



Australian Government

Department of Education and Training

Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: towards a more systemically inclusive student voice. 2015-2016

Final report 2018

Lead institution: University of Technology Sydney

Project leader: Professor Sally Varnham

Project team: Associate Professor Bronwyn Olliffe, Katrina Waite and Ann Cahill



www.studentvoiceaustralia.com

Support for the production of this report has been provided by the Australian Government Department of Education and Training. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Department of Education and Training.



With the exception of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms, and where otherwise noted, all material presented in this document is provided under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License [creativecommons/4.0/license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

The details of the relevant licence conditions are available on the Creative Commons website (accessible using the links provided) as is the full legal code for the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License [creativecommons/4.0/legalcode](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode)

Requests and inquiries concerning these rights should be addressed to:

Learning and Teaching Support
Student Information and Learning Branch
Higher Education Group
Department of Education and Training

GPO Box 9880
Location code C50MA7
CANBERRA ACT 2601

[<learningandteaching@education.gov.au>](mailto:learningandteaching@education.gov.au)

2018

ISBN 978-1-76051-427-3 [PRINT]

ISBN 978-1-76051-425-9 [PDF]

ISBN 978-1-76051-426-6 [DOCX]

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the assistance and input of the Office for Learning and Teaching staff, in particular Victoria Ross and our project evaluator Dr Grace Lynch. We would also like to thank the institutions, organisations, student associations, and individual students and others who so generously shared their time and ideas. Particular thanks go to Professor Gwen van der Velden whose work at University of Bath inspired the development of this project. We would also like to thank Anthony McClaran, CEO TEQSA and Eve Lewis, Director of sparqs for their valuable input. We appreciate feedback received on this project from members of our reference group:

Professor Paul Wormell (Reference Group Chair) (Western Sydney University)

Professor Sally Kift (James Cook University)

Anthony McClaran (CEO TEQSA)

Professor Rick Sarre (University of South Australia)

Professor Nick Reid (University of New England)

Professor Margot Hillel (Australian Catholic University)

Dr Lisa Cluett (University of Western Australia)

Professor Gwen van der Velden (Warwick University)

Professor Dominic Verity (Macquarie University)

Dr Grace Lynch (project evaluator) (RMIT)

Ms Jade Tyrrell (former President National Union of Students)

Ms Alison Whittaker (University of Technology Sydney)

List of acronyms used

AHEGS	Australian Higher Education Graduate Statement
ANZELA	Australia and New Zealand Education Law Association
ASR	Academic Student Representative
AUT	Auckland University of Technology
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CISA	Council of International Students of Australia
ELIR	Enhancement-Led Institution Review (Scotland)
ENQA	European Network of Quality Assurance
ERASHE	European Students in Higher Education
ESU	European Students Union
HEA	Higher Education Academy
HECQN	Higher Education Compliance and Quality Network
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council of England
HERDSA	Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia
HREC	Human Research Ethics Committee
LLB	Bachelor of Laws
NATIPSA	National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Postgraduate Students Association
NUS	National Union of Students (UK and Australia)
NZUSA	New Zealand Union of Students' Associations
OIAHE	Office of the Independent Adjudicator of Higher Education for England
OLT	Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching
OXCHEPS	Oxford Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies
PG	Postgraduate
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency (UK)

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

SCC	Student Campus Council
sparqs	student partnership in quality Scotland
SRC	Student Representative Council
SRP	Student Representation and Participation
SSCC	Student Staff Consultative Committee
SSLC	Student Staff Liaison Committee
TEQSA	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Authority
TSEP	The Student Engagement Partnership
UA	Universities Australia
UG	Undergraduate
UK	United Kingdom
UNSW	University of New South Wales
UoW	University of Wollongong
UQ	University of Queensland
UTS	University of Technology Sydney
UWS/WSU	Western Sydney University
VUW	Victoria University of Wellington

Executive summary

Introduction

This project continued a collaborative investigation into the case for a more systemically inclusive student voice in decision-making and governance in Australian universities. This investigation was driven by the need for a deep consideration of the meaningful and effective engagement of students' views at all levels and of all cohorts, and how this may enhance the quality and standards of the institution and the student's university experience. It drew on international experience and current practice in Australia to ask:

- What is 'student engagement' leading to 'student partnership' in university decision-making?
- Why may student engagement processes warrant consideration in today's higher education environment, in terms of value to universities, their students and to the sector as a whole?
- How may student engagement be embedded most effectively in university policies and processes to enable the development of a culture of student voice?

Higher education in Australia is increasingly multi- and trans-disciplinary with a drive towards student-centred learning. There are projects underway which follow the developing trend in comparative higher education sectors – in the UK, Europe and New Zealand – towards practices and processes which embrace 'students as partners' in learning and teaching. This is accompanied abroad by consideration of the part played by engaging the student voice inside as well as outside the classroom in university decision-making and governance. An emerging body of research internationally points to the benefits for universities, in terms of enhancement of quality and standards, and for students in their university experience and their development as critical thinkers, innovators, leaders and citizens. Sector-wide collaboration in the UK led to the formulation of principles contained in the National Quality Code for Higher Education (Chapter B5) and the formation of The Student Engagement Partnership (TSEP); and in Scotland, the establishment of student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs) and development of the Student Engagement Framework. In Australia, there has been a dearth of research which focuses on student engagement in university decision-making and governance, and how it can contribute to good practice.

All Australian universities have some formal representative systems which enable students to have input into decision-making and governance. Anecdotally from discussions with leaders in the sector, for example chairs of Academic Boards and Senates; feedback following seminar and conference presentations; and interaction with university managers, students and student bodies, there is a feeling that we could do more. The project showed that a range of Australian universities are working in this area, providing instances of exemplary practice and commitment to further initiatives to embrace the student voice in a wide range of university functions.

The project drew on international experience and evolving examples of good practice in Australia to stimulate a conversation about student representation.

This report is part of a set of four publications produced by Professor Varnham and her team that explore and promote the benefits of student engagement in university decision-making and governance. The other publications are a report on international investigations, a good practice case-studies report and a survey report.

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

The Project approach

Engagement of the higher education sector players in examining student participation in universities, building on recent progress, was essential to the central aim of the project.

Phase 1: International research in student engagement in higher education

Providing a foundation and fully incorporated into this project was the compilation of international approaches to student engagement in tertiary institutions. The work was undertaken in early 2015 by Professor Sally Varnham with support from the University of Technology Sydney's Professional Experience Program. It included:

- analysis and synthesis of international project reports, in particular, the Bath University/Quality Assurance Agency (UK) (QAA) project and Good Practice Guide, student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs) '*Celebrating Student Engagement*', and the Ako Aotearoa/New Zealand Union of Students' Associations (NZUSA) Report '*Student Voice in Tertiary Education Settings*' (all 2013/14); and UK agency and government reviews of higher education institutions.
- Semi-structured interviews and focus groups were conducted with top-level sector personnel and student representatives in the UK, Europe and New Zealand.

The project funded the publication of the research report, *Report on international research findings on student engagement in higher education, 2015*, (Varnham et al 2017) It provides a description of student engagement approaches by international institutions and higher and further education systems.

Phase 2: Australian research and review

This phase collated details about the Australian experiences of student engagement in higher education and universities. It entailed researching university policies and processes, and surveying senior managers of universities and private institutions, as well as student leaders at Australian universities.

Phase 3: Case studies and a pilot study

Building on the earlier phases, phase 3 gathered detailed examples of student engagement in university decision making. These case studies aimed to provide understanding and knowledge of practices occurring in Australian universities, with the intent to highlight pockets of good practice.

Dissemination and impact

Phases 2 and 3 yielded detailed descriptions of universities' engagement of students in higher education governance and decision-making. The research findings and case studies provide a useful snapshot of practice in Australia in 2015 and 2016; they are published as companions to this project report to inform current discussion and future work in the area of 'student voice'. The publications are entitled, *Understanding student engagement in university decision making and governance 2015 and 2016 – project survey findings* (Varnham et al, 2017) and *Understanding student engagement in university decision making and governance 2015 and 2016–Good practice case-studies report – Australian examples of student engagement* (Varnham et al, 2017).

The findings from phases 1 and 2 were used early in the project, including as a basis for discussion at the project's student engagement workshop conducted on 27 October 2015. This workshop involved both students and university personnel in productive dialogue. One outcome of the workshop was the identification of the factors needed for effective student

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

engagement to become embedded in and integral to the operations of institutions. These factors replicate the themes from international and Australian research.

The project's findings were presented at conferences, workshops, in The Voice publication (the Newsletters) (originally www.studentvoice.uts.edu.au now www.studentvoiceaustralia.com at resources), and on this website and our Facebook pages. At first this aimed to raise awareness and engage the sector. Later dissemination was more targeted and involved active engagement by personnel from universities and students in a student-engagement conversation. A large-scale national forum on 5 September 2016 marked the end of the project. It involved invited international and national speakers, and two sessions were facilitated by Australian and New Zealand students – putting into practice the student partnership approach.

As this investigative project ended its project leader Professor Sally Varnham commenced her National Senior Teaching Fellowship. Through the Fellowship Professor Varnham will undertake a collaboration between tertiary education leaders and institutions to create a National Framework for Student Partnership in University Decision-Making and Governance. Engaged dissemination will be used to support this objective or 'next-step' in the development of 'student voice' approaches in Australian tertiary education.

Important project findings

What does 'student engagement' and 'student partnership' mean? The wide range of interpretations and implications of these terms made it crucial to establish definitions to frame this work. The project considered 'engagement through representation' and 'partnership through engagement' to distinguish the focus from work which is primarily concerned with a student's engagement in their own learning. It recognises, however, that in considering the university as a community of learning, all engagement is inevitably intertwined. For the project's purposes, engagement involves authentic inclusion of student views in university operations through both formal and informal mechanisms, particularly representative structures. To encourage students to engage, they must see that their voice can make a difference. A perception of 'tokenism' acts as a deterrent to voicing views. Why is student engagement important to the student experience in today's higher education environment? The impetus for the project was the experience of its leader in university deliberative bodies and consensus with other academic board chairs that the sector could improve, informed by developments in the UK, Europe and New Zealand. The project considered international processes which enable students to play a purposeful role in the 'development, management and governance of their institution, its academic programmes and their own learning experience' (HEFCE, 2013). Importantly, there was consideration of the mounting body of evidence highlighting the benefits of effective student engagement for the enhancement of quality and standards in universities, and for the personal development and arguably the employability of students. From an analysis of published reports and reviews, and a series of interviews and focus groups involving a range of stakeholders in the comparative jurisdictions, it was possible to get a clear indication of what works for the benefit of the university, individual students and the sector as a whole.

How can student engagement be included in university policies and processes to embed a culture of a student voice? Key themes were identified from a comprehensive analysis of the international research and the components were mirrored in the Australian research. It has been clearly demonstrated that to encourage engagement, a sincere culture of partnership must be developed through demonstration by universities and the higher
Towards a more systemically inclusive student
voice

education sector of a commitment to and respect for the student voice. Communication is central: first, of the representative opportunities across the institution; and second, how the views of student representatives are integral to decision-making. Essential components are: effective, valued and supported student leadership in partnership with universities; a developmental approach to student representation from course/subject level upwards; resources for training and support; formal and informal processes for the engagement of students at all levels for continual enhancement of courses, their university experience and their personal development; capturing every student's voice to ensure engagement of the whole student cohort; considering the provision of meaningful incentives for student engagement and representation. A national entity supporting student engagement is key to sustained development of student partnership.

