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

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

3 HOW CAN YOU SITUATE AND STRUCTURE THE PROGRAM, HOW DO YOU GET STARTED, AND HOW MIGHT YOU PLAN FOR SUSTAINABILITY?

Reflecting on the first of these questions, Susanna Throop, who was the second director of the Teaching and Learning Institute at Ursinus College following its founding by Meredith Goldsmith, explained that their partnership program is embedded within a larger office dedicated to advancing faculty development. She specifies that the program is "in Academic Affairs, but not in the Dean's Office, because we consider it very important for the program (and participation in it) to be separate from promotion and tenure decisions" (personal communication). About whom the program is designed to serve, she continues: "While the students are indeed learning from the experience of being partners, the program exists to support faculty, and the students are employees in the program. Their work is considered work; they are consultants for their faculty partners." The clarity with which the program at Ursinus is situated has likely contributed to its success. But not everyone makes the same choices, and there are many models of success.

In this chapter, we pose questions that help you explore how you might situate and structure a partnership program in your context, how you can get started with launching your program, and how might you plan for sustainability.

How can you situate and structure the program?

How you address this question will depend in part on how your institution functions, where the existing support structures are, and where the spaces exist that you might fill. Your answer will also depend on what you

imagine and can co-create. As with any new creation, how it is situated, what it is called, who participates, and what new structures you create will all influence, in predictable and unpredictable ways, what emerges.

How will a pedagogical partnership program fit into the larger institution?

Most partnership programs are situated in teaching and learning centers and are one among a number of options for academic development for faculty, staff, and students. SaLT is somewhat anomalous in that it is not located in a teaching and learning center (because neither Bryn Mawr College nor Haverford College has one); it is a free-standing program linked by association and commitment with the Education Program, because that is where Alison holds her faculty appointment, and functioning in collaboration with the Provost's Offices on both campuses, out of which comes much faculty support. As we detail later in this chapter, there are numerous ways to launch a partnership program, but it is first important to think about where it will be located and what other programs or centers it will be connected to.

Who will the program director report to?

This will depend on how the institution and the center or department is structured. Most program directors report to provosts, deans, or vice presidents, but it is essential that such reporting be kept separate from the confidential nature of the partnership work. If your program is located within a teaching and learning center and the program director of the pedagogical partnership program is one staff member among many, that person will likely report to the center director. If you have a more distributed model, such as the one at Bryn Mawr and Haverford, the program director may end up reporting directly to a dean or provost. Consider the implications of any reporting structure, how long directors of the pedagogical partnership program will stay in the role, and who will run the program when the director is on leave, departs, or retires.

Where should the pedagogical partnership be located?

It is important to understand how "partnership" is conceptualized beyond your campus and also how it is already conceptualized on your campus,

if at all, so that you can be intentional and even strategic about situating a student-faculty pedagogical partnership program. Similarly, try to get a sense of whether there are any territorial issues you need to consider and what kinds of collaborations might be possible.

Many programs start out by looking both outward and inward for models or approaches to working in pedagogical partnership, as we discuss in the "Steps in Launching Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource. For instance, a number of institutions have sent groups of faculty and administrators to visit campuses where pedagogical partnership programs are already in operation to meet and talk with various stakeholders, including students, faculty, program directors, deans, and provosts. These same institutions and others have done a kind of inventory of what already exists on their campuses. Kathryn Byrnes, Baldwin Program Director at the Center for Learning & Teaching at Bowdoin College, reflects on her initial steps toward developing a partnership program:

> This is my first year in this role and my plan is to gather students who already work in classes as learning assistants, teaching assistants, writing assistants, or graders to learn about their experiences with the "student partnership" models as they exist at Bowdoin. I think that a re-imagined preparation for students working with faculty and a more concrete and robust model of student partnerships could really benefit the learning and teaching happening at Bowdoin.
>
> —Kathryn Byrnes, Baldwin Program Director, Center for Learning & Teaching, Bowdoin College, United States (personal communication)

As Byrnes describes, it is worthwhile considering what other centers or programs on your own campus work closely or in collaboration with students, such as writing centers, peer-tutoring programs, or other mentoring programs. How do they conceptualize partnership? What are similarities and differences between what they are already doing, and

therefore what is more familiar on campus, and what you want to do, which will likely be unfamiliar and potentially confused with existing centers, programs, and roles?

