

An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning: Data Tables

PART 1: BUILDING ON CONCEPTS

Concept: Threshold Concepts

Description: “Conceptual gateways” or “portals” that, once passed through, lead to “a transformed internal view of subject matter, subject landscape, or even world view” (Meyer & Land, 2006, p. 19): troublesome, transformative, discursive, irreversible, and integrative.

Root/Origins: Economics.

Summary: The threshold concepts framework (Meyer & Land, 2006) has been drawn on with increasing frequency in recent scholarship about student-staff partnership. Much of this literature takes as a central goal establishing that partnership can itself be seen as a threshold concept, expanding the framework beyond its original focus on the learning of disciplinary knowledge. Such work (e.g., Cook-Sather, 2014a; Cook-Sather & Luz, 2015; Werder, Thibou & Kaufer, 2012) draws on perspectives of participants who have taken part in partnership initiatives to establish what makes partnership work troublesome, transformative, integrative and irreversible, and to underline the significance of partnership in the process. In so doing, this research also necessarily positions threshold concepts as a useful analytical framework for SaP: a means of illuminating and understanding the experiences of participants, and—in some cases—a tool for assessing particular partnership programs or teasing out ways in which partnership work might best be supported (e.g., Marquis et al., 2016; 2017). While the bulk of the existing literature in this area focuses on partnership as a threshold concept in and of itself, a different line of thinking considers how student-faculty partnership might help to illuminate understanding of disciplinary thresholds or to expand our understanding of threshold concepts more broadly. Felten (2013), for example, suggests that bringing students and faculty together to think about thresholds can both generate new insights that enrich threshold concepts theory and enhance teaching and learning practice.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
Cook-Sather, A. (2014a). Student-faculty partnership in explorations of pedagogical practice: A threshold concept in academic development. <i>International Journal for Academic Development</i> , 19(3), 186-198.	Draws on data from faculty participants in a pedagogical consultancy partnership initiative, the SaLT program at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, to suggest that student-faculty partnership can be seen as a threshold concept. Illustrates what makes such partnerships troublesome, transformative, integrative, and irreversible for faculty, and offers suggestions for supporting partnership via educational development.	“I argue that student-faculty partnership in explorations of pedagogical practice is a threshold concept in academic development: it is an idea that has ‘the power to transform the way educators understand the teaching and learning process and their role in it’ (King & Felten, 2012, p. 5; Werder, Thibou, & Kaufer, 2012).” (p. 187)

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

<p>Cook-Sather, A., & Luz, A. (2015). Greater engagement in and responsibility for learning: What happens when students cross the threshold of student–faculty partnership. <i>Higher Education Research & Development, 34</i>(6), 1097-1109.</p>	<p>Complements Cook-Sather (2014a) by demonstrating how student-faculty partnership (in the context of the SaLT program at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges) can also be understood as a threshold concept for student participants. Offers evidence speaking to how partnership is experienced as troublesome, transformative, integrative, discursive, and irreversible for student consultants, and suggests that students crossing this threshold contribute to the transformation of higher education into a more democratic space of shared responsibility.</p>	<p>“...crossing the threshold of student–faculty partnership changes in deep and productive ways how students take up their education and their relationships with teachers (Cook-Sather, 2013; King & Felten, 2012; Werder et al., 2012). When students gain insights into the complexities of teaching and learning, recognise and take up greater responsibility for both, and work with faculty and other students to ensure greater engagement and efficacy, higher education can become a shared endeavour that makes both success and enjoyment more likely.” (p. 1106)</p>
<p>Felten, P. (2013). Introduction: Crossing thresholds together. <i>Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education, 1</i>(9).</p>	<p>Describes the threshold concepts framework and then outlines three questions for the model prompted by the essays written by students and faculty in this special issue of <i>Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education</i>: Are threshold concepts limited to disciplinary knowledge?; What are the most troublesome aspects of thresholds?; and, Is the metaphor of the threshold too narrow? Ultimately suggests that bringing students and faculty together to think about thresholds can both generate new insights that help advance/enrich the theory and enhance teaching and learning practice.</p>	<p>“Despite the questions raised here, the threshold concepts framework acts as a lens to focus our gaze on the most significant and troublesome things that students encounter in (and outside of) the curriculum. ... The central insight of this issue is the value of bringing together the distinct perspectives of students and faculty to envision new possibilities for teaching and learning in higher education.” (p. 4)</p>
<p>Marquis, E., Puri, V., Wan, S., Ahmad, A., Goff, L., Knorr, K., . . . & Woo, J. (2016). Navigating the threshold of student-staff partnerships: A case study from an Ontario teaching and learning institute. <i>International Journal for Academic Development, 21</i>(1), 4-15.</p>	<p>Explores the experiences of student and staff participants in a co-curricular Student Partners Program supported by a central teaching and learning institute. Positions student-staff partnership as a threshold concept and draws on this framing to understand/analyse participants’ experiences (and, by extension, to assess the program to some degree).</p>	<p>“...passing through the partnership threshold entails coming to understand staff and students as collegial contributors to teaching and learning, with complementary roles, responsibilities, and perspectives, and <i>realizing</i> this understanding within actual teaching and learning practices.” (p. 6).</p>

<p>Werder, C., Thibou, S., & Kaufer, B. (2012). Students as co-inquirers: A requisite threshold concept in educational development? <i>The Journal of Faculty Development</i>, 26(3), 34-38.</p>	<p>Draws on the authors' reflections about participating in a student-faculty SoTL partnership program to argue that co-inquiry is a threshold concept for faculty, students, and educational developers—and one which has the potential to make substantial contributions to teaching and learning scholarship.</p>	<p>“I had become a member of the higher education community in a new way – not simply as a consumer of knowledge, but also as a contributor to knowledge making. The realization was transformational and the recognition irreversible.” (p. 35)</p> <p>“Once I started to think of learners as research partners, everything changed. Now, no matter what kind of research on learning I’m doing, my first thought is to bring students into the study.” (p. 36)</p>
--	--	---

Concept: Liminality

Description: “A realm of pure possibility whence novel configurations of ideas and relations may arise” (Turner, 1995 [1969], p. 97), where participants are “ambiguous, neither here nor there, betwixt and between all fixed points of classification” (Turner, 1974, p. 232).

Roots: The work of the ethnographer Arnold van Gannep and the anthropologist Victor Turner (1981, 1974, 1969/1995).