Recommendations

The project recommends a sector-wide collaboration framed by these essential components in the Australian context. It should consider the benefits and challenges of student engagement in the Australian sector with its wide diversity of types of institutions and student cohorts. The project uncovered considerable interest in the sector with many institutions now giving priority to creating a culture of collegiality and partnership. It is timely to build on this momentum to develop common understanding of 'student engagement and partnership', to share knowledge and experience, and facilitate innovation of institutional processes. This need is recognised by the granting of an Australian Learning and Teaching National Senior Teaching Fellowship to the project leader, Professor Sally Varnham (2016–17). The Fellowship will involve collaboration of senior university leaders and government policy-makers, student representatives, professional and academic staff, university management, and government agencies, towards development of principles and a framework to assist in this development.

Table of contents

Introduction and context	1
The project approach	4
International research: An overview of the Chief Investigator’s findings	6
Australian surveys: an overview of project findings	12
Case and pilot studies: an overview of project findings	17
A systemic model of student engagement in university governance and decision-making	22
Project team reflections: challenges and opportunities	23
Key findings: Factors needed for effective student engagement	24
Conclusions and recommendations	27
References	28
Appendix A: Certification by Deputy Vice-Chancellor	33
Appendix B: Evaluation Report	34
Appendix C: Impact Plan	38
Appendix D: Dissemination Posters	39
Appendix E: Dissemination List	41

Introduction and context

This project investigated student engagement in decision-making and governance, and the case for a more systemically inclusive student voice in Australian higher education. It drew strongly on the experiences of student partnership processes in comparative sectors, particularly the UK and New Zealand. It considered current engagement of students in decision-making in Australian universities. It asked what is meant by ‘student engagement’ and ‘student partnership’, and why and how international experience could be applied to the widely divergent institutions and student cohorts which make up the sector here.

The research was inspired by the team leader’s experience in university governance, and her prior research which considered legal aspects of the evolving university–student relationship. Key drivers were indications from abroad of the benefits of student partnership for universities in enhancing the quality of teaching and learning, and the educational experience of students; anecdotal reports within Australia about the challenges of engaging student representatives; and the limited scholarship in this field. Importantly, it was seen that engaging students meaningfully in decisions which affect their university and their university experience can assist in their development of the necessary life skills of leadership, critical thinking, innovation and citizenship.

This report is part of a set of four publications produced by Professor Varnham and her team that explore and promote the benefits of student engagement in university decision-making and governance. The other publications are the Report on International Investigations (Varnham & ors 2017b), the Project Final Report (Varnham & ors 2017a), and the Survey Report (Varnham & ors 2017c).

Student engagement

A wide range of interpretations and implications of the term student engagement made its clarification important at the outset. In the context of this project, the term covers activities ranging from those within learning and teaching to those that extend into other aspects of student life, such as how students interact with institutional structures, strategies and processes (Carey, 2013a). The project drew on the latter approach, and that of student partnership in quality Scotland (sparqs) in formulating The Student Engagement Framework for Scotland. It considered engagement of students working with their institutions towards quality enhancement through both formal and informal mechanisms.

The focus on ‘engagement through representation’ and ‘partnership through engagement’ distinguishes this project from other work which considers primarily engagement in learning and teaching in the classroom context. It acknowledges a synergy with this research however, and with other projects in Australia and abroad which deal with the transformative power of the engagement of students as partners in the learning and teaching sphere, for example, in curriculum development and review. Examples include the following Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT)¹ projects.² While

¹ The OLT ceased on 30 June 2016. The Australian Government Department of Education and Training continued to support the project.

²² *Student Leadership in Curriculum Development and Reform* (Deane, UWS, 2013); *Engaging postgraduate students and supporting higher education to enhance the 21st century experience* (Kinash & ors, 2015–16);

this project examined engagement of students from an aspect wider than this work, it did so in recognition that a university is a community of learning where elements are interconnected.

Student partnership

All research points to the conclusion that authentic and meaningful student engagement requires a culture of student partnership. This occurs where the institution and the sector demonstrate in their operations a commitment to and respect for the student voice. Communication is central to students being able to see that their voice is integral to decision-making. The principles embodying student partnership were set out by sparqs (sparqs, 2013) as:

- a culture of engagement
- students as partners
- responding to diversity
- valuing the student contribution
- focus on enhancement and change
- appropriate resources and support.

These themes were constant throughout the international research. They were repeated in the Australian research activities and are embodied in the conclusions of this report.

The Australian policy context

There is evidence that in the UK, Europe and New Zealand, policy and practice in the higher education sector is working towards embedding such a culture of student partnership. Australian Government strategy is aimed at ensuring the excellence and competitiveness of Australian universities by enabling the sector to be more 'adaptive, innovative and engaged, globally and nationally' (Australian Government, *National Strategy for International Education*, April 2016). In the competitive international higher education environment it is essential that Australian universities build on experiences from abroad in the drive for excellence. The project aimed to position the higher education sector in line with these strategies, to lead to further recognition and enhancement of the competitiveness of Australian universities internationally.

Australian universities all have some formal representative systems which, to varying degrees, enable students to have input into decision-making and governance. Anecdotal interaction with leaders in the sector, students and student bodies, and more formal evidence from project surveys suggests that Australia may be lagging in its commitment to involving students as partners in their higher education experience.

An important rationale for investigating the case for change lies in the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 (in force January 2017, replacing the

Innovative perspectives and approaches for enhancing the student experience (Coates & ors, 2015–16); the OLT National Teaching Fellowship of Kelly Matthews, *Students as partners: reconceptualising the role of students in science degree programme curriculum development* (2015); and the Transforming Practices Program Student Engagement: Students as Partners (Crookes, 2016) (all currently underway); and 'Engagement through partnership: students as partners in higher education' (Healy & ors, 2014)

initial 2011 version). Clause 6.1.4 is directed at student engagement in decision-making and provides:

The governing body takes steps to develop and maintain an institutional environment in which freedom of intellectual inquiry is upheld and protected, students and staff are treated equitably, the wellbeing of students and staff is fostered, informed decision making by students is supported and students have opportunities to participate in the deliberative and decision making processes of the higher education provider.

Clause 6.3.3 further provides that 'Students have the opportunity to participate in academic governance'.

The national widening participation initiatives and the resulting diversity of the student body provide further impetus for continuing this work. The Australian student demographic is becoming more varied, with large numbers of international enrolments, widening participation policies, distance education, and a greater enrolment of mature and second-degree students from an array of occupations and backgrounds. There is no longer the 'homogenous' student body for which universities were to some extent able to predetermine motivation and requirements. This increased diversity means that there is now a wide range of expectations and access needs best understood through engaging a cross-section of students in the issues. Developing an approach which provides better avenues for student representation could serve to address concerns relating to high attrition rates, particularly among students with low socio-economic status (Thomas, 2012).

A research-informed review of the Australian sector and outcomes

Research points strongly to the fact that students desire involvement, and that their voice is valuable. Student engagement, however, has failed to gain much traction in Australian universities beyond ad hoc representation on working groups and reviews, and student 'top-down' representation on governance bodies. The top-down approach currently practised is often viewed as token, affording little opportunity for meaningful and authentic student participation in university decisions and governance. This view is supported by international research, for example Carey (2013a)(2013b)(2013c), Bergan (2004) and Luescher-Mamashela (2010). Evidence and experience from the UK and Europe shows that true participation entails more than sitting on committees and consultation in the latter stages of change (Arnstein, 1969). New Zealand research and practice also looks to the UK. The student voice is perceived as transactional in supporting marketability and reputation, and transformational in supporting the university as a democratic institution and a learning community (Dow, 2012, 2013; Gordon & ors, 2011).

As the policy context and university structures differ across institutions and national borders, there was a need for Australia to undertake its own research, which this project achieved. It has led to a developing momentum for considering the implementation of principles and practices of student partnership by all stakeholders, from students to academics and university managers. At the first project symposium held on 27 October 2015, the presentation on the international experience was the first time that many Australian academics and students were made aware of the relatively low focus on this area. Workshop participants were able to benchmark their institutional practices against practices in the wider sector and determine strategic focus areas. This activity produced the factors identified as necessary for effective student engagement to become integral to the operations of higher education institutions and these factors mirrored the themes which ran

consistently throughout the project research. The necessary factors are listed later in this report. The focus was cultural change and the need for legitimacy of student representation; communication of representation opportunities and outcomes from student input; developmental pathways for representation and resources for training and support; students contributing ideas not just feedback; and reward and recognition for representative roles.

The final symposium held on 5 September 2016, followed by two one-day workshops on 6 and 8 September in Sydney and Adelaide, showed a marked rise in recognition of the importance of engaging students in university decision-making. This extends from discussion and workshopping of concepts, ideas and practices to the initiatives which universities have been putting into place. This is clear also from increased activity on Facebook and Twitter.

The project approach

The project progressed the development of the 'student voice' or student partnership approach in Australian tertiary education institutions. It has supported both the dissemination of earlier investigations and the propagation of frameworks and resources to underpin the eventual creation of a national framework for student partnership in university decision-making and governance.

The project included three phases, including dissemination of earlier work. Dissemination actions complemented each of the three phases. Using comparative research and practice, the project stimulated a student voice conversation to gain interest and 'buy-in' for innovation in universities and information-sharing. The approach was collaborative and involved academics, professional staff, university managers and students as reference group participants, as interviewees and for discussion of ideas. The phases are summarised in this report with further detail published in complementary reports and appendices, as noted in this report.

All research for this project is the subject of ethics approval provided by the University of Technology Sydney, Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval number HREC 2012-459A.

Phase 1: International research and review in student engagement in higher education

The international study undertaken by Professor Sally Varnham in early 2015 involved an analysis of written material such as reports and reviews relating to student engagement and student partnership. Interviews and focus groups were conducted in England, Scotland, Belgium and New Zealand with representatives from university management and student bodies as well as higher education agencies. The selected participants were from groups that had experience with developing student engagement or who were student leaders involved with representative processes, and the purpose in interviewing them was to establish what comprises good practice in this field. This research was supported by the University of Technology Sydney's Professional Experience Program. It has been used to inform the next phase which investigated Australian practice. The resulting research report has been published with support by the Australian Government. The publication is entitled, *Report on international research findings on student engagement in higher education, 2015*,

(Varnham & ors, 2017a) It provides a description of student engagement approaches by international institutions and higher education systems.

Phase 2: Australian review

Research on student participation in higher education governance and decision-making across all Australian universities took the form of:

- researching university policies and processes (based on their websites)
- a survey directed at senior managers of institutions informed by the research approach taken in the Bath University/UK QAA research
- a survey of student leaders at Australian universities
- survey analysis and review (produced and published in consecutive issues of The Voice).

