

Pedagogical Partnerships

A HOW-TO GUIDE

for Faculty, Students, and Academic Developers
in Higher Education

Alison Cook-Sather, Melanie Bahti, and Anita Ntem

Elon University Center for Engaged Learning
Elon, North Carolina
www.CenterforEngagedLearning.org

©2019 by Alison Cook-Sather, Melanie Bahti, and Anita Ntem. This work is made available under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) license.

Excerpts from *Engaging Students as Partners* by Alison Cook-Sather, Cathy Bovill, and Peter Felten (2014) used with permission from John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Quoted material may not be reproduced without permission of the publisher.

Series editors: Jessie L. Moore and Peter Felten
Copyeditor and designer: Jennie Goforth

Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Cook-Sather, Alison | Bahti, Melanie | Ntem, Anita

Title: Pedagogical partnerships: a how-to guide for faculty, students, and academic developers in higher education / Alison Cook-Sather, Melanie Bahti, and Anita Ntem

Description: Elon, North Carolina : Elon University Center for Engaged Learning, [2019] | Series: Center for engaged learning open access book series | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019954150 | ISBN 978-1-951414-00-9 (PDF) | ISBN 978-1-951414-01-6 (pbk.) | DOI <https://doi.org/10.36284/celelon.oa1>

Subjects: LCSH: Professional learning communities | Teacher-student relationships | College teaching

2 HOW DO YOU KNOW WHAT KIND OF PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM IS RIGHT FOR YOUR CONTEXT, AND WHY MIGHT FACULTY AND STUDENTS WANT TO PARTICIPATE?

We noted in the introduction that there is a wide variety of approaches to and kinds of pedagogical partnership developing around the world, and we discussed in chapter 1 a range of reasons for developing partnership programs, explicit and implicit purposes of pedagogical partnership programs, and threshold concepts to pedagogical partnership. To give a sense of the range of approaches to pedagogical partnership and also to situate the type of program we focus on in this book, we provide some guiding questions that will help you decide what kind of program might be right for your context. We also include brief overviews of the five programs we mentioned in the introduction—the Student Partners Program at McMaster University in Canada; Co-create UVA at the University of Virginia in the United States; a unique approach to introducing partnership at Queensland University in Australia; a partnership program at Kaye Academic College of Education, Be'er Sheva, Israel; and an approach to curriculum co-creation at Victoria University of Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand. We discuss as well why faculty and students might want to participate in pedagogical partnership programs, and we provide an overview of how programs like SaLT have developed at other institutions.

What are the questions you might ask yourselves to decide what kind of partnership program is right for your context?

Healey and Healey (2018) propose that those embarking upon the process of developing partnerships between and among students, faculty, and staff consider four areas. We present these considerations here as questions and, depending on what is possible and what is non-negotiable in your context, you can choose to address them in the order that makes most sense to you.

Questions to Consider in Developing Pedagogical Partnership Projects and Programs	
What is the aim, scale, and time frame of the project or initiative?	What are the conceptual frameworks that will guide understandings and practices?
What are the emotions, attitudes, behaviors, and values of the participants in pedagogical partnership?	What is the meaning of partnership, or how will you define what it is that you hope and plan to do?

The kind of program and the approach you take to developing it will depend on how you answer these questions. For instance:

Aim, scale, and time frame of the project or initiative: The underlying vision or aim of the pedagogical partnership project, as well as the imagined scale and time frame, will help create parameters and clarify purposes for partnership work. Will the program feature only pedagogical partnerships focused on classroom-based practice and curricular design and redesign, like SaLT, or will it include a wider range of approaches, like Co-create UVA (Doktor et al. 2019) and the Student Partners Program at McMaster University (Marquis et al. 2016b; Marquis, Black, and Healey 2017)? Will it be a pilot or a program focused on a particular, time-bound classroom or institutional challenge, or will it provide a structure through which students in partnership with faculty,

staff, and administrators continually identify, research, and work to transform practices at the institution, such as the Students as Change Agents program at the University of Exeter in England (Dunne and Zandstra 2011; Dunne et al. 2014) or the Wabash-Provost Scholars Program at North Carolina A&T in the United States (Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten 2014)?

