. *Teaching in Higher Education*.
- Mayanja, C. S., (2020). Ladder of citizen participation: Insights into female student representatives on public university councils in Uganda. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(2), 121–132.
- McCulloch, A., (2009). The student as co-producer: Learning from public administration about the student–university relationship. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(2), 171–183.
- Meeuwissen, S. N., Spruijt, A., van Veen, J. W., & de Goeij, A. F., (2019). Student participation in governance of medical and veterinary education: Experiences and perspectives of student representatives and program directors. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 24(4), 665–690.
- Mercer-Mapstone, L., Dvorakova, S. L., Matthews, K. E., Abbot, S., Cheng, B., Felten, P., & Swaim, K., (2017).

A systematic literature review of students as partners in higher education. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(1).

Molesworth, M., Scullion, R., & Nixon, E., (2011). *The Marketization of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer*. Routledge.

Mugume, T., & Luescher, T. M., (2015). The politics of student housing: Student activism and representation in the determination of the user-price of a public-private partnership residence on a public university campus in South Africa. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 3(1), 1–17.

Pennacchia, J., Watson, C., & Bathmaker, A. M., (2021). How is the role of student governor understood in further education colleges in the UK? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. Advance Online Publication.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).