This final report includes some details and results from these Australian investigations. Detailed information about the conduct of the survey are published by the project team in a separate project survey report (Varnham & ors, 2017b).

Phase 3: Case studies and a pilot study

Eleven case studies of student engagement initiatives and practices in Australian universities were undertaken. They arose in two ways: first, from practices identified by respondents in the survey of Australian universities; and second, they were identified by university personnel present at dissemination activities such as presentations at higher education conferences and seminars.

The case studies involved interviews with the main drivers of the processes, usually university senior management, personnel and students, and focus groups with personnel and students.

A pilot course representative student staff liaison committee (SSLC) model was run in a faculty which had not previously used such a system. Students were asked to volunteer to be representatives and training was conducted for those students involved. The pilot was followed up by interviews with participants to gain their perceptions.

This final report includes some details and results from these Australian good practice case studies. Further detail about these Australian university exemplars are published by the project team in a separate report (Varnham & ors, 2017c).

Dissemination and impact

The project adopted an embedded dissemination strategy, informed by the OLT's D-Cubed project (Gannaway, Hinton & Moore, 2011), and developed a communication plan in the establishment phase of the project. It was important to understand at the outset the differences and complexities of the target audiences for whom the project had relevance, from first-year students to university chancellors. Broad communications were aimed at establishing awareness and a climate of readiness for change. Later, the dissemination activities were more targeted and involved active engagement by personnel from all universities and students. Towards the end of the project, many sector dissemination activities were undertaken, including conferences and forums, such as Universities Australia.

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

The project developed posters to support these conversations; Appendix D illustrates two such posters. There is an ongoing process of developing an active media strategy, using outlets such as The Conversation.

Social media (Facebook and Twitter) was used throughout the project to ensure that key stakeholders, particularly students, were kept informed of the project activities and developments in the sector in Australia and internationally. Three issues of a key student publication, Student Voice Conversation, were produced and distributed widely, as well as being made available on the project website. Computer screen shots of Face book and the Student voice webpage at UTS are included at Appendix E.

The project supported a number of concluding workshops in September 2016 as a strategy for engaged dissemination. The workshops were facilitated by Eve Lewis, Director of sparqs; the morning session hosted students' discussions and the afternoon session engaged both students and staff in discussions. Workshops were held at the University of Technology Sydney on 5 September for local universities, and on 7 September at the University of Adelaide for South Australian universities.

Other communication strategies included an initial symposium at UTS on 27 October 2015, attended by 45 students and university personnel from a range of Australian universities, and a large-scale national forum, to which all Australian universities were invited. There were 100 attendees at the symposium comprising university managers and student engagement personnel, representatives from higher education agencies, academics and students. The sessions were led by:

- Anthony McClaran, CEO of TEQSA and past CEO of the UK QAA, on his experience of student engagement in the UK
- Eve Lewis, Director of sparqs
- Professor Gwen van der Velden, Warwick University, a member of the steering committee for The Student Engagement Partnership (TSEP) in England and Wales
- undergraduate and postgraduate student leaders, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and international students
- New Zealand students from the New Zealand Union of Students Associations including Dr Alistair Shaw, Executive Director.

A list of the project's dissemination activities and publications are included at Appendix E. The impact plan for the project is included as Appendix C.

Other project formalities

The project was evaluated by Dr Grace Lynch from the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. Dr Lynch's evaluation report is included as Appendix B to this report. Other required documents appended to this report are mentioned below in the relevant sections of the report.

International research: An overview of the Chief Investigator's findings

As noted earlier the University of Technology Sydney's Professional Experience Program supported Professor Sally Varnham to undertake international research. A fuller description of the research and findings is published in the companion report, *Report on international research findings on student engagement in higher education, 2015*. The overview is included in this report to provide context for phases 2 and 3.

Professor Varnham's international research involved:

- an analysis and synthesis of reports (Bath/QAA project and Good Practice Guide; Ako Aotearoa report; sparqs reports) and other relevant material such as reviews of policies and processes in place in higher education institutions (detailed in the references); and
- semi-structured interviews and focus groups with top-level university personnel, university managers, representatives of student organisations and other student representatives.

All interviews and focus groups were recorded and transcripts reviewed by team members. A set of themes were identified, framing the Australian context.

Investigation context: defining student engagement

The Student Engagement Framework for Scotland identifies the elements of student engagement as:

1. students feeling part of a supportive institution
2. students engaging in their own learning
3. students working with their institution in shaping the direction of learning
4. formal mechanisms for quality and governance
5. influencing the student experience at national level.

It was clear from the outset that while the project focused on 'engagement through representation' (elements 3–5), all elements were relevant. These elements, central to creating an ethos of engagement (sparqs, 2013), were echoed in the Australian research.

This research considered the spectrum of representative student engagement, ranging from less formal interactions, such as representation at the class and course level, to more formal interactions where student representatives participate at senior levels of governance on faculty and university councils and boards.

The objectives were to understand student engagement in comparative sectors in order to inform the Australian research and provide Australian universities with the tools and knowledge to implement processes to facilitate and embed effective student participation.

International evidence

This investigation included analysis of an extended body of documentary evidence relating to the development and practice of student engagement. An important resource was the QAA-commissioned review of current practice in the area by the University of Bath

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

accompanied by a [Good Practice Guide for Higher Education Providers and Student Unions](#) (Pimentel-Botas & ors, 2013). The report concluded that there was necessarily a huge range and differentiation between institutions in the types and extent of engagement. It was clear that student engagement has brought about a variety of changes in institutions. Institutions and students' unions reported that the most common changes were related to the areas of policy, practice and procedures; feedback; curriculum; assessment; and resources. This study provided a valuable template for further Australian research.

In the UK, following the expectation and indicators for student partnership in universities created by Chapter B5 of the [Quality Code for Higher Education](#), the newly established [Student Engagement Partnership](#) (TSEP) created *The Principles of Student Engagement: The student engagement conversation 2014*'. The principles matched the indicators in Chapter B5, and aimed to gather and disseminate good student engagement practice and share the creation of a partnership culture. The value this adds to individuals, institutions and the sector, and the challenges it poses, were emphasised. The [GuildHE](#), in collaboration with TSEP, produced *Making Student Engagement a Reality: Turning Theory into Practice*, which sets out 12 case studies demonstrating that 'student engagement has the potential to have a powerful and lasting impact on the student experience'. [Engagement through partnerships: students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education](#) (2014) sets out the context and case for partnership in learning and teaching, focusing particularly on the role of student associations. It addresses the tensions spawned by a model of working together often guided by different priorities:

Creating an ethos of partnership that permeates the whole culture of an institution requires confronting the significant tensions raised and entering into a re-negotiation of the relationship and underpinning values between a students' union and its institution (p. 59).

In Scotland, student engagement was one of the five 'pillars' of the Quality Enhancement Framework (2003). The Student Engagement Framework formulated by sparqs, following extensive collaboration with the sector, establishes a model of principles and processes adaptable to the Australian sector. The report, *Celebrating Student Engagement: Successes and opportunities in Scotland's university sector* (2013), is the sparqs chronical of the steps to embed student engagement as a key part of decision-making in institutions and in the sector, and its success in quality enhancement and improved learning experience for students. This project had the advantage of the knowledge and experiences of the Scottish sector set out in an array of sparqs-produced documents and reports including toolkits dealing with different aspects of student partnership implementation, for example *Guidance on the development and implementation of a Student Partnership agreement in universities* (2013) and *Recognition and accreditation of academic reps – practices and challenges across Scotland's colleges and universities* (2015). The positive outcomes of student engagement are set out in reviews undertaken for the [Enhancement-led Institution Review](#) (ELIR) process of QAA Scotland.

In New Zealand, the New Zealand Union of Students' Associations and Ako Aotearoa (the National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence) commissioned research into local student representative systems and how they contribute to quality enhancement in tertiary institutions ([Student Voice in Tertiary Education Settings: Quality Systems in Practice](#), 2013). They discovered a vast range of levels and means of student engagement across diverse

institutions, from informal class representative systems to formal representation on committees and governance bodies. The research found that:

Where there were examples of true partnership in action, students made a significant contribution to quality enhancement at the class, faculty and committee level. This worked when students were perceived and treated as equal partners, the students themselves were well prepared and worked in a consultative way with other students to ensure that the views they were putting forward were representative, and when organisations acted on student input and communicated this back to students (pp. 4–5).

The project also referred to material developed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), for example the [European Students Union's \(ESU\) *No Student Left Out: the do's and don'ts of student participation in higher education decision-making*](#) (2011). This focused on the role of student organisations, providing an overview through a series of case studies of the development of student participation in university governance, demonstrating how student bodies can successfully and inclusively represent students.

A good place to conclude this brief summary of the student partnership literature is the UK National Union of Students' (NUS) [Manifesto for Partnership](#) (2012). This states that at its roots partnership is about investing students with the power to co-create not just knowledge or learning but the higher education institution itself: 'A corollary of a partnership approach is the genuine meaningful dispersal of power ... Partnership means shared responsibility – for identifying the problem or opportunity for improvement, for devising a solution and – importantly – for co-delivery of that solution' (p. 8).

Chief investigator's interviews and focus groups

Interviews and focus groups were conducted at the following institutions and sector agencies:

- **UK (England and Scotland)** – University of Bath; National Union of Students (NUS); Quality Assurance Agency (QAA); Higher Education Funding Council for the UK (HFCE UK); student participation in quality Scotland (sparqs); Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE); Oxford Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (OXCHEPS)
- **Belgium** – University of Antwerp; Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
- **New Zealand** – Victoria University of Wellington; Auckland University of Technology; Massey University; New Zealand Union of Students' Associations (NZUSA).

Interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders were recorded with their permission. The interviews were semi-structured using a series of prompt questions while maintaining flexibility in relation to the actual questions asked and their order. The use of a semi-structured format enhanced the exploration of the interview subject matter unhampered by a structured series of questions (Bryman & Bell, 2003).

The interviews and focus group recordings were transcribed and the transcripts were subject to a thematic analysis by members of the project team. Each person identified themes which were compared and consensus was reached on a set of relevant themes.

International themes

The resulting set of themes depicts how institutions can create genuine, relevant and effective student engagement in decision-making and governance. Like themes were coalesced and re-labelled as appropriate to succinctly reflect the key concepts embraced by each theme. Short explanatory descriptions for each theme were developed.

1. Building a receptive institutional culture

Overwhelmingly the research put an institutional culture of student partnership as central – seeing partnership as an ethos rather than an activity. First, there must be institutional process and the creation of policy that recognises, as a starting point, the importance of the student voice. For students to gain a sense of ownership in decision-making they must see that they are able to make a difference. This is sometimes referred to as ‘closing the feedback loop’ and entails a demonstration by the university of a commitment to and respect for the student voice in all that it does. This comes from clearly valuing genuine student involvement not only on issues that matter to students particularly but by involving students at the outset in all decisions affecting the university’s learning, and teaching activities and the educational experience it provides. It involves seeking their ideas for innovation and change, and ensuring that they are engaged throughout the process (rather than being ‘consulted’ at the end).