Conceptual framework: Different ways of theorizing partnership—through constructs or metaphors, for instance—can serve to remind participants what the goals of partnership are and guide both thinking and action (Cook-Sather 2017; Matthews, Cook-Sather, and Healey 2018; Matthews et al. 2018). For instance, theorizing pedagogical partnership as a structure that supports students and faculty in “processes of translation that lead to transformed perceptions of classroom engagement, transformed terms for naming pedagogical practices, and, more metaphorically, transformed selves” (Cook-Sather and Abbot 2016, 1) allows you to attend to the development of ways of perceiving, ways of naming, and ways of being that partnership can transform. If you think of engaging in pedagogical partnership as a process of crossing a threshold, as we discussed in chapter 1—of striving to redefine roles in a way that is, for many participants, troublesome, transformative, discursive, irreversible, and integrative (Meyer and Land 2006; Cook-Sather and Luz 2015; Marquis et al. 2016b; Werder, Thibou, and Kaufer 2012)—then you can focus on supporting participants in managing those challenges, based on what we know about how students (Land, Meyer, and Flanigan 2016) and faculty (Cook-Sather 2014a; King and Felten 2012) grapple with threshold concepts.


Meaning of partnership: Many program directors, faculty, and students embrace this definition of pedagogical partnership: “a collaborative, reciprocal process through which all participants have the opportunity to contribute equally, although not necessarily in the same ways, to curricular or pedagogical conceptualization, decision making, implementation, investigation, or analysis” (Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten 2014, 6-7). If partnership is “a way of doing things, rather than an outcome in itself” (Healey, Flint, and Harrington 2014, 7), it makes sense to emphasize “the relational and social elements of mutual learning”

(Matthews 2016, 1; 2017a). In what ways will these—or other—meanings of partnership guide the structures and practices that you as program director, faculty partner, or student partner develop?

Emotions, attitudes, behaviors, and values of partnership:

Among the attitudes and behaviors we argue are essential for successful pedagogical partnership are: bringing an open mind to everyone’s contribution; building trust; co-creating an approach to the collaboration; communicating; being present to and mindful of others; and advocating. We discuss these in detail in chapter 4. In terms of emotions, anyone who has undertaken pedagogical partnership work knows that it demands intense emotional as well as intellectual engagement. Felten (2017) has asserted that without attending to emotions, we cannot understand either the experiences of or outcomes for individuals in partnerships, or the interactions and relationships between individuals in partnerships (see also Hermsen et al. 2017). Confirming this assertion, one student partner noted how “emotionally vulnerable” student partners make themselves as they “give so much of themselves in their partnerships to make professors understand, to give professors perspective on their experience” (student partner quoted in Ntem and Cook-Sather 2018, 92). Faculty partners, too, experience a range of positive and negative emotions through partnership (Cook-Sather, Ntem, and Felten in preparation). How will you support the emotional work required to engage in partnership and help participants develop the attitudes, behaviors, and values associated with partnership? These are questions we return to in chapter 8.

We recommend spending time addressing these questions with those on your campus who are involved or hope to be involved in developing a pedagogical partnership program. Perhaps have differently positioned people—students, faculty, program directors, others—address the questions separately, and then discuss your responses as a group. Also, as we discuss in chapter 3, we recommend that you talk with others on campus who may already be engaged in partnership, in a wide variety of forms, and consider how to build on or complement those existing approaches. Values and commitments emerge through such dialogues, as Floyd Cheung, founding director of Smith College’s pedagogical partnership program, articulates:



Our student-faculty partnership program not only supports colleagues in improving their teaching but does so with an eye on enhancing inclusivity by foregrounding the perspectives of students from underrepresented backgrounds. Such students, we believe, can help professors see their curricula and teaching practices anew. In conjunction, these students are valued and empowered in ways that most had never imagined.