What relationship will the program have to other programs, such as those focused on academic support for students?

As suggested above, there may already exist on many campuses roles such as writing fellow, peer mentor, teaching assistant, and others that might or might not be understood as forms of partnership between faculty and students and that might or might not provide models you want to emulate. It is important to learn about what this range of programs and roles is and how both are understood on your campus. With that kind of understanding, you can identify the ways in which you want to seek links with existing programs and ways in which you might want to distinguish what the pedagogical partnership program aims to do. Such connecting and distinguishing is both a conceptual undertaking and a communicative one: you need to be clear on your own aims, and you need to strive for productive communication with others on campus so that you do not inadvertently stray into their "territory" or give the impression that you are trying to replace them.

Here is one way in which such overlap and distinguishing can play out. Some offices on campus might already engage in practices, such as gathering midterm feedback, that could overlap with those a pedagogical partnership program might take up. Find out how they go about engaging in their practices, who is involved, etc. It may be that this practice, enacted in one way in one office and in a different way in your partnership program, can offer faculty useful choices, such as between whether a staff member from an office of academic support or a student from your pedagogical partnership program gathers feedback. But understanding and communicating about these differences is essential to contributing to, rather than disrupting, systems that are striving to be functional.

What is pedagogical partnership for faculty?

As our various points of discussion thus far suggest, becoming a faculty partner entails reframing faculty-student relationships, rethinking who has what kind of relevant knowledge regarding teaching and learning,

sharing power, and emerging from what Lee Shulman (2004) called "pedagogical solitude" (as concept or practice) to collaborate with students in classroom- and curriculum-ed work. Faculty partners need to be confident and receptive, courageous and humble, clear and communicative, and willing to engage in deep, ongoing reflection and dialogue. These processes are alternately—and sometimes simultaneously—exhausting and invigorating.

In addition to how faculty members think about themselves as pedagogical partners, they will want to consider how others view partnership. What will colleagues make of the kinds of shifts we describe above? How will such partnership be situated in relation to other roles faculty have on campus, such as participation in committee work? How will pedagogical partnership be perceived at moments of review for reappointment or promotion?

In chapter 1 we discussed assumptions, expectations, and threshold concepts regarding pedagogical partnership, and how you conceptualize the role of faculty partner is bound up with all of these. You may want to return to that discussion to revisit questions of trust and surveillance and how the frame of pedagogical partnership makes it different from formal review. You may want to consider the possible misconceptions of pedagogical partnership—as one-way mentoring of a student, as being shadowed by a student, as working with a TA, as abnegating power and responsibility or losing control. It is easy to slip back into these kinds of assumptions that permeate so much of higher education.

The bottom line is that pedagogical partnership is what faculty make of it. While the same is true for student partners, students take on the role of pedagogical partner for compensation or course credit and so have a certain kind of responsibility to invest. Furthermore, regardless of the ways in which partnership works to support a sharing of power, the reality of most institutions of higher education is that faculty are in positions of greater institutional power, and so it is they who must initiate and sustain the sharing of power if it is indeed going to be shared. Finally, it is the faculty member's classroom, curriculum, or pedagogy that is the focus of the kind of partnership we focus on in this book. The extent to which faculty open up the literal spaces of their classrooms, the

planning and revision spaces in relation to their curriculum, and what one student partner called their "pedagogical thinking space" (Ntem and Cook-Sather 2018, 87) will shape the extent to which the student partners can engage in the partnership.

Pedagogical partnerships are most successful if faculty adopt open and receptive attitudes such as this: "I've partnered with several students over the course of the past six years, and, in each partnership, the conversations I had with them were expansive, inspiring, and exciting. I often came away from my discussions with new ideas, or having revised some approach I had planned . . . [and this] felt like inspiration, arrived at together" and this: "I wanted constructive criticism to improve my teaching. So, I welcomed ALL comments to improve my pedagogical techniques" (Survey responses, Abbot and Cook-Sather, under review).

How do you ensure that pedagogical partnership is separate from faculty review and promotion?