Communication is essential. Building a culture of partnership in an institution requires that students have timely access to relevant information from their first contact with the institution – opportunities for representation, information surrounding the issues and outcomes from their input. An ethos or philosophy is hard to measure but if a partnership approach is genuine and successful it should be visible in how institutions work with students and the results of that work.

Why would students not be interested in improving the quality of their programs? ... it could only be because they think they're not going to be listened to or it's going to be ineffective. Why should I spend my time on this and nothing's going to happen? (NZUSA officer)

2. Strong, supported and effective student leadership

Strong student leadership within universities and nationally, and a strong independent student union, is at the core of partnership and a strong student voice. The increasing focus on students’ associations has reportedly led to a shift in the way they see themselves, moving them towards fulfilling a mature and professional role in partnership with their university.

While recognising that there may be tension between the historically political nature of student organisations and their ability to work together with the university towards common ends, the feedback was that the role of the student organisation need not be compromised. In many cases the students’ unions partnered with the university to assist in the nomination and election of student representatives, programs for the training and briefing of students, and supporting student representatives. At one university, the union provided a ‘student coach’ who was part of the focus group. In all the sectors researched the national student union was pivotal in furthering the cause of the student voice and promoting a democratic vision of partnership.

Because of the transient nature of leaders in student organisations, it was seen as crucial that there was a permanent position in the association within institutions and at the national level, for continuity and knowledge transfer and this was common. This lends strength to the association's ability to take a leading role in student representation across the university or sector. In some sectors, there was an ex-student known as a sabbatical officer who was in this position.

Professional staff ... someone like me in the student associations. We used to call them an educational coordinator ... I think the primary function should be supporting the high-level representatives...If there's a single person who's working with them and correlating them, then ... I think they could actually be better equipped to deal with things ... (NZUSA officer)

3. Capturing every student's voice

The importance of, and the challenges associated with, engaging every student's voice was a universal concern. Increasingly in all sectors there are under-represented minority groups. All sectors agreed that the challenge lies in ensuring representation which reflects the attitudes and concerns of the whole student cohort, not just those of the representatives or particular causes they support, and there is a need for serious consideration of the means of working towards this.

4. Providing training and support

There was universal agreement that proper training and support was crucial to enable representatives to participate effectively in their roles without compromising their studies or personal wellbeing. There were some differing views as to who should have responsibility for the providing and funding of training programs, mentoring and support for student representatives. While finances were important, equally important was the need to ensure autonomy and authenticity of the student voice. Generally, it was seen as a partnership function between the student associations and the institutions.

But the key thing for us is that they are very, very well briefed by the Students' Union. That's the absolute key. So they come knowing about the issues that are going to be raised and are therefore able to have a really valuable input. (UK university student engagement officer)

So not only do we do formal training such as they do an online training module and then we follow that up. We have something called an academic reps conference ... (UK ex- student sabbatical officer)

... we invest a lot of time in terms of making sure that those student representatives have the skills and pre-briefings and things like that to be able to engage in the process. (NZ student leader)

5. Building experience and expertise

Building from the grass roots by providing representative opportunities at the course level was seen as greatly assisting both in the development of a culture of partnership and developing expertise in student representatives. In many cases it was almost seen as a career path by student representatives who started at course level and moved up through a faculty to senior institutional governance bodies. This process allowed students to develop an understanding of what was involved in university management and governance processes, and build experience and confidence in representative roles. Student staff liaison

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

committees were common to many institutions and seen as beneficial in assisting students to develop skills in what it meant to be a representative – connecting with their constituencies to gather their views, working through priorities with them, and putting views forward while differentiating between representation and advocacy.

6. Providing meaningful incentives for student engagement

There were a variety of ways across institutions and sectors for providing recognition of student representative roles and rewards for participation. These included payment, formal recognition in transcripts, academic credit and internships. Voice was not enough – it had to be accompanied by a demonstration of value and effect for students to feel it was worthwhile to contribute their time and energy as partners. Personal development and employability were cited as motivators.

... institutions do need to be really conscious about students being time poor and about the impact that asking them to help with ... essentially the quality enhancement and quality assurance of the institution imposes. ...if you're going to have a three hour long meeting, that 99% of the people are paid to attend and you can't place the same requirements on the unpaid person. ... So for example, the chair needs to say to the student, how long are you guys going to be here for? Is there something that you want at a certain place in the agenda, so that we can deal with it? (NZUSA officer)

7. Sector entities which support student partnership

In the sectors studied there were strong relationships between national entities and student representative bodies. In Scotland, England and New Zealand, sector agencies such as the UK's Quality Assurance Agency, and in New Zealand, Ako Aotearoa, have provided funding for national student association initiatives relating to quality. Students hold positions on sector entities such as the QAA in the UK and the Academic Quality Agency in New Zealand. In contrast, in Australia there is no student representation at TEQSA. While there was student representation within the governance structure of the OLT, with the closure of that body there is no longer student representation at this level.

Australian surveys: an overview of project findings

Surveys of student leaders and leaders in Australian tertiary education institutions were carried out to establish current practices for student engagement in university decision-making and governance. The surveys were developed from the survey conducted by the University of Bath as part of their commissioned research into student engagement in the UK carried out for QAA (UK) (Pimentel-Botas & ors, 2013). The survey of student leaders was formulated following a focus group also with Australian student leaders and representatives.

The surveys were a project phase 2 activity; complementing the overview presented here the detailed findings were published in, *Understanding student engagement in university decision making and governance –survey findings and good practice case-studies*, 2015 and 2016 (Varnham & ors, 2017b).

Student leader survey

Overview

As one of the main objectives of the project was to garner responses, student associations at Australian universities were surveyed to find out what student leaders think about current student engagement. The student survey questions were based on the University of Bath survey, modified as a result of preliminary consultation with Australian students. With a response rate of around 50% of our sample (14 responses) from diverse institutions across the country, the findings are potentially representative of what is happening with student engagement in decision-making in Australian universities from a student perspective. All but one of the respondents were elected student leaders and around half were involved in student associations, university councils and academic boards. Only one was involved at faculty level.

Survey responses showed that students are engaged in a range of decision-making opportunities across their institutions, most commonly in senior decision-making bodies such as council and academic board or senate. Final comments provided by students raise concern that this opportunity for participation is tokenistic. Students reported less opportunity for engagement in matters relating specifically to learning and teaching activities and where it occurs there are typically no voting rights. Students see institutional and staff attitudes to student representation as compliant, with students being seen as customers or stakeholders rather than partners. Student representatives see limited provision of formal incentives to participate and recognition for their participation.

Student representatives are reportedly moderately difficult to recruit, typically coming from the ranks of full-time, undergraduate, local students, recognising their role as representing the interests of their fellow students. A range of communication methods are employed to advertise opportunities, with informal sources and social media the most effective. The challenge lies in ensuring that valued information is easily available through the sources students are most likely to use. Training and support for student representatives is typically provided through student associations.

All respondents saw their role as providing leadership and representing the interests of the student body as a whole. Less than half saw themselves as activists and one-third identified the role as developing their careers.

How do student leaders see their institution's attitude towards student engagement?

Over a third of respondents saw their institution as supporting student representation but around half considered that their institution did not value student representatives. Around 25% of respondents thought that students are seen as customers, with no respondents perceiving they were considered partners. The engagement of staff with students in decision-making roles is variable. There is some indication that student representatives consider that they are viewed more seriously than other students.

Incentives

Informal recognition was the most common incentive for student representation reported. One-third reported no incentives being offered and 20% reported payment or formal

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

certificates being provided. The most highly ranked incentive was academic credit followed by certificates for specific training, inclusion on graduate statements and, lastly, payment. It is important to note here the issues of selection bias. From the project work, it has become apparent that student leaders may not be representative of the student cohort as a whole. In other project work and discussions, it appears that many university student leaders were student leaders at high school and reached university seeking leadership opportunities. While for them payment may not be important, there are other students who are not able to put themselves forward for leadership positions as they need to earn money to support their studies.

Levels of student involvement

Students reported being fully involved and having voting rights at over 80% in student associations, 60% in academic board, around 45% in council, and significantly less at faculty level and below. Students perceive their achievements through engagement as affecting policy, council and academic board, and in terms of raising issues.

Impact of student involvement

Respondents considered that student involvement had impacted decision-making in their institutions, most notably within their student associations but also in raising awareness of particular issues and students' responses to them. Students also saw themselves as having impact in relation to policy, within university council and academic board.

Communication

Students reported that the most useful category of information provided by their institution was results of student feedback surveys (93%), followed by reports of actions taken to enhance student educational experience (72%), employability survey data (64%), program/course evaluations and student progression and retention data (both 57%). University rankings, external examiners' reports and institutional financial data were reported as the least helpful.

Further thoughts

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide any further thoughts. A strong theme throughout was the importance of appropriate and effective communication, with the main challenge emerging for institutions being to ensure that the engagement they are working to provide is effective and effectively communicated to students. There was also the persistent concern that student participation can be perceived as token. This can only be countered by furthering and deepening student engagement, engaging students at the beginning of decision-making and strategy development processes, and maintaining a focus on delivering positive outcomes for students.

Institutional surveys

Overview

The outcome of international research together with the survey conducted by the University of Bath into student engagement were used to inform the development of a survey that was sent to staff across Australian tertiary education institutions to examine what is happening in Australia with respect to student engagement in university decision-making and governance.

The response to the survey was strong (53%) with 27 responses received from 47 institutions. Analysis of this survey revealed that there are pockets of good practice where students are engaged in decision-making. However, there is no systemic approach. Australian institutions, like some in the UK, are grappling with the concept of students as partners, more often perceiving students as stakeholders or customers.

Respondents were from different types of institutions with the Group of 8, Australian Technology Network, Regional Universities Network, Innovative Research Universities, Open Universities, unaligned universities and other higher educational institutions all represented in the responses received.

The following headings reflect the survey questions.

Where are students engaged and how?

Students are represented on all respondents' academic boards and at faculty level while most (84%) engage students on the institutional council and have a student association. Most institutions (92%) reported engaging students at course level and 80% engage students in grievance processes. At course level the engagement is overwhelmingly through student feedback surveys, with two instances of SSLCs reported, which are most prevalent at faculty level (64%). Committees in general are a major form of engagement, with surveys and ad hoc projects also being used to engage students. Fifteen of the responding institutions reported other forms of student engagement including student senators, student representative councils, consultation forums, co-creation projects and specialist senior executive appointments.

Ease of recruitment

Almost half of the respondents (48%) reported that it was moderately challenging to recruit student representatives while 26% reported difficulty in recruiting student representatives. Some institutions noted that it was easier to recruit university-wide representative positions than faculty-based positions.

Who engages?

The students most likely to engage are undergraduate, full time, local students. Postgraduate, part-time, international and minority-group students are significantly less likely to engage. Thirteen institutions reported that they are taking action to improve the engagement of groups with limited participation.

How does recruitment occur?

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

Student association elections commonly provide council and academic board representatives as well as student association representatives. Institution-run elections are used in some institutions to provide academic board representatives as well as faculty representatives. At the faculty level, representatives may be volunteers, nominees or appointed by staff.