—Floyd Cheung, director,
Sherrerd Center for Teaching and Learning,
Smith College, United States
(personal communication)

What is the range of pedagogical partnership programs currently under development?

As indicated in the section above, every pedagogical partnership is context specific. The SaLT program is no exception, and in the **“History and Structure of the SaLT Program”** resource we provide the details of our context and the way the SaLT program is structured. Here we provide examples of programs that have developed in contexts that are quite different from that in which SaLT developed as well as from one another. We asked the directors or developers of pedagogical partnership programs at McMaster University in Canada, University of Virginia in the United States, University of Queensland in Australia, Kaye Academic College of Education in Be’er Sheva, Israel, and Victoria University of Wellington in Aotearoa New Zealand to describe the kind of institution in which they work, what their partnership program does, why they chose their particular structure over another, and what their program does not (yet) accomplish. Their detailed responses to our questions are included in the **“Five Stories of Developing Pedagogical Partnership Programs”** resource, presented in their own voices. Below are short summaries of each of their stories.

Story 1: Student Partners Program, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

Under the leadership of Beth Marquis, Associate Director (Research) at the Paul R. MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching, and her colleagues at McMaster University, the Student Partners Program (SPP) has developed several overlapping strands: supporting student-faculty co-inquiry on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) projects; engaging students as course design/delivery consultants who partner with faculty to design, re-design, or review courses faculty partners are teaching (modeled on the SaLT program); and connecting students with faculty and departments working on program-wide curriculum development or review. Furthermore, at this medium-sized (~30,000 students) medical doctoral, research-intensive university that consistently ranks among the top institutions in Canada for research intensity, student partnership has been integrated into a major fellowship program supported by the teaching and learning institute. In all cases, the aim is to develop collaborative partnerships wherein students make meaningful contributions to the intellectual development of the work they undertake. Cherie Woolmer, Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the MacPherson Institute, reflects on why the Student Partners Program might have developed and flourished so quickly:



McMaster's Student Partners Program has grown significantly over a relatively short period of time. A key part of this, I think, has been a conscious decision to allow partnerships to flourish in a variety of contexts that have been identified, and are therefore meaningful, to colleagues across the university community. Partnerships are enacted through the connections and relationships built between individuals working on shared projects and initiatives; this is where I see the values of partnership become real and transformative for people involved in the program. Scaling up such activities in a way that retains this space for individuals to connect through meaningful dialogue is not without its challenges. For

example, we have to be mindful of how we can ensure equity as demand grows; encourage participation of a wider group of faculty, staff and students; and influence institutional discourses about impact and success to ensure they capture the value and benefit of partnerships in meaningful ways. Facilitators in the MacPherson Institute play a key role in mediating these tensions to ensure that we continue to enact the principles on which the program was founded.

—Cherie Woolmer, Postdoctoral Research Fellow,
MacPherson Institute, McMaster University,
Canada (personal communication)

Story 2: Co-create UVA, University of Virginia, United States

Dorothe Bach, faculty co-creator, Center for Teaching Excellence, and Keaton Wadzinski and Jacob Hardin, student co-creators at ReinventED Lab, a student-led organization, developed the partnership program at the University of Virginia (UVA), a large public research institution with a strong commitment to undergraduate education. Co-create UVA was founded in 2014 as a partnership between ReinventED Lab and the Center for Teaching Excellence. The program consists of multiple initiatives, including six to eight paid undergraduate student teaching consultants, student-facilitated design thinking workshops, student-faculty luncheons at new faculty orientation, and course development grants for faculty and student teams. (See Doktor et al. 2019 for a full discussion.) One of the student co-creators reflects on the profound experience the development of Co-create UVA was for him:

“ Participating in Co-create UVA was the most profound experience during my entire time at the University of Virginia. Never before had I been asked to think about the way that I, or my peers, learned. The level of metacognitive thinking and agency that came with coordinating an effort like Co-create UVA gave me the confidence to pursue a career in education innovation. I worked

regularly with professors and faculty at the Center for Teaching Excellence as a program coordinator and as a consultant, giving real feedback to real assignments, syllabi, and courses that were being taught at the university. I began my work as a consultant thinking that professors would come to us for advice to indulge us as proactive students, but the genuine conversations that happened proved otherwise. I wish every student could feel what we felt as undergraduate consultants. We really made a difference.