Summary: These articles explore liminality within four different frames within HE: academic leadership, individual student-staff partnerships, quality enhancement, and redefining identities. Cook-Sather and Felten (2017) examine the role of liminality within academic leadership, focusing on how such liminality can support transformation of higher education institutions and their cultures. Cook-Sather and Alter (2011) focus on the role of liminal spaces at the individual level: in student-staff pedagogical partnerships. Jensen and Bennett (2016) focus on how liminal spaces can nurture the enhancement of teaching and learning through dialogue. And Matthews et al. (2018) argue that liminal spaces afford participants in partnership opportunities to negotiate and redefine their own roles and identities. All four articles argue for liminal spaces as places of possibility where individuals (together) can disrupt the traditional norms of higher education from in-between spaces among those norms.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Cook-Sather, A., & Felten, P. (2017). Ethics of academic leadership: Guiding learning and teaching. In S. Feng & M. Wood (Eds.), <i>Cosmopolitan perspectives on academic leadership in higher education</i> (pp. 175-191). London, UK: Bloomsbury.</p>	<p>Argues that academic leadership in higher education should embrace an ethic of reciprocity and the practice of partnership in order to cultivate practices that embrace a diversity of differently positioned people. Proposes that this cultivation of diversity might be achieved through the creation of liminal spaces within which academic leaders and others might explore and experience partnership in liminal spaces that provide the context for dialogue and change.</p>	<p>“Intentionally embraced as places within which the possible might unfold, such ‘as-if’ spaces can support academic developers, academic staff, and students engaging with one another as partners, and by enacting partnership in this in-between place, they can learn to become partners beyond it.” (p. 181)</p>
<p>Cook-Sather, A., & Alter, Z. (2011). What is and what can be: How a liminal position can change learning and teaching in higher education. <i>Anthropology & Education Quarterly</i>, 42(1), 37-53.</p>	<p>In the context of pedagogical partnerships at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, draws on consultants’ perspectives to argue that when students engage with staff as pedagogical consultants, they are situated within the liminal ‘in-between’ space—between traditional conceptualizations of student and staff. This re-conceptualization of positioning as liminal blurs the traditional delineation of responsibilities for learning (student) and teaching (staff). Argues that positioning students within this liminality has the capacity to transform student perceptions of education as well as societal understandings of tradition educational hierarchies.</p>	<p>“We reframe this set of traditions as a problem of practice and analyze how the creation of a new position for students within a faculty development program — the position of ‘student consultant’ — catalyzes a revision of students’ relationships to their teachers and their responsibilities within their learning. We use the term ‘liminal’ to describe the position of student consultant because this classical anthropological concept foregrounds ‘in-betweenness,’ a quality of experience with unique potential to challenge deep-seated assumptions about how a community or society works.” (p. 2)</p>
<p>Jensen, K., & Bennett, L. (2016). Enhancing teaching and learning through dialogue: A student and staff partnership model. <i>International Journal for Academic Development</i>, 21(4), 41-53.</p>	<p>Describes and analyses a model for developing student-staff partnerships to enhance teaching and learning in a higher education context. The model is based on a student consultants project at a UK university in which students and staff were engaged in quality enhancement of teaching and learning. Importantly, the program created a liminal space in which students and staff were able to come together outside their normal roles.</p>	<p>“The most successful student–staff partnerships that came about from the consultation process created space for conversation and collaboration, a liminal space where students and staff stepped outside normal roles and the traditional learner–teacher relationship. In this liminal space, and acting in a new, not quite defined role, as Student Consultants, the students reported that they felt equal to the academic staff they were working with.” (p. 51)</p>

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

<p>Matthews, K., Dwyer, A., Hines, L. & Turner, J. (2018). Conceptions of students as partners. <i>Higher Education</i>.</p>	<p>Sixteen student and staff interviews show three conceptions of partnership as counter-narrative, values-based practice, and cultural change. Uses concept of liminality to illuminate the ways in which the liminal positionality of partnership allowed participants space to overcome boundaries and consider new identities.</p>	<p>“In the liminal space, SaP gives permission for both staff and students to consider and enact new identities as mutual learners. This process of conceptualising roles in different ways disrupts traditional arrangements, and has personal implications. Not only do students and staff go through a mutually beneficial process of negotiation with one another in the liminal space, they negotiate and redefine their own roles and identities.” (p. 17)</p>
--	--	--

Concept: Participative Reality

Description: “Within a participatory worldview, the world is not seen as existing independently of any observer, just waiting to be known through a process of observation and analysis. Rather, it views human beings as equal participants in the world, who co-create a reality which is shaped by the nature and quality of our subjective-objective relationships” (Walton, 2013, p. 402).

Roots/Origins: Based on work of John Heron.

Summary of articles: Participative reality is concerned with the ways in which partners experience partnership, which, according to this concept, is co-constructed by partners themselves through engagement in the partnership process. As a result, experiences are neither subjective nor objective, as the concept of participatory reality aims to bridge both of these worldviews by arguing that meaning is enacted through the participation of the human mind with the world. The article below by Walton (2013) uses participatory reality as a concept to document and explore an instructor’s experience teaching a second-year course entitled, “Active Participation in Learning.”

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Walton, J. (2013). Active participation in learning: Students creating their educational experience. In E. Dunne & D. Owen (Eds.), <i>The student engagement handbook: Practice in higher education</i> (pp. 401-419). Bingley, UK: Emerald.</p>	<p>Argues that reality is co-constructed by learners' participation in and engagement with the world; rejects the positivist paradigm of the 'subject-object divide.' This particular case study is a first-person account of an instructor's experience teaching a second-year course entitled, "Active Participation in Learning," an optional module for students hoping to gain employment post-university in an educational setting, generally but not exclusively in schools or youth services. Integrates student voices to detail the challenges and benefits of students' experience with this SaP initiative.</p>	<p>"Within a participatory worldview, the world is not seen as existing independently of any observer, just waiting to be known through a process of observation and analysis. Rather, it views human beings as equal participants in the world, who co-create a reality which is shaped by the nature and quality of our subjective-objective relationships." (p. 402)</p> <p>"A major challenge, then, was how to introduce the idea that I wanted the students to engage in the process of planning the curriculum for the whole module, with me facilitating the process but not determining it." (p. 408)</p>

Concept: Communities of Practice

Description: "Communities of practice are formed by people who engage in a process of collective learning in a shared domain of human endeavor" (Wenger & Wenger-Trayner, 2015).

Roots/Origins: Learning theory and anthropology.

Summary: When partnerships are formed, members bring with them pre-existing experiences, stories, tools, and ways of knowing. In cases where partners come from different communities of practice—for example, in partnerships involving faculty/staff and students—partnership can be both strengthened and challenged, as individuals often experience a sense of 'in-between-ness' while negotiating differing worldviews and power dynamics (e.g., Meacham, Castor, & Felten, 2013). However, partnership can also lead to the formation of new and powerful communities of practice, in which members learn from one another and contribute to the development of a shared identity through participation and reciprocal knowledge exchange. This can lead to meaningful learning and have transformative effects on members' identities (e.g., Tierney, 2012).

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Meacham, M., Castor, M., & Felten, P. (2013). Partners as newcomers: Mixed-role partnerships as communities of practice. <i>Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education</i>, 10.</p>	<p>Through two case studies, uses the communities of practice conceptual framework offered by Lave and Wenger (1991) to explore experiences and practices of mixed-role partnerships in higher education (e.g., faculty/staff-student partnerships). Particular emphasis is placed on participation in overlapping communities of practice—specifically, the “in-between-ness experienced by people in mixed-role partnerships” (p. 1). The complexities of how power operates in mixed-role partnerships are also considered and discussed.</p>	<p>“Mark’s and Maggie’s experiences illustrate how, as newcomers, they were both enabled and constrained by their participation in overlapping CoPs. Each of them at least initially was limited by feeling like an outsider, on the periphery of a new community of practice. In both cases, certain aspects of a CoP’s language and activities (such as research jargon and conference submission guidelines) reinforced that peripherality, even when those more central to the CoP intended to be welcoming and inclusive. However, both Mark and Maggie demonstrated expertise they had developed in other CoPs (Mark as a teacher, Maggie as a student), thus acquiring legitimacy and access in the new mixed-role CoP. Ultimately, their experiences suggest that certain aspects of participation in mixed-role CoPs may be empowering while others may be disempowering.” (p. 9)</p>
<p>Tierney, A. M. (2012). Undergraduate interns as staff developers: Flowers in the desert. <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching International</i>, 49(1), 7-17.</p>	<p>Describes an internship program through which undergraduate students from a variety of backgrounds were invited to spend four weeks investigating enquiry-based learning supported by a Teaching and Learning Centre facilitator, before moving on to work with a subject-based staff mentor for the following academic year. Central to the success of the program was the formation of a community of practice, where students not only learned through the support of their mentors, but also contributed their own knowledge to the community. This reciprocal knowledge exchange contributed to their sense of identity in a variety of ways.</p>	<p>“Through observation of the group during the initial phase of the project and whilst working with three of the interns on two projects, I naively thought that the confidence and sense of identity of the group had increased in a linear fashion throughout the duration of the project. However, on closer scrutiny, through the use of semi-structured interviews conducted at the end of the project, a much more complex picture of the ebbs and flows of confidence was revealed as the interns negotiated relationships and experiences which contributed, both positively and negatively, to their sense of identity.” (p. 9)</p>

Concept: Student Engagement

Description: A complex phenomenon that encompasses student involvement, excitement, and persistence (Ahlfeldt, Mehta, & Sellnow, 2005), layered and meaningful participation in, and commitment to, learning (Kuh & Ewell, 2010), and emotional as well as intellectual investment that are both a requirement for and outcome of partnership (Bovill, Cook-Sather, Felten, Millard, & Moore-Cherry, 2016).