Training

The vast majority of respondents reported some form of training for student representatives, mostly through formal institutional or student association programs, or staff who have this as a formal responsibility. There were also reports of using external providers to provide specific training (e.g. the Australian Institute of Company Directors). If there was a formalised process, respondents were asked to identify how it is funded. Sixteen institutions reported that funding was allocated to training student representatives. Mostly the funding is provided by the institution although there appears to be institutions allocating Student Services and Amenities Fees (SSAF) to this purpose.

Support for student representatives

Most respondents reported providing support and advice for student representatives, typically through staff with this responsibility. In just 44% of responses, the institution had formal institutional programs in place, with 36% of respondents providing student association programs and the same percentage utilising current student-representative mentors.

Informing students about representative roles

All respondents reported having a mechanism for informing students about representative roles. Orientation and information on the institutional website were the most common means, with social media and student forums also popular. Other reported mechanisms were letters from the DVC, a pop-up shop, student ambassadors, information on the student association website and emails to all students.

Acknowledging student contributions

Institutions were asked to report on whether student contribution to governance and decision-making is explicitly acknowledged in publications and news items. Ten institutions said that student contributions were not acknowledged and one was unsure. Those that reported that student contributions were acknowledged reported that this was through various channels including news stories, reports, attribution of authorship or contribution, AHEGS statement, meeting minutes, letters of thanks, and membership lists.

Performance indicators

Institutions were asked to report on whether they had performance indicators for the effectiveness of student engagement. Thirteen institutions reported that they did not have relevant performance indicators and one respondent was unsure whether their institution had relevant indicators or not. For those institutions reporting having relevant indicators,

they were generally found in the institution's strategic plan. The areas that were reported as being evaluated were variable.

Incentives

In terms of incentives offered to student representatives, thirteen institutions reported providing informal recognition, seven provide specific awards and eight provide payment. Other reported incentives were training and development opportunities in relation to leadership and governance, AHEGS, and gifts and gratuities. Five of the institutions provide no incentives. None of the institutions provide academic recognition.

How the institution perceives students

Student roles are perceived differently in different situations within institutions, as shown in the graph below with the most common role being stakeholder.

Institutional attitude towards student engagement

The most prevalent institutional attitude towards student engagement was 'championing/pioneering' at about 56%. About 36% of institutions identified themselves as 'compliant'. The remaining 8% characterised themselves as avoiding student engagement.

Increasing engagement

Institutions were asked to identify what would motivate them to increase student engagement. Of the respondents, 52% reported being self-motivated while 36% reported that provision of incentives would motivate them.

Case and pilot studies: an overview of project findings

Responses to the survey of student engagement practices in Australian universities together with stories volunteered to the project team at conferences were the input for phase 3 of the project. They revealed initiatives and existing practices at Australian universities that are already providing opportunity for students to have a significant role in decision-making processes. Consequently, with the approval of the relevant institutions, the project team conducted phase 3 interviews and focus groups with key personnel and students to gain an understanding of what these practices look like and how they are experienced by staff and students.

These case studies cover the experiences at a range of Australian universities, and demonstrate the successes and challenges of initiatives in the field. The examples span relatively new initiatives to more established ones. Many of these practices have been recently implemented and are thus not cast as best practice. Nonetheless, they show that the sector is interested in engaging students in decision-making, and what the universities who have championed the student voice have achieved so far. Complementing the phase 3 overview presented here, detailed case studies and exemplars were published in *Understanding student engagement in university decision making and governance –survey findings and good practice case-studies*, 2015 and 2016 (Varnham & ors, 2017c).

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

Interviews and focus group sessions of phase 3 were audio-recorded and the recordings transcribed to provide a record of the practices explored at each of the nine universities examined. These transcripts were used to inform detailed analysis of each case study, presented in a separate publication (Varnham & ors, 2017c). While the overall experiences were beneficial, these initiatives were not without challenges, and the more extensive treatment permitted in the guide provides an opportunity to discuss these issues in a deeper context as well as elaborate on specific processes and views underpinning the initiatives. Briefer synopses appear below (as University A, etc.).

The willingness to develop greater expertise in some sector quarters led to the opportunity to conduct a pilot project relating to the use of student staff consultative committees (SSCCs)(essentially the same type of body as those referred to in other institutions as staff student liaison committees (SSLCs)). This type of practice, used overseas as well as in some Australian institutions, is highly valuable in building a culture of student engagement and allowing both students and staff to gain expertise in student representation. This pilot study is also reported in detail in the guide.

University A: student staff consultative committee

This university provides student staff consultative committees (SSCCs) operating at the program level. The SSCCs enable students to have real input into their study program in meetings held to discuss program-related issues. Student representatives are a diverse mix of domestic and international, undergraduate and postgraduate, and full-time and part-time students.

There are guidelines for the operation of the SSCCs that are provided to student representatives. There is also a student representative manual. Training provided by the university is offered to student representatives. In 2016 the Student Union introduced a new staff member to provide SSCC student representatives with advice on areas of policy that they might need assistance in understanding. The union also held a SSCC Student Leadership Summit which included a keynote address by the Vice Chancellor and President, leadership and critical feedback workshops, as well as peer discussion to share experiences.

University B: student campus councils at a multi-campus university

University B has multiple campuses and each campus has a student campus council (SCC). In addition to each SCC, there is a Student Representative Council which includes three members of each SCC and deals with university-wide issues. In place of either a Student Association or a Student Union, University B uses the student representation and participation (SRP) model.

To ensure diversity in representation, membership of each SCC is specified and consists of six general representatives, one postgraduate student representative, one international student representative, one residential student representative, and two clubs and societies representatives. It is open to an SCC to appoint non-voting office-bearers to assist in particular areas where assistance may be required such as women's or Indigenous issues.

Students receive training in the form of a general induction provided by the university. Each student representative is given a comprehensive Leaders Resource Guide. A university position (Manager, Student Representation and Participation) is in place to support the

operation of the SCCs (and the Student Representative Council). An additional university position is that of Student Voice Officer. This position was created to support and resource student leaders and to facilitate student voice in university decision-making.

University C: student engagement at a regional university with multi campuses and large numbers of distance students

University C has multiple regional campuses and a significant population of distance education (DE) students. There is wide variation between campuses and student cohorts, both of which pose challenges for student engagement.

Each campus has a student representative council (SRC) plus an associated senate with representatives from all campuses. The SRCs are intended to be responsible for ensuring a student voice; funding student clubs and social events on campus; and providing opportunities for leadership, university engagement, community engagement and practising skills directly relevant to the workplace.

A student voice think tank led to the concept of a student leadership conference as a vehicle for students from different campuses to meet to build a 'whole' university student leadership culture. The conference also provided an opportunity to build skills to allow representatives to work more effectively in their positions and the opportunity for the students to meet with and question some of the senior staff leaders of the university. It was considered to be so effective that it will be held annually.

There is a two-day induction for all council members including the student representative. To enhance financial literacy, the university sends the student representative to the Australian Institute of Company Directors to undertake a course.

University D: student-centred key strategic partnership providing programs and activities which complement the learning and development outcomes of the university

University D has a dedicated non-profit entity that provides a range of non-academic services and facilities, as well as social, cultural, recreational and sporting programs. Its activities cover a wide spectrum, from the operation and management of commercial venues in the university to discipline clubs in faculties and schools, and diverse sports clubs. This entity seeks to engage all members of the university community – students, staff and alumni – in its activities, holding effective collaboration to be of primary importance.

The entity has a board that has a majority of elected student directors (7 out of 13 members) which include the President and Vice-President. All new student directors attend a one-day course on governance for directors run by the Australian Institute of Company Directors. There is also a full-day induction workshop where student directors are taken through every aspect of the company.

The President is reimbursed for expenses incurred, and both the President and Vice-President receive an honorarium.

University E: Student Guild and Education Council

The Student Guild has an undergraduate student president who is elected for one year. The president works alongside an elected postgraduate student president, representing students across the university and assisted on postgraduate issues by an elected postgraduate student president.

Below the guild is the Education Council which is made up of representatives from all faculty societies. This council ensures that students from each faculty have a voice on education issues. Below faculty societies there may be discipline clubs whose membership is made up of students from particular disciplines within faculties. Some faculties do have a course representative structure but this is not common throughout the university.

The Education Council meets monthly to discuss campus-wide issues which may be taken up by the Education Council President and the Student Guild President. The Education Council is a place where representatives from faculties collaborate and skill-share to enhance the education of all students. The council oversees the lobbying of faculties, the university and government.

There are two other sub-councils of the guild, The Public Affairs Council and the Societies Council, with presidents. Below this there are around 13 other representative-based portfolios. This structure provides not only student input on education issues but also comprehensive student input into university life areas such as orientation, residency, staff awards, etc. Each incoming guild president is required to attend governance, risk and financial management training conducted by the Australian Institute of Company Directors and funded by the senate. Training is also offered to specific guild officers in relation to their specific roles. There is an informal 'succession' of student guild leaders where the president is likely to have performed a series of other leadership roles while being mentored by the preceding experienced student leaders. The guild also has a very formal, structured handover process – as well as the incoming President 'shadowing' the outgoing one, the Council receives training and there are handover packs distributed to affiliated bodies.

University F: academic student representative

An academic student representative (ASR) program currently operates in four schools in one division. It was instituted by the Dean and is led by an Experience Plus Support Officer.

Each program has an ASR and this includes undergraduate, Honours and postgraduate coursework. There are published recruitment guidelines for ASRs which provide that there should be one for every year level of a program. Orientation is required for the ASRs and there is a student representative handbook.

Positives for students were recognition of their views; developing socialisation and communications skills; and getting to know program directors, and other ASRs and students generally.

University G: co-creation of a major student facility

A comprehensive student facility was established through a project of co-creation with students actively engaged in the process of determining what would be in the centre and

how it would work. When the facility opened it was instantly populated by students, particularly those who had contributed to the space.

A virtual co-creation concept was pursued the following year with the same committee, logic and system. This project identified a significant number of issues that impacted student experience. These issues were addressed individually and led to improved student experience through e-commerce, a timetabling app, compatibility with different devices and improved Blackboard functionality.

The success of the project created institutional awareness of the value of investing in the student experience.

University H: embedded leadership practices at an older university

University H is among the oldest universities in Australia and has a long tradition of active student representation. It has an engaged student association at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

University H offers a course, Leadership and Influence, for academic credit. It is one of the courses known as a vice-chancellor's course and is interdisciplinary with a peer-learning ethos. It is available to students from second year onwards who have an elective available. The course guide notes that: 'Students will develop a strong sense of their individual efficacy in pursuing self, social or organisation change and development'. One of the assessment tasks is a group project to develop an idea to 'pitch' at the end of the course to the vice-chancellor on how to enhance the student experience.

There is a vice-chancellor's student leadership program that has an undergraduate and a postgraduate version. Students who are in or intending to apply for university student leadership positions are strongly encouraged by the university to apply. As part of the program students are assigned a senior member of staff as their mentor.

A student leadership forum is held towards the end of the year and is a gathering of those students who have been elected for student leadership positions in the following year.

University I: staff student consultation committee pilot project

A pilot project was initiated in the law faculty at University I, working with students and staff engaged in the undergraduate LLB program to determine whether this type of engagement with students would be beneficial to staff, students and the program.