— Jacob Hardin, student co-creator,
ReinventED Lab, University of Virginia,
United States (personal communication)

Story 3: National Australian Learning and Teaching Fellowship on Engaging Students as Partners, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

At the University of Queensland (UQ), a large (~50,000 students), comprehensive “Group of Eight” university in Australia and one of the oldest universities in the country, Kelly Matthews, Associate Professor, Curriculum, Institute for Teaching and Learning Innovation, was the recipient of a National Teaching Fellowship in 2015 to develop “Students as Partners: Reconceptualising the Role of Students in Curriculum Development.” The fellowship supported a range of activities through the Institute for Teaching and Learning Innovation at UQ, including establishing an Australian community of scholars with international ties; mapping students as partners activities across Australia; piloting student-academic partnership activities at UQ; developing guiding principles and case studies; and facilitating workshops and roundtables. Matthews reflects on her intentional choice to develop partnerships with students:

“What is unusual, at least in Australia, was my deliberate choice to engage with students on the fellowship activities as a central part of learning about *students as partners* through partnerships. Because I see my work as creating

community, I have a long-term view with some clear goals in mind . . . but lots of room to follow opportunities as they arise.

—Kelly Matthews, Associate Professor, Curriculum,
Institute for Teaching and Learning Innovation,
University of Queensland, Australia
(personal communication)

Story 4: Kaye Academic College of Education, Be'er Sheva, Israel

Kaye Academic College of Education is an institution of higher education in southern Israel for teacher education and the professional development of 5,000 kindergarten, elementary, and high school teachers each year who are preparing to serve the Jewish and Bedouin population of the Negev Desert. College President Lea Kozminsky, Partnership Coordinator Ruth Mansur, student partners, and twelve student-faculty pairs launched a pedagogical partnership program at the beginning of the 2018-2019 academic year. The goal is to include students' perspectives in their teacher education process, and thus to improve their current pedagogical practices and contribute to the conceptualization of learning and teaching as collaborative processes. Student partners Iska Naaman and Moria Propost describe their experiences of participating in this launch:

“The project is very important as I feel that I am the voice of the students, a partner in teaching, and can express my views and raise various points of view. In addition, the project develops my pedagogical professionalism. The connection between Doron (the lecturer) and myself is based on respect, listening, and sharing. He answers my questions very seriously, reveals to me his considerations regarding the course, both the pedagogical considerations and the teaching methods he uses.

— Iska Naaman, student,
Kaye Academic College, Israel (personal communication)

As a student, I have the opportunity to be exposed to new knowledge and understand the logic that lies behind Dini's (the lecturer) actions. My relationships with her are based on professionalism, respect, honesty, and open communication. Following my first meeting with her, I was surprised to see that she had already decided to implement what we had discussed and let the students become more active. I benefit from this project by gaining confidence as a future teacher, and also enriched my knowledge regarding implementing methods of teaching.

— Moria Propost, student,
Kaye Academic College, Israel (personal communication)

Story 5: Victoria University of Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand

Victoria University of Wellington is a mid-sized (~22,000 students) research-intensive university in Aotearoa New Zealand. Senior Lecturer Irina Elgort, Associate Professor Kathryn Sutherland, and student mentors and undergraduates Isabella Lenihan-Ikin and Ali Leota are leading the development of Ako in Action, following the introduction in 2017 of Te Rautaki Maruako, the university's new learning and teaching strategy. This new strategy embeds a bicultural approach to learning and teaching that recognizes the value of *akoranga*, translated in the strategy as "collective responsibility for learning." Students and staff work in partnership on the two key components that comprise Ako in Action: observations of teaching, and consultations on the design of learning and teaching. Kathryn Sutherland explains the values that inform their program's approach:

The values embedded in our learning and teaching strategy draw from Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) and represent New Zealand's, and our university's, commitment to partnership. These values lend themselves to the co-construction and co-design of reflective, collaborative, and dialogic teaching and learning experiences. By honouring the students' participation

through scholarships – rather than by paying them as employees – we allow them to retain their identities as students. We ask everyone participating in Ako in Action to think of themselves in partnership; it is not just “students as partners” but also “academics as partners” and “professional staff as partners” and “Centre for Academic Development staff as partners.”