Roots/Origins: Retention and thriving in higher education, a growing concern and focus of attention starting in the mid-1990s. Has roots in concerns about the time and effort students commit to learning (Astin, 1984), and later evolved to focus on what institutions can do to support students to engage in educationally purposeful activities—the kinds of activities that lead students to persist and thrive in higher education (Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Kinzie, 2009).

Summary: SaP and student engagement have clear overlaps, but as Healey, Flint, and Harrington (2014) argue: while all SaP is student engagement, not all student engagement is SaP. Numerous scholars have explored student-staff partnership within the frame of student engagement: Bovill et al. (2016); Bovill and Felten (2016); Bryson (2013); Chapman, Blatchford, and Hughes (2013); Cook-Sather (2013); Matthews (2016); Millard, Bartholomew, Brand, and Nygaard (2013); Taylor, Wilding, Mockridge, and Lambert (2012) to name a few. Student engagement is evoked in relationship to partnership in varying ways. For example, here are four different ways that scholars have employed student engagement to illuminate SaP: as one variable in the dynamic among student engagement, co-creation, and partnership (Bovill et al., 2016); to argue that partnership is a path toward student engagement (Bovill & Felten, 2016); to argue for thinking about staff/faculty engagement as well as student engagement (Cook-Sather, 2013); and to redefine engagement as partnership (Matthews, 2016).

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Bols, A., & Freeman, R. (2011). Engaging students in shaping their curriculum. <i>Educational Developments</i>, 12(2), 5-9.</p>	<p>A summary report of a UK project of the National Union of Students and the Higher Education Academy, looking at “three key strands of student engagement: student feedback, student representation and students shaping their curriculum.” (p. 6) The article uses as a case study the Student Academic Partners program at Birmingham City University. It offers a “toolkit” for moving from passive consultation of students (the “autopsy” approach of exploring what went wrong) through involvement, engagement, and partnership. There’s a graphic on p. 7.</p>	<p>“It is more important than ever that we work to ensure that students are meaningfully involved in shaping the learning process and see the value of their engagement. Without being involved, or having the opportunity to be involved, in the shaping of their education, the consumer model of higher education will only be exacerbated, and a service deliverer–product–consumer relationship will be encouraged.” (p. 6)</p>

<p>Bovill, C., Cook-Sather, A., Felten, P., Millard, L., & Moore-Cherry, N. (2016). Addressing potential challenges in co-creating learning and teaching: Overcoming resistance, navigating institutional norms and ensuring inclusivity in student–staff partnerships. <i>Higher Education</i>, 71(2), 195-208.</p>	<p>Provides a set of examples from higher education institutions in Europe and North America that illustrates some important challenges that can arise during co-creation and how these might be resolved or re-envisioned as opportunities for more meaningful collaboration.</p>	<p>“...keep the three phenomena— student engagement, co-creation and partnership—in dynamic relationship to one another, allowing for variation in how they interact” (Bovill et al., 2016, p. 196).</p>
<p>Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2016). Cultivating student-staff partnerships through research and practice. <i>International Journal for Academic Development</i>, 21(1), 1-3.</p>	<p>Editors’ introduction to a special issue on partnership that features articles from Australia, Canada, Sweden, and the UK, all of which highlight the challenge of moving partnership from theory to practice.</p>	<p>“Over the last several years, student-staff partnerships have increasingly been portrayed as a primary path towards [student] engagement.” (p. 2)</p>
<p>Bryson, C. (Ed.) (2014). <i>Understanding and developing student engagement</i>. London, UK: Routledge.</p>	<p>Edited collection that builds on prior scholarship by Bryson (esp. Bryson & Hand, 2007, The role of engagement in inspiring teaching and learning, <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching International</i> 44:4, and also a longitudinal study he did of Honours students at University of Newcastle) to argue for the importance of students as actors in their own engagement. With this work, Bryson helped to shift scholarship on engagement from studying students in the abstract to (a) aiming to understand the lived experiences of diverse students, and (b) framing students as agents of their own engagement.</p>	<p>The existing paradigms used by scholars to describe and evaluate student engagement “do not uncover the richness and diversity of the student experience, or very much about the perspective of students” (p. 7), so scholars/practitioners should attend carefully to the voices/experiences of students -- and partnership is essential to doing that.</p>
<p>Cook-Sather, A. (2013). Catalyzing multiple forms of engagement through student-faculty partnerships exploring teaching and learning. In E. Dunne & D. Owen (Eds.), <i>The student engagement handbook: Practice in higher education</i> (pp. 549-565). Bingley, UK: Emerald.</p>	<p>Moves beyond a focus on student engagement alone to include staff engagement. Argues that forms of engagement that are at once reciprocal and inclusive facilitate more nuanced understandings of the complexities of teaching and learning, inspire empathy and appreciation, and deepen a sense of responsibility for the educational process.</p>	<p>“When academic staff work in such deeply collaborative ways with student consultants, engaged as true partners, they can develop a stronger sense of where deeper engagement might unfold with their students more generally.” (p. 555)</p>

<p>Matthews, K. E. (2016). Students as partners as the future of student engagement. <i>Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal</i>, 1(1), 1-5.</p>	<p>Provides a description of how the notion of engagement has evolved; suggests that partnership is a process for engaging with rather than doing to or doing for students; offers a vision for student engagement as students as partners.</p>	<p>“Students as partners offer a view of student engagement that is a joint endeavour to shape and influence university teaching and learning.” (p. 1)</p>
<p>Millard, L., Bartholomew, P., Brand, S., & Nygaard, C. (2013). Why student engagement matters. In C. Nygaard, S. Brand, P. Bartholomew, & L. Millard (Eds.), <i>Student engagement: Identity, motivation, and community</i> (pp. 1-15). Oxford, UK: Libri.</p>	<p>Distinct from others published before it and focused on engagement because all chapters “are written in close collaboration between students and staff at Birmingham City University” (p. 3). Argues that belonging is a key facet of engagement, it can be generated through partnership, and that attention to belonging ensures that students are not treated as consumers (p. 11).</p>	<p>“Kuh (2009:683) defined student engagement as ‘the time and effort students devote to activities that are empirically linked to desired outcomes of college and what institutions do to induce students to participate in these activities.’ Although there are many definitions of student engagement in the literature, this one is particularly useful in our context as it reflects elements of the partnership nature of the relationship between the student and the university.” (p. 8)</p>
<p>Chapman, P., Blatchford, S., & Hughes, E. (2013). Lightening up the dark side: A partnership approach between a students' union and the university. In C. Nygaard, S. Brand, P. Bartholomew & L. Millard (Eds.) <i>Student engagement: Identity, motivation and community</i> (pp. 271-289). Faringdon, UK: Libri.</p>	<p>Examines the evolving relationships between student unions and higher education institutions in the UK. At first partnership might seem like a positive for student unions, but it can be challenging because closer ties restrict the unions’ traditions of autonomy and independence. However, drawing on the Birmingham City University experience, framing students as change agents can lead to empowering partnerships for all by expanding the scope of the learning community that students engage in (to include the academic, social, and service purposes of a student union). This leads to re-conceptualizing the role of students, from passive recipients of knowledge to co-creators of learning.</p>	<p>Table 1 offers helpful overview of the role of the student within engagement activity (pp. 283-284) as part of a discussion of changing relationships between students and staff.</p>