While it is likely that the partnership program will collaborate in some ways with the offices of the provost, deans, vice-president for academic affairs, or other high-level administrative bodies on campus—around new faculty orientation, for instance—it is essential, as Susanna Throop, director of the Teaching and Learning Institute at Ursinus College, noted at the opening of this chapter, that the partnership program not be located in a program or office that oversees processes of review and reappointment. We agree strongly that the partnership program should be a space in which faculty and student partners can explore, experiment, be vulnerable, take risks, and otherwise engage in the messy, unpredictable, error-filled processes of learning and growing. If pedagogical partnership programs are linked to processes of review, reappointment, and promotion, faculty are less likely to engage in the ways described above.

In addition, we recommend that participation in the pedagogical partnership program be voluntary. Student partners may seek out this role as a campus job, as connected to a career aspiration or an informal but passionate interest, or as an area of intellectual as well as practical

exploration. It is equally important that faculty partners choose to participate in pedagogical partnership for their own personal and professional reasons.

Finally, we feel strongly that all participants in the program—program directors, faculty partners, and student partners—ensure that the work student and faculty partners do is confidential, also not to be connected with processes of review for reappointment or promotion unless faculty partners choose to reference or include it. Some faculty partners request letters from their student partners for their review processes. It must be their choice to do so, however, not an option for student partners or program directors to reveal any of what unfolds in pedagogical partnerships without participant permission (and unless there are real concerns or dangers: see chapter 8).

How might you conceptualize, name, and compensate student and faculty partners' work?

Part of developing a pedagogical partnership program is figuring out what is already in place and what you need to pay attention to as you proceed. Another part is imagining what you want to develop and attending to how the choices you make will inform what follows.

How can you ensure that students are involved from the beginning in conceptualizing and developing the pedagogical partnership program?

As we discuss in our description in the "How the SaLT Program Got Started" resource, students were involved from the beginning in conceptualizing the program, recommending who should participate in the launch, naming the program, and naming their role (see also Cook-Sather 2018a). To be consistent with the spirit of this work, it is important to consider how students can be at the table, alongside faculty and program directors, and perhaps others, from the beginning.

We have already mentioned other programs' approaches to including students as partners in conceptualizing and launching programs. We noted, for instance, that Co-create UVA was founded in 2014 as a partnership between student-led organization ReinventED Lab and the Center for Teaching Excellence at the University of Virginia. The Student

Partners Program at McMaster University was initially developed via a collaboration between staff and faculty at the MacPherson Institute and students in the Arts & Science program on campus. Another example of co-creation from the outset is the efforts of Kaye Academic College of Education in Be'er Sheva, Israel, where the faculty and administrative leaders of the initiative to launch a pedagogical partnership program are including student participants and collaborators from the beginning.

There are many ways to ensure that students are active partners from the outset. Conducting focus groups to gather a wide variety of perspectives, ensuring that there are positions for students on advisory or steering committees, and creating new roles, such as the postbaccalaureate fellow (see the "Creating Post-Bac Fellow Positions to Support the Development of Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource), are just a few possibilities. Without these intentional efforts, students might not be present at all or might be relegated to roles from which they might have input but do not have any real agency or influence as the program develops.

What options should you consider for compensating student partners?

Student partners in most pedagogical partnership programs are compensated in one of three ways. Meredith Goldsmith and Susanna Throop, who have both served as directors of Ursinus College's student-faculty pedagogical partnership program, suggest that program directors ask themselves this question: Do I consider the work that student partners are doing primarily labor or learning? It is, of course, both, but the point is to clarify for yourself how you situate partnerships within the structures of your institution. At Berea College, for instance, student labor positions are part of the academic program for accreditation purposes and are clearly aligned with academics in many cases, so such a question needs to be addressed differently from how it might be addressed in institutions where student work and student academic pursuits are more clearly distinguished.

One way to compensate student partners is through situating the position as a campus job with hourly pay. Like other jobs on campus, the

student partner position can be advertised through the student employment office. In the SaLT program, we generally use this approach, paying students for every hour they spend observing their faculty partners' class sessions, typing up their observation notes, meeting weekly with their faculty partners, working with their faculty partners and other students to develop or revise courses, and meeting weekly with Alison and other student partners. This approach may be of particular benefit to students who need to work:

> Instead of having lower-income undergraduates serve as personal maids for their peers, colleges could provide on-campus jobs that foster skill acquisition, contact with faculty and administrators, and opportunities for enrichment. Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, for example, host the Students as Learners and Teachers (SaLT) program, where students are paid to collaborate with faculty as "pedagogical" partners to enhance innovative teaching at the colleges. (Jack 2019, 177)