—Kathryn Sutherland, Associate Professor,
Victoria University of Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand
(personal communication)


Why might faculty and students want to participate in a pedagogical partnership program?

The brief overviews above capture some sense of how five different partnership approaches were conceptualized in different institutional contexts. The wide range of reasons individual faculty and students might participate in such programs can shape the opportunities offered as well as the evolution of the program. In the section below, we describe the three main reasons faculty choose to participate in the SaLT program.

Why might faculty members want to participate?

In the SaLT program, faculty can choose to participate in three basic ways in the two program options (classroom-focused partnership and curriculum-focused partnership) for distinct but often related reasons. All incoming faculty members may choose to engage in a student-faculty partnership that is linked to a pedagogy seminar in exchange for a reduced teaching load in their first year at Bryn Mawr or Haverford College (see Cook-Sather 2016a). Through these partnerships, faculty and student partners often combine classroom- and curriculum-focused work, although their main focus tends to be pedagogical. The reason most faculty choose to participate in partnership at this point is to get oriented to a new cultural context. They may have completed their graduate work at research-focused institutions and feel unfamiliar with the norms and practices of liberal arts colleges. Or, they may have worked at a liberal arts college with a very different ethos and want to learn about student

culture at Bryn Mawr and Haverford. A student partner who worked with a faculty member who had switched institutions after a number of years of teaching explains how partnership can support such a transition between institutional cultures:



The first issue we addressed was that my faculty partner was not sure of what to expect with regards to interacting with students. For instance, she wondered if covering the guidelines for papers might imply that she didn't think the students were smart enough; she worried that their intelligence might be offended if she said a certain thing; etc. The way we worked through these issues was that I told her what I thought was "normal" for Haverford, and then she would ask the class during the week what they thought about the way she was interacting with them. This strategy of opening up the classroom for discussions was one that I felt was crucial in giving the students a say in what they wanted, while still allowing my faculty partner to make clear what she wanted from the class. (Wynkoop 2018, 2)

Once faculty have participated in a partnership in their first year, a proportion of them continue with their student partners, or with different student partners, either maintaining a focus on pedagogy (see, for example, Schlosser and Sweeney 2015) or switching to a curricular focus (see, for example, Charkoudian et al. 2015). The reason they choose this option is to deepen and extend their work, either with the same student partner or a different one (see chapter 8 for a discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of staying with the same pedagogical partner over time). Lou Charkoudian, assistant professor of chemistry at Haverford College, explains why she wanted to work in a second partnership and what the focus of the partnership was:




I came up for air in December of 2013 after finishing my first semester as an assistant professor of chemistry

at Haverford College. After carefully stacking 78 graded organic chemistry final exams on the top shelf of my office, I sat down to reflect on what had been a whirlwind experience. While I had participated in the Teaching and Learning Institute at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, and worked closely with a student consultant throughout the semester, this was the first time I was relaxed enough to ask myself some fundamental questions: *Did the overall structure of the course make sense? Did my forms of assessment align with my course objectives? What could I do to improve this class for future students?*

Indeed, I was already thinking ahead to the Fall 2014, when I would be teaching this class for the second time. I wanted to make informed improvements to the course while the material was fresh in my mind. I had gathered some useful information from the end-of-semester evaluations, but what I really craved was a dynamic discussion with my former students. After all, they were the ones who sat through each lecture and worked through each assignment. They held the insights that I needed to make mindful revisions to the course materials and pedagogical approaches. (Charkoudian et al. 2015, 1)