The pilot project was well received by the students involved. They liked the opportunity to work with staff, raise student concerns and have those concerns addressed in an open, collaborative discussion. Students benefitted from gaining a better understanding of university processes and recognising that some decision-making is centralised and therefore not controlled by the faculty. Understanding the reasoning behind policies and processes was beneficial. Students appreciated the changes that were implemented as a result of their comments and advice that matters that could not be actioned immediately would be pursued. Students also appreciated this opportunity to enhance communication and transparency while engaging with students from other years of their course.

It was beneficial for the faculty to meet students in a collaborative environment and hear from a 'new group' of students representing their peers rather than depend on those students who were active in other student bodies. Better briefing and training of academics prior to the first SSCC meeting may have increased positive responses from some academic members.

University J: embedded student representation processes at a private university

University J is relatively small and has a very active student body. Student representation is embedded and supported at all levels of the university from class representation to university council. Student representatives have been the initiators of university-wide administrative changes. For example, when a member of the student association proposed a change to the student evaluation system, to extend the time for responding until after exams, and the proposal was eventually passed at the next meeting.

University K: student representative systems at a young university

A young regional university is a 'greenfields' site for embedding a culture of student partnership in decision-making and governance. This case highlights the challenges in developing the structures which support a culture of student representation when that culture has not previously existed within the student body. Communication issues were at the forefront particularly in relation to the means used by the university to advise both potential student representatives, and the student body as a whole, of election processes. It was seen that development of an SRC required a delicate balance between student autonomy and management guidance. Management is committed to the development of a representative culture and is engaged in further review and development.

A systemic model of student engagement in university governance and decision-making

The project work has allowed the production of a model representing a systemic view of student engagement in university decision-making and governance (Figure 1). Prior to this project, the primary concern was with the issues of increasing engagement within the higher-level deliberative bodies of universities, such as senates, councils and academic boards. The research work and extensive contact with student leaders has shown that the development of a strong student voice in decision-making requires attention at all levels of the sector, from subject and course representation to policy. The relationships between the various bodies, in some cases portrayed through the image of an incomplete 'ladder', suggest that the relationships may not yet be sufficiently developed.

This model has been used in by the project team in sector workshops as a stimulus for participants to consider the student–institution relationships in their priority areas.

Student partnership in university decision-making A systemic model




Figure 1: The model for student partnerships in universities developed by the project.

Project team reflections: challenges and opportunities

A single-institution project presented both challenges and opportunities:

1. Execution of the project fell to a small team at one institution. While this made for an extremely busy period, it allowed the opportunity to engage with a wide range of institutions and student cohorts. This generated a broader and more coherent picture of current Australian practice.
2. The nature of the university timetable and student election cycles posed considerable difficulties with engaging students in the project. In particular, it was hard to find suitable times to conduct focus groups involving students. This difficulty was overcome by being flexible in terms of phone interviews and timing of focus groups to fit in with students' timetables. The universities involved assisted greatly in this.
3. Difficulties were also encountered with contacts in university and national student organisations due to changeovers in personnel. Rather than trying to maintain contact with a moving population of office holders in these organisations, it was found to be more valuable to work with individual students and student leaders who had contacted the team or stood out in focus groups and interviews. These students represented diverse student groups including Indigenous, international, postgraduate, disabled and minority groups, and they played an important part in

the research and project activities, for example, organising and leading the symposium sessions and gathering students for focus groups.

4. Making contact with the people within an institution who could provide information regarding the institution's student engagement practices was challenging. This challenge was solved by a program of wide dissemination which ultimately allowed far-reaching contact with the right people.

Key findings: Factors needed for effective student engagement

The project team, drawing from all three phases, were able to identify important factors in universities and higher education institutions that are necessary for effective student engagement. The factors are described below, and summarised in Figure 2.

1. Effective and valued student leadership in partnership with universities

Strong student leadership at all levels is shown to be pivotal with a strong focus on partnership of student associations and student leaders with the university. The UK QAA states: *'It is notable that for an institution to do well in engaging students, it needs to work in partnership with the representative student body'* (QAA, 2009–2011). The representative context of student leadership needs clear definition at both a national level and at most universities. Case studies of two Australian universities which have a strong commitment to student leadership showed clearly the value in a collaborative partnership approach and institutional support for its place in the matrix of student representation at universities. Support for this role could follow through to national student bodies.

2. A developmental approach to student representation from course/subject level to high-level institutional bodies

The importance of the development of student representative capability from the early years of students' programs emerged universally as an important factor. Case studies at Australian universities showed that course representatives play a key role in gathering student opinion and working with academic staff to use this information to enhance the student experience. This role gives students representative experience and confidence to propel further into faculty and university bodies.

3. Resources for training and support of student representatives

Training and support is essential and may involve student trainers. The value is well recognised in UK reports (ELIR 2008–2011, QAA Scotland 2014–15). Importantly, training can be a partnership enterprise between universities and student associations. There is also a need for working with university personnel and academics to develop processes to incorporate the views of student representatives.

4. Processes for the engagement of students in curricula design, and involvement in a continual process of enhancement of courses and their university experience

Student engagement in the classroom was not a specific focus of this project but it is integral to the development of a culture of student partnership. There is an increasing body of OLT and international research in this area (detailed above).

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

5. Capturing every student's voice – engaging under-represented student groups to ensure engagement of the whole student cohort

A significant challenge lies in capturing the voices of all student cohorts – international, Indigenous, distance, full-time and part-time, and undergraduate and postgraduate – and there is a need for sector-wide collaboration to share ideas to consistently deliver the best outcomes. The voices of international students are seldom specifically included within current structures. The need for innovation in this area is particularly important to maintaining international competitiveness by showing that the Australian sector is seen as responsive to and inclusive of the views of these students.

6. Considering the provision of meaningful incentives for student engagement

The development of appropriate financial and non-financial support for student representation needs consideration. Research indicates that the low level of diversity among student representatives may be related to financial issues such as the need to engage in paid work to support study. It is necessary also to examine a range of possibilities for educational recognition which may be seen to aid employability.

7. National entities supporting student engagement

In the comparative sectors a key role is played by strong national entities which support student engagement. They have permanent staff to assist with research agendas, training and support. In the case of elected student organisations, they provide the knowledge transfer which is essential with a transient student body. These agencies work either through sector support for the national student organisation, for example, NZUSA or ENQA, or as a separate body set up as a collaboration between sector bodies, for example, sparqs (set up in 2003) and TSEP (created in 2012). The latter are collaborations between the National Union of Students (NUS), the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), the Higher Education Funding Council (HEFCE), the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and the Guild of Higher Education. Their work illustrates the value of a sector-supported co-ordinated agency or collaboration underpinning a policy commitment to student partnership.

The findings of this project are to be progressed by an Australian Learning and Teaching Senior National Teaching Fellowship awarded to Professor Sally Varnham for 2016–17. A sector-wide collaboration will work towards the development of an agreed set of principles and a framework for student engagement. It is hoped that this will be followed by the production of toolkits to assist universities in the implementation of these principles.

Figure 2: A summary of the factors necessary for effective student engagement

A model of student engagement

1. Effective, valued and supported **student leadership in partnership** with universities.
2. A **developmental approach** to student representation from course/subject level to high level institutional bodies.
3. Resources for **training and support** of student representatives.
4. Processes for the engagement of students in curricula design, and involvement in a continual process of enhancement of courses and their university experience.
5. **Capturing every students' voice** - engaging underrepresented student groups to ensure engagement of the whole student cohort.
6. Considering the provision of **meaningful incentives** for student engagement.
7. **National entities** supporting student engagement.

Conclusions and recommendations

Although Australian universities have student representatives on faculty and university bodies, representation does not weave through all layers of the institutions. In addition, the extent of representation varies greatly. There is a need for a common understanding towards creating effective student representation or engagement at all levels of university operations in a diverse sector. Low-level student engagement in university governance and decision-making is often attributed to student apathy as reflected in the headline to an article about the project in the Higher Education section in *The Australian*: 'Mission to reverse student apathy' (11 November 2015) (even though the project was not represented in this way in the interview leading to the article). However, behaviour which may appear apathetic may be better ascribed to the relatively low level of systemic support for student engagement. The comparative international research has highlighted the patchiness of systemic support in Australia and the minimal policy framework.

Nonetheless, the project discovered exemplary cases of student partnership in Australia, with strong support and highly engaged student representatives. With effective institutional support, students have been able to contribute effectively to university functions. There are cases where innovative strategies with significant implications for the quality of student learning have been initiated by student representatives. Commitment and respect are essential to embed principles of a student voice and an ethos of student partnership and this is often embodied in strong student leadership processes. Students must be able to trust the university in order to engage and this comes from the institution demonstrating that the student voice counts. There was more enthusiasm for taking a representative role when students felt they could 'make a difference'.

The innovations underway in many Australian universities show a readiness in the sector to embrace principles of student partnership. The establishment of a separate function of student engagement of NUS and/or CAPA supported by the sector with dedicated permanent staff, or the creation of a separate agency along the lines of sparqs or a collaborative body like TSEP, would show sector commitment to turning the concept of student partnership into a reality in Australian universities.

References and further reading

Ako Aotearoa: The National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence and New Zealand Union of Students' Associations (2013) *Student Voice in Tertiary Education Settings: Quality Systems in Practice* at <https://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/download/ng/file/group-4/student-voice-full-report.pdf>

Arnstein S R (1969) *A Ladder of Citizen Participation* JAIP, 35, No. 4, July, 216–224

Bergan S (ed) (2004) *The University as res publica: Higher Education Governance, Student Participation and the University as a Site of Citizenship*, Council of Europe Publishing, www.coe.int/en/web/portal/home

Boyatzis RE (1998) *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*, Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi: SAGE Publications

Brown R (2011) *What do we do about university governance* Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education 15(3), 87-91

Bryman A & Bell E (2005) *Business Research Methods*, 4th ed, Oxford University Press

Budapest Declaration: Governance and Student Participation. 21st European Student Convention February 2011

Carey P (2013a) *Student as co-producer in a marketised higher education system: as case study of students' experience of participation in curriculum design*, Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 50(3), 250–260

Carey P (2013b) *Student Engagement in University Decision-Making: Policies, Processes and the Student Voice*, Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Lancaster University, UK

Carey P (2013c) *Student Engagement: Stakeholder perspectives on course representation in university governance*, Studies in Higher Education, 38(9), 1290–1303

Coates H (2005) *The value of student engagement for higher education quality assurance* Quality in Higher Education 11 (1), 25-36

Commonwealth of Australia Government (2009) *Transforming Australia's Higher Education System*

Deane E (2013) *Student Leadership in Curriculum Development and Reform*, Office of Learning and Teaching, Australian Learning and Teaching

Department for Business, Innovation & Skills, 'A new 'fit for purpose' regulatory framework for the higher education sector, Technical Consultation', August 2011

Dow A (2013) *Student Representatives engaging in opportunities and negotiating barriers to participation in tertiary governance*, Paper presented at Australia and New Zealand Student Services Association (ANZSSA) Biennial Conference Dec 3–6, Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand

European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) (2006) *Student involvement in the processes of quality assurance agencies* at (<http://www.engq.eu/indirme/papers-and-reports/workshop-and-seminar/Student%20involvement.pdf>)

European Students Union (ESU) (2011) *No Student Left Out: the do's and don'ts of student participation in higher education decision-making* at <https://www.esu-online.org>

Gordon L, MacGibbon L, Mudgway S, Mason T & McIroy (2011) Final Report Stocktake of codes of practice in tertiary organisations, Networkers, Wellington, New Zealand

Healey M & ors (2014) *Engagement through partnership: students as partners in higher education*, Higher Education Academy, <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/enhancement/themes/students-partners>

Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2011 and its 2015 replacement (from January 2017)

Jackson J, Fleming H, Kamvounias P & Varnham S (2009) *Student Grievances and Discipline Matters Project Report and Good Practice Guide* accessible at <http://www.olt.gov.au/resources?text=student+grievances+and+discipline+matters>

Kamvounias P & Varnham S (2006) *Getting What They Paid For: Consumer Rights of Students in Higher Education*, Griffith Law Review, 15 (2), 306-332

Krause K-L 'Student engagement: a messy policy challenge in higher education' in *Engaging with learning in higher education* (Solomonides I, Reid A & Petocz P (Eds) (Faringdon: Libri, 2012)

Little B, Locke W, Scesa A & Williams R (2009) *Report to HEFCE on student engagement*, HEFCE, Bristol, UK

Little B & Williams R (2010) *Students' roles in maintaining quality and enhancing learning: Is there a tension* Quality in Higher Education, 16(2), 115-127.