Ursinus, Reed, Oberlin, Lewis & Clark, and Lafayette Colleges and McMaster University have also taken this approach. As Susanna Throop, director of Ursinus College's partnership program, explains: "The move to hourly pay [for the work student partners do] was deliberate for us, and I think this is another way in which institutional culture gets reflected in such programs" (personal communication). At McMaster University, they had wanted to consider a stipend or scholarship model (instead of or in addition to pay), but it proved impossible within their institutional structures. This example illustrates once again that it is important to consider not only how institutional practices and policies might shape what is doable but also how your particular values and commitments intersect with those.

A second way to compensate student partners for their time is to situate the work in the academic arena. One option here is to offer a quarter- or half-credit course in which student partners enroll. Some program directors, such as Floyd Cheung at Smith College, have proposed new

courses to be approved by the appropriate faculty and administrative body (see the "Sample Student Partners Course Syllabus" resource for a version of the syllabus Alison designed for Floyd and the student partners at Smith College). Another option is to offer the possibility of an independent study supervised by the director of the partnership program, which may not need to go through a formal course approval process. In these cases, students not only do all of the work described above but also read selected texts and engage in reflective and analytical writing. Some student partners in the SaLT program have chosen the option of completing an independent study, either for a grade or for credit/no credit. Student partners at Smith College complete a 2-credit course taken for an S (Satisfactory) or U (Unsatisfactory) (a "normal" course at Smith carries 4 credits), and student partners at Berea College complete a quarter-credit course (which corresponds to a 1-credit course in a 4-credit system).

A third way to compensate student partners is through scholarships. Two benefits of this approach are that they shift the dynamic between student partners and program directors out of the employee/employer dynamic and that, in some institutions, such scholarships are exempt from taxes. Victoria University of Wellington in Aotearoa New Zealand is developing this model as they expand their approaches to pedagogical partnership. In their program, students' participation is honored through scholarships—rather than by paying them as employees—so that they retain their identities as students.

How student partners are compensated will situate them in relation to other student positions on campus, such as TAs, so it is worth considering, if you have the flexibility, which model makes most sense for students. Furthermore, some students might also have restrictions connected to paid work—some may need to spend their time in paid positions for financial reasons, but others (e.g., some students with disabilities on McMaster's campus) have restrictions about how many hours they can spend in paid positions while receiving particular grants to support their education. Colleagues on campuses such as McMaster's have tried to figure out ways to be flexible, while still ensuring equitable compensation.

Also, consider which approach might fit in with, complement, or be in tension with other student positions on campus. Many student partners spend a good deal of time explaining that they are not TAs. For some this may just be a matter of title, but for others it might be a matter of status or credential. For these reasons, whether you conceptualize student partners' work as labor or learning or both and what you call the pedagogical partnership program and the position of student and faculty partner within it (e.g., student consultant, student as change agent, student and faculty partners), as discussed below and in the "Choosing Names for Partnership Programs and Participants" resource, are questions that warrant deliberation.

An additional consideration regarding compensating student partners is that many students need to have predictable and reliable work hours. Some partnerships might take more time than others. Program directors need to ensure that student partners are guaranteed a minimum number of hours and that the program makes an effort to find more work for consultants if their partnerships are not reaching that minimum.

What options should you consider for compensating faculty partners?

The issue of how to compensate faculty for their participation raises a different set of questions from those to consider around student partner compensation. While faculty partners must consider how to integrate partnership into their work and their schedules, they do not, like student partners, take on an entirely new position when they participate in partnerships focused on classroom practice or curricular design and redesign. At Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, only new faculty who simultaneously participate in weekly seminars and pedagogical partnerships with students are compensated (with a reduced teaching load in their first year). Faculty who participate at other points in their careers are not compensated financially. Some institutions take up the stance that it is the responsibility of faculty members to develop their pedagogical and curricular approaches, and so additional compensation is inappropriate.