Finally, the third way that faculty can choose to participate in SaLT is by simply asking to work with a student partner, regardless of where the faculty member is in their career. Some faculty members request student partners every semester; others go several years after their initial participation in SaLT and then request a student partner. Still others spend most of their career at the colleges without working in a pedagogical partnership and then decide that they want or need to. This last option has become increasingly important as the socio-political climate in the United States has become more tense and divisive. A student partner describes the experience of working in partnership with an experienced faculty member:



The reason my partner wanted to be part of the SaLT program was clear. For the first time in his thirty plus year career, he was unsure about whether he was fit to teach his subject matter. He worried that his class was not inclusive enough and that he lacked an understanding of what his students were experiencing that was necessary to create a successful learning environment. My partner also wanted to know if there was a way that he could create a curriculum that would make him more “in touch” with his students. It was then and there that I realized that my partner had lost trust in himself. . . . He had been blindsided by an experience the previous semester to do with tensions in his class around race and had lost clarity on how to move forward. This was the root of everything. It was by learning this that I was able to further individualize everything I suggested: each discussion, idea, and approach. It was also by learning this that I was able to continue working to gain his trust, while also helping him regain his self-trust. Understanding the history and personal reasons someone has for joining a partnership can be incredibly beneficial to all components of a partnership but especially for building trust. (Brunson 2018, 2)

In the SaLT program, faculty need only contact Alison and let her know of their interest. Any faculty member who wishes to work in partnership focused on pedagogy or curriculum may do so, from those new to the college through those on the eve of retirement, from those on the tenure track to those visiting for a year or passing through as postdocs. With the exception of the faculty who participate in the seminar option during their first year, there is no financial compensation for faculty who participate in SaLT.

Why might students want to participate?

We frame our discussion of why students might want to participate in pedagogical partnership with a quote from Sophia Abbot, former student

partner in SaLT, and former fellow for collaborative programs through the Collaborative for Learning and Teaching at Trinity University, Texas, where she started a pedagogical partnership program:


“Students who participate in student-faculty pedagogical partnership programs gain access to the behind-the-scenes workings of the university, helping make the language and goals of professors more legible. Participating students also impact their faculty partners by increasing professors’ awareness and understanding of the diversity of perspectives and experiences present in their classrooms and helping them to see different ways of presenting ideas and information. Finally, partnerships between students and professors can result in more equitable and inclusive courses.

—Sophia Abbot, former student partner in SaLT,
fellow for collaborative programs at
Trinity University, United States (personal communication)

In SaLT, the student partner role is also voluntary, but it is compensated, and students seek out the role for a variety of reasons. Some are simply looking for a well-paying campus job and stumble upon it listed among other campus jobs, but most are seeking a meaningful form of engaging with the campus, faculty, and other students. Many student participants in SaLT are referred to, or first hear about, the program from friends who have participated in the past.

Some student partners are drawn to the role because they are seeking a greater sense of connection to professors and the academic community. Melanie heard about the SaLT program from a friend and chose to apply based on her desire to actively build relationships with faculty at Bryn Mawr. After taking most of her courses for two years on other campuses as part of a consortial major shared across several institutions, she felt disconnected from Bryn Mawr’s academic community. By becoming a student consultant, she built relationships with professors as people and made space for herself in the college’s academic life. Student partners

get to connect or reconnect academically with individual faculty and with departments by actively fostering relationships and maintaining a connection with the campus as a whole. The following quote is an example of what students write on their applications regarding why they want to join the SaLT program:




It would be a truly invaluable experience to work one-on-one with a professor, and expand my understanding of my academic experience. Being a Student Consultant would provide me with the opportunity to work closely with a faculty member to better understand the experiences of both students and educators in the classroom. As a student, I am seldom able to witness firsthand the thought process behind the way in which my professors structure their classes and its content. Normally, I only experience the classroom through my perspective. However, through my work as a Student Consultant, I would be able to engage in meaningful conversation with professors about their pedagogy, allowing me to reflect on the experiences I have had within the classroom. (Student partner, excerpt from application to SaLT program)