<p>Lambert, C., Mockridge, A., Taylor, P., & Wilding, D. (2012). Reinventing engagement. In I. Solomonides, A. Reid & P. Petocz (Eds.), <i>Engaging with learning in higher education</i> (pp. 259-278). Oxford, UK: Libri.</p>	<p>Aims to demonstrate the possibility and necessity of involving students actively in “all processes of the university” (p. 261). Argues that this will produce gains for students and the institution. This model of engagement challenges the powerless position of students as consumer and enables students “to become creators and producers of ideas, knowledge and meaningful outputs.” (p. 261). Concludes that partnership is essential for engagement.</p>	<p>“This focus on the student as producer (re)locates the university itself as an important public institution engaged with, and contributing to, wider social, political and economic concerns. Students do not shut themselves away for three years in order to ‘consume’ a degree that may (if they are lucky) earn them a place in the labour market from whence they can pay back their debt. The university is a workplace and the development of critical, creative and collaborative citizens is its business.” (p. 262)</p>
---	---	--

Concept: Deliberative Democracy

Description: A method of democratic engagement that builds capacity/confidence of people to involve themselves in the decision-making process.

Roots/Origins: Traceable back to Aristotle, the concept has influenced many models, mostly focused on governmental processes, citizen participation, and political movements.

Summary of articles: The process of deliberative democracy works on three principles. First, through inclusion/representativeness, which seeks to include a representative random sample. Second, through deliberation, which gives these participants the opportunity to engage with the complexity of the issues at hand. Third, through influence, which states that the resulting suggestions of participants must be seriously considered. Through this three-part process, deliberative democracy becomes “an ideal method of engaging students in the curriculum renewal process” (Bell, Carson, & Piggott, 2013, p. 502) as well as being particularly suited to developing student graduate attributes such as leadership.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Bell, A., Carson, L., Piggott, L. (2013). Deliberative democracy for curriculum renewal. In E. Dunne & D. Owen (Eds.), <i>The student engagement handbook: Practice in higher education</i> (pp. 499-508). Bingley, UK: Emerald.</p>	<p>There are three principles of deliberative democracy: inclusion/representativeness, deliberation, and influence. It involves understanding of beliefs and priorities, analysis of factual data, acknowledging multiple perspectives, and consideration of stakeholder concerns.</p>	<p>“[A professor] drew on her background in deliberative democracy to create an opportunity for the students to give feedback” on a unit and “collectively decide” in a large group on a “final list of suggested changes” to the unit. (pp. 503-504)</p>

Concept: Ecology of Participation

Description: Conceptualises participation in the co-creation of curricula as an ecology where all are considered valuable actors

Roots/Origins: The branch of biology focused on the interactions among organisms and their environment; Morris’ (2002) argument for an ecological paradigm that recognises integration with the world and others’; and aspects of Alfred North Whitehead’s process philosophy.

Summary: Drawing on the work of Morris and Whitehead, Taylor and Bovill (2018) develop the concept of curriculum co-creation as an ecology of participation. This notion of curriculum co-creation “enables greater scope for individuals to be educational actors; creates a greater role for sociality and for the mutual constitution of action and meaning within curriculum assemblages; and draws attention to co-creation as an embodied, embedded and relational practice of curriculum-making.” (p. 113)

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Taylor, C. A., & Bovill, C. (2018). Towards an ecology of participation: Process philosophy and co-creation of higher education curricula. <i>European Educational Research Journal</i>, 17(1), 112-128.</p>	<p>Taylor and Bovill (2018) draw on biological notions of the interactions among organisms and their environment and a set of ideas from process philosophy “to consider co-creation in the curriculum and co-creation of the curriculum.”</p>	<p>“We outline three dimensions of an ecology of participation: a process of becoming which recasts subjectivity; acting well in relation which enacts concern; and an orientation to harmony in which difference in equality is valued. The contribution of the article is twofold: first, the concept of an ecology of participation takes forward current thinking on higher education curricula and partnership ethics; second, its use of process philosophy provides a new lens to consider co-creation in the curriculum and co-creation of the curriculum.” (p. 112)</p>

PART 2: DRAWING ON CONSTRUCTS

Construct: Identity

Description: Identity is who we are as defined by intersecting social dimensions/characteristics.

Roots/origins: Critical, feminist, post-structural, and intersectionality theory.

Summary: Identity figures in a range of work on students as partners, insofar as notions of student and staff roles, perspectives, and definitions of self and other underpin much discussion of the benefits and challenges of partnership work. Nevertheless, identity is not often explored explicitly or concretely, or by drawing on existing scholarly formulations. Amongst the ways in which identity has been taken up more extensively in SaP literature are considerations of how partnership initiatives can mobilize the diverse identities of student and staff participants in ways that enhance teaching and learning, amongst other benefits (e.g., Cook-Sather, 2015); explorations of how partnership can occasion productive shifts in identity (e.g., Gibson et al., 2017); and analyses of interactions between self-conceptions of identity and partnership (Mercer-Mapstone, Marquis, & McConnell, 2018). All three of these discussions emphasise the problematic nature of dichotomies and the generative potential of diversity.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
Cook-Sather, A. (2015). Dialogue across differences of position, perspective, and identity: Reflective practice in/on a student-faculty pedagogical partnership program. <i>Teachers College Record</i> , 117(2).	Analysis of how a student-faculty partnership program supports dialogue across differences of student and faculty position, perspective, and racial or cultural identity within partnerships focused on individual courses and partnerships focused on an interdisciplinary program that links multiple courses.	“Inviting faculty and students into partnership, seeking and affirming differences, and embracing diversity as a resource—these actions embody a feminist ethic of risk and constitute some of the ways that difference can unite us and help to effect change in higher educational practices.”
Gibson, S., Baskerville, D., Berry, A., Black, A., Norris, K., & Symeonidou, S. (2017). Including students as co-enquirers: Matters of identity, agency, language and labelling in an International participatory research study. <i>International Journal of Educational Research</i> , 81, 108-118.	Describes the development of an international, participatory research project about ‘diversity’ in higher education, which sought to engage students as both participants and co-researchers. Acknowledges the challenges for researchers attending to shifts in participant role identity, but ultimately argues that such shifts lead to new insight (in terms of the research findings), participant researcher ‘empowerment’, and more just and equitable research approaches (with the implication that this is especially important for research with members of equity-seeking groups).	“Our experiences with shifting identities for example, from ‘student as participant’ to ‘student as co-enquirer’ added more depth and criticality to the research and it was also an empowering experience as noted elsewhere by the participants. The blurring lines of our identities and the disruption brought was at first experienced as problematic, however in the end it became a more liberating experience providing rich insights into the world and lives of our students.” (p. 117)
Mercer-Mapstone, L., Marquis, E., & McConnell, C. (2018). The ‘partnership identity’ in higher education: Moving from ‘us’ and ‘them’ to ‘we’ in student-staff partnership. <i>Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal</i> , 2(1), 12-29.	Describes the interaction between self-conceptions of identity and partnership from the perspective of three partnership practitioners. Argues that there is need for more recognition of the diverse conceptions of identity that individuals bring to partnership. Suggests the notion of an overarching partnership identity for those who have crossed a partnership threshold that brings partners together in terms of sense of belonging.	“...the complexity of identity in partnership contexts cannot be underestimated. We emphasise the need to move away from dichotomous labels of ‘student’ and ‘staff’ as there are risks associated with causing dissonance, stereotyping and marginalisation as a result of such oversimplification. ... We highlight the emerging juxtaposition of ‘traditional academic identity’ – with attached norms associated with the historically-entrenched, top-down culture of the academy — and ‘partnership identity’ – with norms that reflect the ethos of partnership as a collaborative teaching and learning endeavour.” (p. 15)

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

Construct: Power

Description: Power is the capacity to act.