Lizzio A & Wilson K (2009) *Student participation in university governance: The role conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on department committees* Studies in Higher Education, 34(1), 69-84.

Luescher-Mamashela T M (2010), *From University Democratisation to Managerialism: The changing legitimisation of university governance and the place of students*, Tertiary Education and Management, 16(4), 259–283

Luescher-Mamashela T M (2012) *Student representation in university decision making: good reasons, a new lens?* *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(1), 1442–1456

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

McMillen C (2014) *The government should think hard before deregulating university fees* *The Conversation* 2 May 2014 at theconversation.com/the-government-should-think-hard-before-deregulating-university-fees-26175 accessed 23 June 2015

Marginson S & Considine M (2000), *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England

Meek V L (2000) *Diversity and marketisation of higher education: incompatible concepts?* *Higher Education Policy* 13, 23-39

National Student Forum, Annual Report (2010), UK

NUS (2012) *Student Engagement in Learning and Teaching Quality Management National Union of Students (NUS) Manifesto for Partnership* at <http://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/a-manifesto-for-partnership>

Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE) UK, Annual Reports (2011, 2012, 2015) www.oiahe.org.uk

Pabian P & Minksova L (2011) *Students in Higher Education Governance in Europe: Contrasts, commonalities and controversies*, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 17(3), 261–273

Pimentel-Botas P C, van der Velden G M, Naidoo R, Lowe J A, and Pool A D (2013) *Student Engagement in Learning and Teaching Quality Management: A Study of UK Practices. Research Findings* Commissioned by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education http://www.bath.ac.uk/learningandteaching/pdf/student_engagement/Research_Findings_Report_11.9.2013.pdf

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (2012) *UK Quality Code for Higher Education*, (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Quality-Code-Overview-2015.pdf>)

Report of the Working Group on Student Engagement in Irish Higher Education (2016) *Enhancing Student Engagement in Decision-Making* April at <http://www.iua.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/HEA-IRC-Student-Engagement-Report-Apr2016.pdf>

Report to the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2009) *Student Engagement* at http://oro.open.ac.uk/15281/1/Report_to_HEFCE_on_student_engagement.pdf

Solomonides & ors (2014) *Student engagement: a messy policy challenge in higher education* in 'Engaging with Learning in Higher Education'

Student engagement through partnership (2010) The Higher Education Academy,

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

Student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs) (2016), *Engaging Students in Institution-led Review*, May

Student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs) (2015), *Recognition and accreditation of academic reps- Practices and challenges across Scotland's colleges and universities*, November

Student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs), Association of Colleges (AoC) and NUS (2015), *Developing your students' union*

Student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs), (2013), *Celebrating student engagement, successes and opportunities in Scotland's university sector*

Student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs), (2013), *Guidance on the development and implementation of a Student Partnership Agreement in Universities*, November

Student partnerships in quality Scotland (sparqs), (2005), *Report of the higher education mapping exercise of student involvement in quality assurance & enhancement processes*

(all sparqs publications above accessible at www.sparqs.ac.uk)

Student Voice in Tertiary Education Settings: Quality Systems in Practice Prepared for Ako Aotearoa: The National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence and New Zealand Union of Students' Associations (2013)

The Student Engagement Partnership (TSEP) & GuildHE (2015) *Making Student Engagement a Reality- Turning theory into Practice* at www.guildhe.ac.uk

The Student Engagement Partnership (TSEP) (2014) *The Principles of Student Engagement: The Student Engagement Conversation*

Thomas L (2012), *What Works? Student Retention & Success*, Final Report for the Higher Education Funding Council

Trowler V (2010) *Framework for Action: enhancing student engagement at the institutional level (2010)*, The Higher Education Academy, York, England

Trowler V (2010) *Student engagement literature review* Department of Educational Research Lancaster University, November

UK Government - Department of Business Innovation and Skills (2011), *White Paper – Higher Education: Students at the Heart of the System*

Van der Velden G M, Pool A D, Lowe J A, Naidoo R & Pimentel-Botas P C (2013), 'Student Engagement in Learning and Teaching Quality Management - A good practice guide for higher education providers and students' unions'. Commissioned by The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Varnham, S, Olliffe, B, Waite, K and Cahill, A (2017a) *Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: towards a more systemically inclusive student voice. International Research Report 2015*

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

Varnham, S, Olliffe, B, Waite, K and Cahill, A (2017b) *Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: towards a more systemically inclusive student voice 2015 and 2016. Australian Survey Report*

Varnham, S, Olliffe, B, Waite, K and Cahill, A (2017c) *Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: towards a more systemically inclusive student voice 2015 and 2016. Good Practice Case Studies Report – Australian examples of student engagement*

Victoria University of Wellington (2010-2014), *The Student Experience Strategy*

Appendix A

Appendix A: Certification by Deputy Vice-Chancellor

I certify that all parts of the final report for this OLT grant provide an accurate representation of the implementation, impact and findings of the project, and that the report is of publishable quality.

Name: Professor Shirley Alexander

Position: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education and Students)



Signature:

Date: 3 November 2016

Appendix B: Evaluation Report

Evaluation Report

**Student Engagement in university decision-making and governance –
towards a more systemically inclusive student voice**

Evaluator: Grace Lynch

Background

The aim of this project was working towards enhancing the student experience by the development of a more systemic inclusion of student voice in decision making and governance in Australian universities. It investigated the case for deeper engagement of the views of diverse student bodies in order to consider how this may be achieved at many levels and facets. Ultimately, it aimed to provide mechanisms for better defining student expectations in the evolving new higher education environment as an inclusive culture embracing student participation in decision making is essential to the development of citizens and leaders in a democratic society. This project explored how the student voice has been championed internationally and used that experience to provide universities with the tools and knowledge to implement processes to facilitate and embed effective student participation. It worked towards building inclusive and responsive universities which value the student voice, and enhance the student experience by understanding and meeting student expectations.

The intended deliverables were all achieved and include:

- Research report of international research and experience and identifying good practices.
- Review report of Australian practices in student engagement in university decision making and governance.
- Case studies, frameworks and resources developed from pilots in a range of Australian universities.
- State and symposia and national workshop to engage the sector in adopting new practices.

The project was allocated an evaluator from the independent evaluation team for all Strategic Commissioned Projects by the then Office for Learning and Teaching. The role of the evaluator was to conduct formative evaluation activities throughout the life of the project as well as providing summative evaluation of the project at its conclusion informed and based by the ALTC Project Evaluation Resources designed to assist projects in achieving success and impact.

The summative evaluation that forms the basis for this report has been guided by the following questions:

- Was the project managed and conducted in ways that contributed to project success?
- Did the project achieve its stated outcomes?
- Did the project achieve as much impact as it should have?
- How could the processes associated with the project be improved and replicated?

Evaluation Reflections

This project team and the evaluation team were first introduced at the OLT opening workshop in March 2015 for all 2014 Strategic Commissioned Projects. The 21st Century student experience cluster was comprised of four project teams, including this project led the University of Technology Sydney, by Professor Sally Varnham, with project team members Katrina Waite, Bronwyn Olliffe and Project Manager Ann Cahill.

This project team was slightly different than other strategic commissioned projects as there was only one university involved, but the team had clear strategies in place to interact with, and gather feedback from a number of Australian and International Universities. By the time of the March workshop, the project was already underway with ethics approval and had commenced data gathering from relevant international institutions. A key strength of this project was the strong leadership of the project lead who was highly experienced in student governance and a dedicated and committed Project Manager, Ann Cahill.

Formative Evaluation Strategies

In order to determine that the project's aims were achieved and outcomes delivered, formative and summative evaluation strategies were undertaken throughout the project. The independent evaluator was welcomed as a member of the Project Team and external Reference Group and included in all project team communications. The evaluator was provided access to the project team's shared document Dropbox space and participated in virtual and face to face project meetings, reference group meetings and inter-cluster meetings. During the project lifecycle, the evaluator provided ongoing advice and feedback for progress reports, development of reports, and development and refinement of case studies. The evaluator met one on one regularly with the Project Manager and Project leader.

Project Management

It has well known that effective project management practice incorporates principles that:

- Identify project requirements
- Establish clear and achievable outcomes

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

- Balance the competing demands for quality, scope, time and cost
- Manage the expectations of various stakeholders
- Adapt plans to overcome challenges

This project clearly evidenced these project management principles. In particular, the project was tightly managed with clearly defined outcomes and deliverables, realistic timelines and flexibility to fine tune and make adjustments to accommodate challenges. A wide range of stakeholder groups were involved in the project as sources of data including the advisory reference group and were provided with extensive opportunities to contribute a strong voice. The team was also proactive in making links and forming collaborations with other project teams in the 21 Century Student Experience cluster of 2014 Strategic Commissioned Projects. The combined experience of the project leader and manager previously working together was also an obvious asset and strength in their abilities to keep the project performing on scope, time and to high quality.

Achievement of Outcomes

This project has successfully interacted with almost 250 individuals (181 in Australia and 85 internationally). In terms of sector engagement and reach, 12 institutions were represented in the reference group, 40 institutions engaged in symposiums, 14 student leaders responded to student survey and 11 case studies were created. The forms of interaction included surveys, interviews, workshops and symposiums. The findings indicate that there are pockets of good practice in Australia but no systemic response to the importance of partnering with students in decision-making and governance processes.

The key findings were that in order to encourage student engagement in university policies and procedures a sincere culture of partnership must be developed and visibly committed to respecting student voices. Communication is critical, including student representative opportunities within the university and through these opportunities the views of student representatives are integral to decision making.

The 11 case studies involved interviews and/or focus groups with the senior university personnel and students. A pilot of course representative staff/student liaison committee model was run in a faculty which had not previously utilised such a mechanism. Training was provided for those participating in the successful pilot.