Anita and other student partners have indicated that moving beyond traditional hierarchical power structures in educational institutions may also motivate students to participate (Cook-Sather et al. 2019). Participating in student-faculty partnership shifts those power dynamics to more of a level field of collaboration by operating outside the hierarchies that limit faculty and student relationships. The student partner role also provides an opportunity to connect with faculty in a way that creates sincere relationships through deepened understanding of both roles. The student partner role emphasizes the value of student perspectives and elevates student expertise; this validation is attractive to students who have opinions about their educational experiences but limited opportunities or agency to voice and act on them.

Some students include this reasoning in their applications. One student wrote: “The experience [of being a student consultant] would provide a lot of insight into how classroom practices are created and how professors navigate classroom culture among college students.” This student specified that her interest in the role was informed by the importance to her of culturally responsive practice: “I am also interested in the ways classroom culture encompass understandings of diversity, inclusion, and positionality and how to support and have conversations that center and accommodate for these factors.”

Anita has noted that students see this role as offering a rare opportunity that empowers them with the right to analyze education from various angles. Student partners are able not only to be activists but also to ask constructively critical questions that assess pedagogical structures and the effects of those structures on the student experience. This role encourages students to be positive “agents of change” in their own education and to be advocates for their peers by improving the student experience at their institution. The opportunity to think about learning from a different angle gives students a new frame for their own courses and serves as useful preparation for those who plan to be teachers themselves. Some students participate as a way of preparing themselves to be future educators who have built confidence in advocating, affirming, and analyzing situations. We discuss these outcomes in detail in the [“Outcomes of Pedagogical Partnership Work”](#) resource. A recently graduated student consultant, Fatoumata Sylla, explains how participating in partnership changed her perceptions:



In my first few years of college, I had a relatively skewed perception of professors and my positionality in relation to them. My educational background had taught me that within the realm of academia and learning, there exists a clear hierarchy: the professor sits at the top of this hierarchy and students below them. This mindset, though conventional, serves as a roadblock to what I regard as effective learning/ mutually beneficial classroom dynamics. Through my work as a consultant in the Students as

Learners and Teachers (SaLT) program at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, I've had the opportunity to critically reflect on my past learning experiences and evaluate how they have impacted my conceptions of socially responsible teaching. Through a process of reflection on my own education and using my past experiences to inform and guide me through my SaLT partnerships, I've realized that there is one essential and key element that must be present in any meaningful teaching and learning interaction; this element is trust. Trust, between a student and a professor, allows for several channels of dialogue to be opened, therefore allowing for more enriched, holistic, and socially conscious educational engagement. (Sylla 2018, 1)

How have SaLT and programs like it expanded beyond student-faculty partnerships?

Pedagogical partnerships are often collaborations between students and faculty members, but SaLT and programs like it can also support partnerships between students and other members of educational institutions, such as librarians, instructional technologists, and administrators. The SaLT program itself grew out of a model in which teams of four—a faculty member, a student, a librarian, and an instructional technologist—worked together to revise a course (Cook-Sather 2001). In the current iterations, student partners work with faculty and librarians.

For instance, one faculty member in the natural sciences collaborated with her own student partner and a science librarian who was also working with a student partner to develop a lecture and group activity on research proposal preparation. The faculty member and her student partner brainstormed some active learning, group-based activities for students based on the faculty member's learning goals and the final research proposal. Then the faculty member brought these ideas to the librarian, and they drafted an active learning guide that students could fill out during the lecture and group activity. Working with her

student partner, the faculty member also developed an evaluation form for students to fill out during the last ten minutes of class that was collected and summarized by the student partner.