Roots/origins: Critical, feminist, post-structural, and intersectionality theory—all of which frame power as something that is (and ought to be) contested. In keeping with Foucault’s notion that power is typically understood as something that cannot be avoided or eliminated, but rather must be navigated: “the nature of higher education institutions is that power relations do exist and are perceived between lecturer and student, with the power and authority resting in the lecturer in obvious, subtle and also taken for granted ways (Mann, 2001)” (Allin, 2014, p. 101).

Summary: In the partnership literature, power often appears in the context of hierarchies, positions, and practices of those engaged in the partnership in higher education—a context that has long/strong traditions, habits, and policies that reinforce distinct roles and significant differences in power/status. In other words, while power generically is defined as the capacity to act, in the higher education partnership context power most often seems to be understood/addressed in relation to power differentials (e.g., between staff and students) that affect one’s ability to act, and discussions of power explicitly or implicitly focus on the difficulties power presents to those striving to be in partnership.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
Seale, J., Gibson, S., Haynes, J., & Potter, A. (2015). Power and resistance: Reflections on the rhetoric and reality of using participatory methods to promote student voice and engagement in higher education. <i>Journal of Further and Higher Education</i> , 39(4), 534-552.	Uses narratives from four perspectives in one partnership to explore questions of power and resistance. Frames “ownership and expertise” as two key aspects of power in partnerships (p. 547) and argues against a simplistic understanding of resistance. Advocates a critical pedagogy approach to voice, engagement, and partnership.	“Current policy and research literature has a tendency to gloss over the complexities and contentiousness of the claims made regarding student voice and engagement. Our experience suggests that, if we continue to ignore issues of power and resistance, we will fall far short of the vision of student engagement and the ideals of strong participation and expression of student voice.” (p. 550)
Crawford, K. (2012). Rethinking the student/teacher nexus: Students as consultants on teaching in higher education. In M. Neary, L. Bell & H. Stevenson (Eds.), <i>Towards teaching in public: Reshaping the modern</i>	Examines a collaborative approach to harnessing the student experience through engagement in the philosophies of professional democratic practice, teaching in public, and repositioning the student-teacher relationship. It provides an example of recognising students as experts in the joint	“In a desire to democratize knowledge, making our teaching more public, it is not enough to recognize the inequality in power that characterizes the relationship between student and teacher; that recognition must be a catalyst that enables challenge and cultural transformation.” (p. 57)

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

<p><i>university</i> (pp. 52-67). London, UK: Bloomsbury.</p>	<p>endeavour of knowledge production through the Students Consulting on Teaching (SCOTs) project.</p>	
<p>Mihans, R., Long, D., & Felten, P. (2008). Power and expertise: Student-faculty collaboration in course design and the scholarship of teaching and learning. <i>International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</i>, 2(2), 1-9.</p>	<p>Describes an approach to course redesign by a team of faculty, undergraduate students, and an academic developer. Focuses particular attention on power relations and issues of expertise.</p>	<p>“By working together to take full advantage of all of the team’s expertise, we began to understand the true meaning and importance of shared power through collaboration.” (p. 5)</p>
<p>Matthews, K.E. (2017). Five propositions for genuine students as partners practice. <i>International Journal for Students as Partners</i>, 1(2).</p>	<p>Editorial that proposes five interrelated principles for good practice in partnership that are all grounded in issues of power.</p>	<p>“Power, whether discussed or left unspoken, is always a factor in SaP interactions. The intention of SaP is not to eliminate power or tip the scales of power in favor of one group over the other... Theories of power offer a framework to illuminate power in SaP, to discuss it within partnerships, or reflect upon power dynamics as SaP practitioners and researchers.”</p>

Construct: Gender

Description: Gender identity as a sociocultural construct

Roots/origins: Feminist, post-structural, and intersectionality

Summary: In the context of students as partners literature, gender is of focus regarding how individuals’ gender identities influence and are influenced by partnership experiences. This work links in to broader notions of identity – given the construction of gender specifically as an identity construct – and how that identity is salient in partnership practice. Theoretical links have been made between partnership and gender through the application of feminist theories, where Mercer-Mapstone & Mercer (2018) explored the lessons for partnership work from previous feminist movements, noting that both processes deal with power, binaries, and inclusivity.

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Mercer-Mapstone, L., & Mercer, G. (2018). A dialogue between partnership and feminism: Deconstructing power and exclusion in higher education. <i>Teaching in Higher Education</i>, 23(1), 137-143.</p>	<p>Draws a parallel between conception of gender as portrayed through feminist theories and students as partners as both being “seated in similar and radical processes of challenging, questioning, destabilizing, deconstructing, and empowering” (p. 6). Uses feminist theories on the problematic nature of binarized gender conceptions to problematize the binarization of students/staff based in partnership work with implications for disruption of patriarchal structures and related power hierarchies.</p>	<p>“...students are positioned as equivalent to women in terms of the binaries that shape patriarchal institutions in terms of being the Other? Yes, there’s a strong argument for that parallel. One other parallel which struck me is that feminist theories ... seek to disturb the ways in which [patriarchal] structures have silenced the knowledge and narratives of those most affected and marginalised (Hanson and Buechler 2015).</p>

PART 3: IMAGINING THROUGH METAPHORS

Metaphor: Self-Authorship

Description: “The internal capacity to define one’s own belief system, identity, and relationships” (Baxter Magolda, 2007, p. 69).

Roots/Origins: Based on the work of Robert Kegan, then adopted by Baxter-Magolda in relation to college students, and subsequently applied to partnership

Summary: Self-authorship in partnership scholarship draws on developmental theory that suggests that certain experiences—including partnership—can help individuals ask and answer critical questions about themselves, such as, “How do I know?,” “Who am I?,” and “How do I want to construct relationships with others?” (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Earlier work on self-authorship focused primarily on the experiences of students; however, more recent work has demonstrated that self-authorship occurs in a similar way for faculty. Although the article below has some implications for partnership, there is considerable opportunity to explore the links between self-authorship and partnership more explicitly in future scholarship.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Gunersel, A. B., Barnett, P., & Etienne, M. (2013). Promoting self-authorship of college educators: Exploring the impact of a faculty development program. <i>Journal of Faculty Development</i>, 27(1), 35-44.</p>	<p>Baxter-Magolda (2007) defines self-authorship as “the internal capacity to define one’s own belief system, identity, and relationships” (p. 69). Using the metaphor of self-authorship, this article explores the experiences of 12 instructors who participated in a faculty development program at a large, urban research university. Findings were that the program helped instructors exercise and further develop their self-authorship as educators and that engaging with colleagues from various disciplines influenced instructors’ perceptions regarding themselves as educators, their teaching practices, and the nature of knowledge.</p>	<p>“The continuing exercise and development of instructors’ self-authorship as educators is important as it leads to consistency between intrapersonal identity, interpersonal relations, and teaching practices. When the epistemological understanding of the constructed nature of knowledge is in place, the way instructors think of their role as educators and their relationship to students lead to actual practices that are learner-centered.” (p. 42)</p>

Metaphor: Student as Producer

Description: Emphasizes the role of students as collaborators in the production of knowledge; “Student as Producer is a critical response to attempts by recent governments in the UK, and around the world, to create a consumerist culture among undergraduate students.” (Neary, 2010)

Roots/Origins: Derived from “critical social theory grounded in avant-garde Marxism that developed in Soviet Russia after the Bolshevik uprising in 1917, before being suppressed by Stalin, and a group of modernist Marxists working in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s” (Neary, 2010) and draws in particular on the work of Walter Benjamin and Lev Vygotsky.