Impact

The project adopted an embedded dissemination strategy and broad communications were aimed at establishing awareness and interaction with the project, particularly as this was a single institution project. Social media was used throughout the project and three project magazines were distributed widely and are available on the project website.

Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

There was a workshop conducted late October 2015 involving students and university staff. A national forum in early September 2016 with over 100 attendees, involved both international and national speakers including students and as this project ends, impact will be extended through a national fellowship.

The project achieved the intended deliverables as illustrated below.

Outcomes	
Final Report	1
Good Practice Guide	1
Case Studies	11
Conference Presentations	12
Project Magazines	3
Workshops/Symposiums	2

Summary

The project activities ensured that a large number of stakeholders (students, academics and university leaders) were not only consulted in developing the findings, but were also engaged with the critical question of why is student engagement in decision making important to the student experience in today's higher education environment.

This project was a pleasure to work with due to the experience, respect and willingness of the team to engage with and learn from others. It was a highly competent and well led team that achieved not only its project outcomes but has also extended impact in a range of areas and ways. The relationships that have been formed during this project are a key strength and will be an asset for the endurance of the project work already commenced into the future through the Australian Teaching and Learning National Senior Teaching Fellowship awarded to Professor Sally Varnham, this project's leader.

Appendix C: Impact Plan (updated, as at 2016)

	Anticipated changes at:			
	Project completion	Six months post-completion	Twelve months post-completion	Twenty-four months post-completion
(1) Team members	Knowledge about student engagement in UK, Europe and New Zealand. Empirical evidence regarding status of student voice in Australian university governance. Authorship of good practice exemplars, and conference presentations	Published papers	Published papers Further research and roles in developing student engagement	Further research and roles in developing student engagement
(2) Immediate students	Benefitting from increased knowledge of good practice in relation to student engagement	Benefitting from increased knowledge of good practice in relation to student engagement	Greater engagement with student representation opportunities and/or articulation of opinions to student representatives	Improved student experience, continuing enhanced student engagement
(3) Spreading the word	Exemplars, Reports, Conference presentations, Social media, Web	Social media, Web, Published papers	Social media, Web, Published papers	Social media, Web
(4) Narrow opportunistic adoption	Attendees at conferences and symposia trying specific practices identified as potentially beneficial in presentations delivered by the team	Attendees at conferences and symposia trying specific practices identified as potentially beneficial in presentations delivered by the team	Change at UTS (adopting evidence based best practice)	Embedded protocols at UTS
(5) Narrow systemic adoption	UTS, reference and pilot institutions trying specific practices identified as beneficial in the project	UTS, reference and pilot institutions trying specific practices identified as beneficial in the project	Other universities participating in the project adopting evidence based best practice and credit recognition	Embedded protocols at other universities
(6) Broad opportunistic adoption	Interaction of adopters with managers from other institutions encouraging broader adoption	Universities moving towards credit recognition and organised training	Universities embracing credit recognition and organised training	Universities embedding and improving credit recognition and organised training
(7) Broad systemic adoption	[not expected at this stage]	Recognition of the need for change	Development of recommendations based on research and early adopters	National review mechanism Higher education threshold standards National credit recognition

Student engagement in university decision-making and governance – towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

Appendix D: Dissemination posters

Student voice – what post graduate students think matters

Sally Varnham, Bronwyn Olliffe, Katrina Waite & Ann Cahill University of Technology Sydney

Introduction

The student voice project is examining good practice in student engagement in decision making and governance in universities internationally and in Australia. In Australia there are pockets of good practice but there is still a way to go in developing a systemic approach.

The Problem

We have identified that in Australia post graduate students are an under represented group in university decision making and governance.

Methodology

We have:

- interviewed key players from universities and organizations involved in student engagement in the UK, Europe and New Zealand and carried out a thematic analysis on the transcripts
- Carried out an Australian institutional survey based on our findings in our international research and a similar survey conducted in the UK.
- Conducted case studies in Australia based on our survey findings

Results

Key finding 1:
There are five key dimensions that contribute to effective student engagement in decision making

Key finding 2:
Not all categories of students are well engaged in decision making and post graduates are an under represented group

Student category	% of students well engaged in decision making (by group)
Undergraduate	81
Postgraduate	33
Part-time	0
Part-time	88
Local	0
International	10
International	88

Key finding 3:
Provision of suitable training and support and incentives to participate require development in Australian universities. Few instances of formal incentive schemes were reported.

Formal support	% institutions reporting to support	% institutions reporting no support
Formal budgetary programs	80	10
Staff	8	10
Staff study	61	88
Formal student representation programs	10	88
Staff	0	8
Student voice programs	8	88
Part-time	0	8
International	0	0

Key finding 4:
A bottom up approach to developing student engagement seems to work best providing opportunities starting early in a student's academic career and at course level. This can assist greatly to develop an ethos or culture of student engagement in the university which extends to an expectation of student voice at all levels including postgraduate

Summary

There is a strong culture of student engagement in decision making in universities in other countries.

That culture is emerging in Australia but more work is needed to make it systemic.

Under represented student groups, such as post graduate students, need to be better engaged.

Training and support and incentives are important dimensions to improving engagement.

A culture of partnership is borne out of institutional commitment to and respect for student voice.

References

studentvoice.uts.edu.au


Pimentel Bótas, P. C. van der Velden, G. M. Naidoo, R. Lowe J. A. and Pool A. D. *Student Engagement in Learning and Teaching Quality Management: A Study of UK Practices Research Findings Commissioned by the Quality Assurance Agency* University of Bath

Support for this publication/activity has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views expressed in this publication/activity do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.

Student engagement in university decision-making and governance – towards a more systemically inclusive student voice



STUDENT PARTNERSHIP: UNIVERSITY DECISION MAKING IN AUSTRALIA IN 2030 - THE WAY IT COULD LOOK



Support for this project has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government.

Student engagement in university decision-making and governance – towards a more systemically inclusive student voice

Appendix E: Dissemination list

The following dissemination activities and opportunities occurred during the project.

Conference presentations

Varnham S, Waite, K, Olliffe, B, Cahill A, 'Student voice in Australian university decision-making: From misrecognition to a systemic model.' Society for Research in Higher Education Annual Research Conference Dec 2016, Newport, Wales, United Kingdom. (forthcoming)

Varnham S, Olliffe B, Cahill A, Tangonan M & Bridges T, Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: what, why and how? 2016 UTS Learning and Teaching Forum (forthcoming)

Varnham S, Cahill A, Chapman L, Heckenberg S & Ngan B, 'Creating a National Framework for Student Partnership in University Decision-making and Governance: the OLT National Senior Teaching Fellowship' TEQSA/HECQN conference 9-11 November 2016

Waite K, Varnham S, Olliffe B & Cahill A, 'Student Engagement in University Decision making and Governance: Australian perspectives'. Student Voice and Quality at Universities Conference, Oct 12, 2016. AKO Aotearoa, Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities, and NZUSA

Varnham S & Olliffe B, '*Student Engagement in university decision-making and governance – what, why and how?*' Law Faculty Learning and Teaching Seminar, UNSW, 6 October 2016 (followed by entry in Law Faculty blog)

Waite, K, Varnham, S, Olliffe, B, & Cahill, A. 'Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice' Workshop with staff, students and student leaders. University of the Sunshine Coast, 6 October 2016

Varnham S, '*Student Engagement in university decision-making and governance –what, why and how?*' ANZELA Conference, Auckland New Zealand, 28-30 September 2016

Varnham, S, Olliffe, B, Waite, K, & Cahill, A. National Symposium 'Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice'. 6 September 2016. University of Technology Sydney.

Mercer-Mapstone, L., Matthews K, Rueckert, C., Varnham, S., Thomas, L. 'Students as Partners' in Higher Education: An insurmountable challenge or an opportunity for transformation?' HERDSA, Fremantle Australia, July 2016

Varnham S, '*Student Engagement in University Decision-making and Governance: towards a more systemically inclusive student voice– an OLT Strategic Commissioned Project*' Office of Learning and Teaching Conference, Melbourne, July 2016

Varnham S, 'Student Engagement in University Decision-making and Governance: towards a more systemically inclusive student voice– an OLT Strategic Commissioned Project' [National postgraduate student experience symposium 2016, 7-8 April, Gold Coast](#)

Varnham S, 'Student Engagement in University Decision-making and Governance: towards a more systemically inclusive student voice' Universities Australia Conference, HECQN Satellite Session, Canberra, 12 March 2016

Varnham S, Waite, K, Olliffe, B & Cahill, A, 'Building the argument for more systemic student voice in university governance and decision-making in Australia: Learnings from the UK', *Converging Concepts in global Higher Education Research: Local, national and international perspectives*, Society for Research into Higher Education Annual Research Conference December 2015, Newport, Wales, United Kingdom

Varnham S (2015) 'Students as partners: the student voice in university decision making and governance – discussion of an Office for Learning and Teaching project', Higher Education Compliance and Quality Forum, Melbourne, Australia, November 2015

Varnham, S, Olliffe, B, Waite, K, & Cahill, A. National Workshop 'Student engagement in university decision-making and governance: Towards a more systemically inclusive student voice'. 27 October 2015. University of Technology Sydney.

Varnham S (2015) 'Seen and Heard: engagement of the student voice in university decision making', 24th National Conference of the Australia & New Zealand Education Law Association, Brisbane, Australia, September 2015

Varnham S (2015) 'Student engagement in university decision-making and governance - towards a more systemically inclusive student voice' Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Melbourne, Australia, July 2015

Varnham S, Olliffe B, Cahill A and Waite K (2015) 'Student engagement in university decision-making and governance - towards a more systemically inclusive student voice' Australasian Law Teachers Association 2015, Melbourne, Australia, July 2015

Posters

Varnham S, Olliffe B, Waite K & Cahill A, 'Student Voice – what postgraduate students think matters' [National postgraduate student experience symposium 2016, 7-8 April, Gold Coast](#)

Varnham S, Olliffe B, Waite K & Cahill A, 'Student Partnership: University Decision-making in Australia 2030 – the way it could look' Office of Learning and Teaching Conference, Melbourne, July

Media

'Mission to Reverse Student Apathy' The Australian, Higher Education Supplement, 11 November 2015

'Efforts to Engage Students Pays Off' The Australian, Higher Education Supplement, 5 October 2016

'Interview with Sally Varnham, University of Technology Sydney' 27 October 2016

<http://www.sparqs.ac.uk/announcement-detail.php?page=562>

Book Chapters

Varnham S, 'University Governance: Responsibility and Accountability' in Varnham, S., Kamvounias P & Squelch J (eds), *Higher Education and the Law*, The Federation Press, 2015 pp. 16-29

Tyrrell J & Varnham S, 'The Student Voice in University Decision-making' in Varnham S, Kamvounias, P & Squelch, J (eds), *Higher Education and the Law*, The Federation Press, Sydney, 2015 pp. 30-40

Consultation submission

Project team submission to the recast OLT consultation process led by Professor Ross Milbourne for the Department of Education and Training reported as 'A new national institute for learning and teaching' Aug 2015.