About this experience, the librarian explained that her student partner “was truly embedded in the process. She didn’t just observe the instruction session; she was part of the planning activities as well” (personal communication). Furthermore, the librarian’s student partner offered feedback on the session that the librarian conducted in the faculty member’s class. As the librarian explained: “Her comments were invaluable! The strength of [her] feedback lies in her blow by blow account of my presentation; in other words, she allowed me to see the layout, timing, and content of my presentation through someone else’s eyes.” The student partner who worked with the librarian explained that she “gained a greater sense of the scaffolding librarians had done (really laying out the research goals for students).” This not only gave the student partner insight into the work that librarians do but also affirmed her as a student scholar, which gave her a lot more insight on how the institution saw her as a potential scholar. As she put it: “it felt empowering to have my perspective be so valued by the librarians who in many ways had architected my academic experience.” Ferrell and Peach (2018) describe a similar librarian-student partnership at Berea College.

SaLT has also supported partnerships between students and administrators specifically to explore issues of equity and inclusion more broadly across their campus. On both Bryn Mawr’s and Haverford’s campuses, student partners have worked with the directors of access and disability services in a collaboration led by an experienced student partner, who organized and facilitated the partnerships and the regular meetings of student partners. This collaboration sparked more conversations on both campuses regarding accessibility in the classroom, and student partners in this collaboration worked to collect and document student and faculty experiences with access in the classroom. This work resulted in the creation of a living online resource for faculty and student partners to refer and contribute to.

A similar partnership developed at Ursinus College. Building on the success of their traditional faculty-student partnerships, the Teaching

and Learning Institute at Ursinus College used funds awarded to them from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations (through the Pennsylvania Consortium for the Liberal Arts) to create partnerships between student consultants and administrators or department chairs. As Diane Skorina, staff co-director of Ursinus' Teaching and Learning Institute, explained: "We reached out to administrators and chairs who we thought would most benefit from a student consultant's perspective on issues of inclusion and equity on campus, with the aim to bring student perspectives beyond the individual classroom to people who can be somewhat distanced from the student experience due to heavy administrative responsibilities" (personal communication). The most successful partnership, according to Skorina, was created between an experienced student consultant and the director of disability services. This yearlong partnership resulted in the development of a two-credit disability studies course that will be proposed to the faculty through Ursinus' academic council. The student, the director, and the Teaching and Learning Institute also brought a speaker to campus to give greater exposure to issues around inclusion and equity related to disability.

Where can you learn more about other colleges' and universities' approaches to developing pedagogical partnership programs?

The "[History and Structure of the SaLT Program](#)" resource details the context of the SaLT program and the way it is structured, and the "[How the SaLT Program Got Started](#)" resource narrates the evolution of the program. The "[Five Stories of Developing Pedagogical Partnership Programs](#)" resource offers greater detail about how partnership programs developed at McMaster University in Canada, University of Virginia in the United States, University of Queensland in Australia, Kaye Academic College of Education in Be'er Sheva, Israel, and Victoria University of Wellington in Aotearoa New Zealand. Finally, the "[Selected Reading Lists](#)" resource includes publications that describe other programs and projects.

YOUR TURN

Addressing key questions:

Who on your campus is interested and invested in the idea of partnership? Might you gather such individuals and groups together and address some or all of these questions:

What is the aim, scale, and time frame of the project or initiative?

What are the conceptual frameworks that will guide understandings and practices?

What are the emotions, attitudes, behaviors, and values of the participants in pedagogical partnership?

What is the meaning of partnership, or how will you define what it is that you hope and plan to do?

Looking to existing models:

Which aspects of the approaches taken at the following institutions might you want to build on or emulate?

- McMaster University in Canada
- University of Virginia in the United States
- University of Queensland in Australia
- Kaye Academic College of Education in Be'er Sheva, Israel
- Victoria University of Wellington in Aotearoa New Zealand

What other institutions might provide models for a pedagogical program that would work in your context?

Learning about student and faculty interests and goals:

What questions might you include in surveys or focus groups to learn why faculty and students might want to participate in a pedagogical partnership program?

Are there places on campus where partnership is already happening that you could connect to or build on?

What is missing on campus that partnership could help address?

Imagining:

How have SaLT and programs like it expanded beyond student-faculty partnerships?

In what other ways might existing partnership programs be further developed and expanded?