Summary: The concept of students as producers aims to combine two principal aspects of university teaching and research into a single scheme, by positioning students as collaborators in the production of knowledge with their staff counterparts. As a broad, overarching concept, portrayals in literature can be quite varied. Neary and Winn (2009), for example, view students as producers as a direct response and antonym to the movement of the student as a consumer and the corporatization of higher education, giving the metaphor a more ethereal feel as a frame of mind or a university movement. Others see students as producers as a corporeal, clearly defined set of instructions for student involvement, arguing that when students are provided with a suitable environment within which to function, they are able to produce quality original material (Finnan, Gibbs, Waite, & Davidson-Fisher, 2015).

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Finnan, A. F., Gibbs, C. L., Waite, M., & Davison-Fisher. (2015). Students as producers: The postgraduate teaching assistant pilot project. <i>Journal of Educational Innovation Partnership and Change</i>, 1(1).</p>	<p>Provides a detailed case study example of students being taken on as teaching assistants and becoming producers of certain curriculum materials. Argues that if students are given a good environment within which to function, they are able to produce original material.</p>	<p>“The role of student as producer is a resource which, when aligned with effective leadership and a solid infrastructure within which to function, can collaborate, enhance, innovate and produce, providing insight and previously untapped expertise, while concurrently maintaining a successful student role and meeting learning outcomes and requirements.” (p. 10)</p>
<p>Neary, M. & Winn, J. (2009). The student as producer: Reinventing the student experience in higher education. In L. Bell, M. Neary, & H. Stevenson (Eds.), <i>The future of higher education: Policy, pedagogy and the student experience</i> (pp. 192-210). London, UK: Bloomsbury.</p>	<p>Discusses student as producer as a historical and contemporary antonym to student as consumer, as well as the role of student as producer within the university system, the university’s teaching and learning. Student as producer is not just a junior researcher, but a critical response to corporatization of higher education. Points out the students as producers create a way to unify the two main goals of university: research and teaching.</p>	<p>“The controversial notion of student as consumer is much discussed in academic circles, but what is less well debated is the extent to which the basis of student life might be rearranged within higher education” (p. 193). “The idea of student as producer encourages the development of collaborative relations between student and academic for the production of knowledge.” (p. 209)</p>

Metaphor: Translation

Description: To bear, remove, or change from one place or condition to another; to change the form, expression, or mode of expression of, so as to interpret or make tangible, and thus to carry over from one medium or sphere into another; to change completely, to transform (*Webster’s New International Dictionary*, 2nd ed.).

Roots/Origins: Literary and translation studies

Summary: Translation is used as a metaphor that is strongly aligned with transformation. This transformation applies to student/staff perceptions of practices and of themselves during or as a result of working in partnership. It is applied to various contexts including in-classroom pedagogical practices (Cook-Sather & Abbot, 2016), student voice and experience in schools (Cook-Sather, 2007), and various pre-service teacher education contexts in higher education (Cook-Sather, 2003; Gibson et al., 2017).

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Cook-Sather, A., & Abbot, S. (2016). Translating partnerships: How faculty-student collaboration in explorations of teaching and learning can transform perceptions, terms, and selves. <i>Teaching & Learning Inquiry</i>, 4(2), 1-14.</p>	<p>Employs translation as metaphor to argue that faculty members and student consultants who participate in pedagogical partnership programs engage in processes that lead to transformed perceptions of classroom engagement, transformed terms for naming pedagogical practices, and, more metaphorically, transformed selves. Data is drawn from action research into two pedagogical partnership programs in the US, from previous writings from the programs, analysed through narrative analysis.</p>	<p>“Translation is an evocative combination of communicative and experienced change, which makes it a particularly rich conceptual framework for analyzing and supporting the processes of engagement that faculty and students experience in partnership, the specific contextual and relational qualities of these processes, and the transformations of language and sense of self that result.” (p. 2)</p> <p>“On the metaphorical level, student consultants and faculty translate themselves into new versions of those selves through their partnerships. These transformations are empowering: both student consultants and faculty members become more informed (by multiple perspectives), more confident, and more capable of risking and undertaking a wider range of forms of communication and practice.” (p. 7)</p>
<p>Cook-Sather, A. (2006). <i>Education is translation: A metaphor for change in learning and teaching</i>. Philadelphia, PA: Penn Press.</p>	<p>Includes the following chapters: an introductory chapter about the author’s experience living the translation of her words and self in Germany; a chapter focused on how second-year undergraduate students experience both those forms of translation in a reading/writing/thinking course; a chapter focused on how pre-service teachers experience both those forms of translation through teacher preparation; a chapter focused on how students, staff, and faculty working in teams to revise courses experience both those forms of translation; and a final chapter that pulls all these together.</p>	<p>When I conceptualize education in these terms, I emphasize its primarily language-based nature, I foreground interpretation, expression, and communication as rich, complex human processes, and I argue for ongoing transformation—ongoing interpretation and articulation not only of meaningful words but also of meaningful relationships and selves—rather than a static state or relationship, as its desired goal. A student who genuinely engages in well-designed formal education changes her condition, makes herself comprehensible to others in a new sphere, makes a new version of herself, is transformed. These processes are never finished; they are always open to further revision and always lead to further re-renderings.” (p. 36-37)</p>

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

<p>Gibson, S., Baskerville, D., Berry, A., Black, A., Norris, K., & Symeonidou, S. (2017). Including students as co-enquirers: Matters of identity, agency, language and labelling in an International participatory research study. <i>International Journal of Educational Research</i>, 81, 108-118.</p>	<p>Examines “the methodological development of an international study, which involved 8 academics and 373 students in departments of Education from 6 universities in Europe, New Zealand and the USA” (p.1) addressing questions of student diversity and inclusion, and the role of participants as co-researchers through the lenses of identity, agency, language, and labelling. Translation is introduced in the final section of the discussion where authors align the metaphor of translation making space for marginalized voices with their inclusion of challenges and the resulting changes in making space for the voices and experiences of students to be included. Authors also adopt the metaphor of translation to describe the changes they experiences in language - as students moved from participants to co-inquirers.</p>	<p>“Cook-Sather (2012, p. 353), addressing the power of translation as metaphor and creator of meaning in relation to marginalised voices argues: Recent feminist perspectives brought to bear on translation studies highlight the power of dynamics inherent in translation and the importance of focusing on previously neglected people, experiences and interpretation. Her discussion on ‘translation connects with our methodological challenges. In a similar vein our decision to make room for these challenges and the subsequent discussions, and changes they caused, allowed various participant voices to be heard, and enabled the student participants to experience power and become a central part of the study’s meaning making. The student as co-enquirer served to challenge traditional, well-trodden forms of education research.” (p. 10)</p>
---	--	---

Metaphor: Student Voice

Description: Both a metaphor for and the literal sound, presence, and power of students in conversations about educational practice

Roots/Origins: K-12 school reform in Canada, UK, Australia, and US

Summary: Available literature is intertwined in terms of claims about this metaphor. Owing to its all-encompassing nature, some literature has re-categorized student voice in terms of the level of student involvement, ranging from peer support, to learning partnerships, to student evaluation of the staff/school (Fielding, 2011). This points to a commonly discussed issue within the student voice conversation, mainly that student involvement is often restricted and formulated in such a way as to reduce the chance of power sharing between staff to student (Frison & Melacarne, 2017), possibly reducing the chance of genuine student engagement (Seale, Gibson, Haynes, & Potter, 2015). Student voice is perceived positively in some of the partnership literature we surveyed; it is described as helping to improve curriculum (Brooman, Darwent, & Pimor, 2015, p. 671) and as changing perspectives of both staff and faculty (Cook-Sather, 2014). There are also dangers of student voice, in that it can be restricted and appropriated.

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

Full Citation	Summary of Argument	Representative Quotes or Useful References
<p>Brooman, S., Darwent, S., & Pimor, A. (2015). The student voice in higher education curriculum design: is there value in listening? <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching International</i>, 52(6), 663-674.</p>	<p>Argues through a case study that change based on what students say is more influential and challenges long-held notions of teaching and learning. The authors suggest that active involvement of students in shaping their own curriculum can lead to greater student engagement and help staff confront their own notions of curriculum design.</p>	<p>“As curricula continue to rapidly evolve, feedback on how they are received will be increasingly important. . . . Enhancing the student voice may help to avoid repeating design mistakes.” (p. 671)</p>
<p>Seale, J., Gibson, S., Haynes, J., & Potter, A. (2015). Power and resistance: Reflections on the rhetoric and reality of using participatory methods to promote student voice and engagement in higher education. <i>Journal of Further and Higher Education</i>, 39(4), 534-552.</p>	<p>Uses a case study of a participatory research project to provide groundwork on how student voice definition has changed to include all manner of participatory research in recent years. Argues that this doesn’t remove its value, as participants gain ownership of the initiative and have a space to work in collaborative, non-hierarchical partnerships. However, the nature and quality of engagement with the student voice matters, perhaps more than the quantity of it, with issues of power possibly affecting project members’ feeling of ownership and in turn diminishing their desire to participate and use their voice.</p>	<p>“Participatory research emphasises collaborative partnerships, but goes beyond this to emphasise non-hierarchical relationships.” (p. 537)</p> <p>“On the surface we appear to be doing so much on the subject of student voice that we are nearly bursting, but is this more to do with responses to market forces than genuine engagement with such voices?” (p. 544)</p>
<p>Frison, D., & Melacarne, C. (2017). Introduction – Students-faculty partnership in Italy: Approaches, practices, and perspectives. <i>Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education</i>, 20.</p>	<p>An introduction to a special issue of <i>Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education</i> about student-faculty partnership in higher education in Italy, centring itself particularly on the issues of student voice and power. Argues that student involvement tends to be structured and highly monitored with specific access points for the students. Suggests that student involvement as such is restricted and formulated in such a way as to reduce the chance of a power shift from staff to student.</p>	<p>“We increasingly found ourselves asking each other why, whilst studying how to improve teaching methods, we were only partially prepared to allow students to take on an active role during our conferences, why we only thought up activities with a specified time for students and their ideas.” (p. 1)</p>

<p>Fielding, M. (2011). Patterns of partnership: Student voice, intergenerational learning and democratic fellowship. In N. Mocker & J. Sachs (Eds.), <i>Essays in honour of Susan Groundwater-Smith</i> (pp. 61-75). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.</p>	<p>Paper that maps the large spread of existing student voice approaches/definitions and encompasses both neo-liberal and person-centred democratic approaches. There is a large range of student voice work, from peer support, to learning partnerships, to student evaluation of the staff/school. Students can also be thought of in a number of different ways: as a data source, as active respondents, as co-inquirers, as knowledge creators, as joint authors, or be part of intergenerational learning as lived democracy.</p>	<p>“We are generally not well-served by dominant approaches to student voice that, whatever their surface attractions and however bright their talk of transformation, remain the creatures of an economic and political world-view that insists there-is-no-alternative to a status quo that is intellectually impoverished and morally destitute.” (p. 20)</p>
<p>Cook-Sather, A. (2014b). Multiplying perspectives and improving practice: What can happen when undergraduate students partner with college faculty to explore teaching and learning. <i>Instructional Science</i>, 41, 31-46.</p>	<p>A case study that argues that student involvement and the presence of student voice expands and multiplies a participant’s perspective. Here, student voice is not just a way to involve students, but also a way to fundamentally change the perception of both faculty and students. The paper stresses that student voice and engagement do not consist of a one-sided transfer of knowledge from student to staff, but rather constitute a conversation that changes the perceptions and actions of both groups.</p>	<p>“Multiplying perspectives has the potential to make both faculty and students more aware, more responsive, and more confident in their engagement and, in turn, rethink the educational process as a more collaborative venture.” (p. 39)</p>

An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning: Data Tables

References

- Ahlfeldt, S., Mehta, S., & Sellnow, T. (2005). Measurement and analysis of student engagement in university classes where varying levels of PBL methods of instruction are in use. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 24(1), 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436052000318541>
- Allin, L. (2014). Collaboration between staff and students in the scholarship of teaching and learning: the potential and the problems. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 2(1), 95-102. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.2.1.95>
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308. Retrieved from <https://www.middlesex.mass.edu/ace/downloads/astininv.pdf>
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2007). Self-authorship: The foundation for twenty-first-century education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2007(109), 69-83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.266>
- Bell, A., Carson, L., Piggott, L. (2013). Deliberative democracy for curriculum renewal. In E. Dunne, D. Owen (Eds.), *The student engagement handbook: Practice in higher education* (pp. 499-508). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Bols, A., & Freeman, R. (2011). Engaging students in shaping their curriculum. *Educational Developments*, 12(2), 5-9.
- Bovill, C., Cook-Sather, A., Felten, P., Millard, L., & Moore-Cherry, N. (2016). Addressing potential challenges in co-creating learning and teaching: Overcoming resistance, navigating institutional norms and ensuring inclusivity in student–staff partnerships. *Higher Education*, 71(2), 195-208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9896-4>
- Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2016). Cultivating student-staff partnerships through research and practice. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 20(1), 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2016.1124965>
- Brooman, S., Darwent, S., & Pimor, A. (2015). The student voice in higher education curriculum design: Is there value in listening? *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52(6), 663-674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.910128>
- Bryson, C. (Ed.). (2014). *Understanding and developing student engagement*. London, UK: Routledge.

Data table for: Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

- Chapman, P., Blatchford, S., & Hughes, E. (2013). Lightening up the dark side: A partnership approach between a students' union and the university. In C. Nysgaard, S. Brand, P. Bartholomew & L. Millard (Eds.), *Student engagement: Identity, motivation and community* (pp. 271–289). Faringdon, UK: Libri.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2003). Movements of mind: *The Matrix*, metaphors, and re-imagining education. *Teachers College Record*, 105(6), 946-977. Retrieved from http://repository.brynmawr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=edu_pubs
- Cook-Sather, A. (2006). *Education is translation: A metaphor for change in learning and teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: Penn Press.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2007). Translating researchers: Re-imagining the work of investigating students' experiences in school. In D. Thiessen and A. Cook-Sather (Eds.), *International handbook of student experience in elementary and secondary school* (pp. 829-871). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2013). Catalyzing multiple forms of engagement through student-faculty partnerships exploring teaching and learning. In E. Dunne, D. Owen (Eds.), *The student engagement handbook: Practice in higher education* (pp. 549-565). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2014a). Student-faculty partnership in explorations of pedagogical practice: A threshold concept in academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 19(3), 186-198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2013.805694>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2014b). Multiplying perspectives and improving practice: What can happen when undergraduate students collaborate with college faculty to explore teaching and learning. *Instructional Science*, 42(1), 31-46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9292-3>
- 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). Retrieved from http://repository.brynmawr.edu/edu_pubs/32/
- Cook-Sather, A., & Abbot, S. (2016). Translating partnerships: How faculty-student collaboration in explorations of teaching and learning can transform perceptions, terms, and selves. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 4(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.20343/10.20343/teachlearninqu.4.2.5>
- Cook-Sather, A., & Alter, Z. (2011). What is and what can be: How a liminal position can change learning and teaching in higher education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 42(1), 37-53.
- Data table for:** Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1492.2010.01109.x>

- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cook-Sather, A., & Felten, P. (2017). Ethics of academic leadership: Guiding learning and teaching. In F. Su, & M. Wood (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan perspectives on academic leadership in higher education* (pp. 175-191). London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Cook-Sather, A., & Luz, A. (2015). Greater engagement in and responsibility for learning: What happens when students cross the threshold of student–faculty partnership. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(6), 1097-1109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.911263>
- Crawford, K. (2012). Rethinking the student/teacher nexus: Students as consultants on teaching in higher education. In M. Neary, L. Bell & H. Stevenson (Eds.), *Towards teaching in public: Reshaping the modern university* (pp. 52-67). London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Felten, P. (2013). Introduction: Crossing thresholds together. *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education*, 9. Retrieved from <http://repository.brynmawr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=tlthe>
- Fielding, M. (2011). Patterns of partnership: Student voice, intergenerational learning and democratic fellowship. In N. Mocker & J. Sachs (Eds.), *Essays in honour of Susan Groundwater-Smith* (pp. 61-75). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Finnan, F. A., Gibbs, C. L., Waite, M., & Davison-Fischer, J. (2015). Students as producers: The postgraduate teaching assistant pilot project. *Journal of Educational Innovation, Partnership and Change*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.21100/jeipc.v1i1.183>
- Frison, D., & Melacarne, C. (2017). Introduction – Students–faculty partnership in Italy: Approaches, practices, and perspectives. *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education*, 20. Retrieved from <http://repository.brynmawr.edu/tlthe/vol1/iss20/1/>
- Gibson, S., Baskerville, D., Berry, A., Black, A., Norris, K., & Symeonidou, S. (2017). Including students as co-enquirers: Matters of identity, agency, language and labelling in an international participatory research study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 81, 108-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2016.11.008>
- Data table for:** Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*.

- Gunersel, A. B., Barnett, P., & Etienne, M. (2013). Promoting self-authorship of college educators: Exploring the impact of a faculty development program. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 27(1), 35-44.
- Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). *Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. York, UK: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/engagement_through_partnership.pdf
- Jensen, K., & Bennett, L. (2016). Enhancing teaching and learning through dialogue: A student and staff partnership model. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 21(4), 41-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015.1113537>
- Kuh, G. D., & Ewell, P. T. (2010). The state of learning outcomes assessment in the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 22(1), 1-20.
- Lambert C., Mockridge A., Taylor P. & Wilding, D. (2012). Reinventing engagement. In: I. Solomonides, A. Reid, & P. Petocz (Eds). *Engaging with learning in higher education* (pp. 259-278). Oxford: Libri.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mann, S. J. (2001). Alternative perspectives on the student experience: Alienation and engagement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(1), 7-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070020030689>
- Marquis, E., Puri, V., Wan, S., Ahmad, A., Goff, L., Knorr, K., . . . & Woo, J. (2016). Navigating the threshold of student–staff partnerships: A case study from an Ontario teaching and learning institute. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 21(1), 4-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015.1113538>
- Matthews, K. E. (2016). Students as partners as the future of student engagement. *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal*, 1(1), 1-5. Retrieved from <https://journals.gre.ac.uk/index.php/raise/article/view/380>
- Matthews, K. E. (2017). Five propositions for genuine students as partners practice. *International Journal of Students as Partners*, 1(2). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijasp.v1i2.3315>
- Matthews, K., Dwyer, A., Hines, L. & Turner, J. (2018). Conceptions of students as partners. *Higher Education*.
- Mercer-Mapstone, L., Marquis, E., & McConnell, C. (2018). The ‘partnership identity’ in higher education: Moving from ‘us’ and ‘them’ to ‘we’ in student-staff partnership. *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal*, 2(1), 12-29. Retrieved from <https://journals.gre.ac.uk/index.php/raise/article/view/Mercer-Mapstone/638>

- Mercer-Mapstone, L., & Mercer, G. (2018). A dialogue between partnership and feminism: Deconstructing power and exclusion in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(1), 137-143.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1391198>
- Mihans, R., Long, D. & Felten, P. (2008). Power and expertise: Student-faculty collaboration in course design and the scholarship of teaching and learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(2). Retrieved from
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1110&context=ij-sotl>
- Millard, L., Bartholomew, P., Brand, S., & Nygaard, C. (2013). Why student engagement matters. In C. Nysgaard, S. Brand, P. Bartholomew & L. Millard (Eds.), *Student engagement: Identity, motivation and community* (pp. 1-15). Faringdon, UK: Libri.
- Meacham, M., Castor, M., & Felten, P. (2013). Partners as newcomers: Mixed-role partnerships as communities of practice. *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education*, 10. Retrieved from
<http://repository.brynmawr.edu/tlthe/vol1/iss10/5/>
- Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2006). *Overcoming barriers to student understanding: Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Neary, M. (2010). Student as producer: A pedagogy for the avant-garde? *Learning Exchange*, 1(1). Retrieved from
<http://eprints.lincoln.ac.uk/4186/>
- Neary, M., & Winn, J. (2009). The student as producer: Reinventing the student experience in higher education. In L. Bell, H. Stevenson, & M. Neary (Eds.), *The future of higher education: Policy, pedagogy and the student experience* (pp. 192-210). London, UK: Continuum.
- Seale, J., Gibson, S., Haynes, J., & Potter, A. (2015). Power and resistance: Reflections on the rhetoric and reality of using participatory methods to promote student voice and engagement in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 39(4), 534-552. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2014.938264>
- Taylor, C. A., & Bovill, C. (2018). Towards an ecology of participation: Process philosophy and co-creation of higher education curricula. *European Educational Research Journal*, 17(1), 112-128.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904117704102>
- Taylor, P., Wilding, D., Mockridge, A., & Lambert, C. (2012). Reinventing engagement. In I. Solomonides, A. Reid & P. Petocz (Eds.), *Engaging with learning in higher education* (pp. 259-278). Faringdon, UK: Libri.
- Data table for:** Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward Theories of Partnership Praxis: An Analysis of Interpretive Framing in Literature on Students as Partners in Teaching and Learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*. 28

- Tierney, A. M. (2012). Undergraduate interns as staff developers: Flowers in the desert. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 49(1), 7-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.647779>
- Turner, V. (1995 [1969]). Liminality and communitas. In *The ritual process: Structure and antistructure* (pp. 94–130). New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Turner, V. (Ed). (1974). *Dramas, fields, and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Walton, J. (2013). Active participation in learning: Students creating their educational experience. In E. Dunne, D. Owen (Eds.), *The student engagement handbook: Practice in higher education* (pp. 401-419). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Wenger, E. & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). Communities of practice a brief introduction. Retrieved from <http://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/07-Brief-introduction-to-communities-of-practice.pdf>
- Werder, C., Thibou, S., & Kaufer, B. (2012). Students as co-inquirers: A requisite threshold concept in educational development? *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 26(3), 34-38.
- Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Kinzie, J. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and integration to understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(4), 407-428. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0077>