Other institutions compensate faculty for participating in pedagogical partnerships either through course development grants or other kinds of

fellowship schemes, and indeed, at Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, faculty can combine grants for curricular innovation, for instance, with collaboration with a student partner. At Berea College, faculty members participate in the program as members of a grant-funded community of practice that complements their work with their individual student partners. Faculty participants meet with each other once every three weeks or so for an hour to discuss their experiences in the program. Over the course of three semesters, faculty participants at Berea have unanimously found these faculty meetings very beneficial, deepening the developmental opportunities of the program, as this extensive set of responses, provided by Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens, the director of Berea's partnership program, with permission of the faculty, documents:

> "I really appreciated getting feedback from other faculty and hearing how they worked with their partners, and also hearing a bit more about how other people run their classes in general (how they get feedback on the effectiveness of their teaching, different kinds of activities to engage students, etc.). This was a good skill-sharing opportunity [especially for me as a new faculty member]."
>
> —Lex Lancaster, Art History

> "I enjoyed the sense of shared purpose and community in these meetings. As a veteran in partnership, I think that I probably didn't 'need' these meetings in the way that a novice participant would. Had I been new to the program, I would have found them a critical space for support and encouragement."
>
> —Anne Bruder, English

> "I had to miss about half the sessions [due to a conflict with department meetings]. Some content was nice and useful but the true benefit to me was the reminder that this is not just me and my partner. I liked that the meetings that I was able to attend forced me to engage in reflection that I would otherwise not have engaged in."
>
> —Volker Grzimek, Economics

"I loved attending the meetings because hearing others share made me dig in even deeper and commit even further. There were faculty partners who truly valued and listened to their student mentors [*this participant always referred to her partner as her "mentor"*], and from them I drew inspiration, taking away ideas of ways to communicate and work with my own mentor. There were other faculty who seemed to not trust or value their mentors as much as I did mine, and they were helpful, too, because they forced me into this entire interior monologue where I railed against their attitudes and defended the program against their skepticism. It's funny, but whenever you're forced into one of those imaginary arguments, in your head alone, because you're too polite to engage for real, it forces you to take a firmer stance. So thanks are due to the non-believers, right?"

—Amanda Peach, Library

"I attended all the faculty meetings. It was great to hear about others' experiences, and bounce ideas around. I got some excellent ideas that I'm going to try in my classroom. I also really enjoyed the activity where we had to stand in different places in the room based on our response to a question. I'm going to use that. Thanks for that!"

—Beth Feagan, General Education

"The meetings allowed us to see the spectrum of how the partnerships have developed between students and faculty. I was able to take away a better understanding of how feedback helps me in the classroom. I also was exposed to the possibility of having the students take a more active role in the direction the course could take. I will consider this in upcoming classes."

—Ric Hale, Accounting

While faculty participants at Berea receive a small stipend for a semester-long commitment, the intrinsic motivation that brings them to the

work constitutes the major incentive, and many are surprised at the end of the term to receive the stipend, despite the fact that the call for participation included it as a benefit of participation. The program at Berea is conceived as much as a formal component of the overarching faculty development program through their Center for Teaching and Learning as it is a program for offering growth opportunities for students.

As you are conceptualizing and planning for your program, discuss these questions explicitly: How can you ensure that students are involved from the beginning in conceptualizing and developing the pedagogical partnership program? What options should you consider for compensating student partners? What options should you consider for compensating faculty partners? Remember that whatever choice you make initially may set a precedent or might be framed as a pilot approach that will later be folded into existing structures or serve to create a new structure.

What might you call what you want to do?

Naming is a form of bringing into being. Van Manen, McClelland, and Plihal (2007) have written about this phenomenon in relation to naming in teacher-student relationships. In reflecting on the power of naming, they evoke the semiotic analyses of Derrida and Gusdorf: "What occurs when one gives a name? asks Derrida (1995). What does one give? One does not offer a thing. One delivers nothing. And yet something comes to be" (85). What "comes to be" is the perception of a presence and the recognition of a relationship that were not there previously. That is why, van Manen et al. (2007) contend, "Gusdorf (1965) suggested that 'to name is to call into existence' (p. 38)" (85).

What you call your program, practice, and participants will make a difference in how they are received and experienced. The name you choose should reflect your understanding of what you are doing and your commitment in doing it. Even the term "partnership" itself, or the phrase "students as partners," can be problematic for some (Cook-Sather et al. 2018). For instance, in Aotearoa New Zealand, the term "partnership" signals for many Māori the failed promise of a treaty between the British Crown and the indigenous population of the country, so while the principles that underlie partnership—respect, reciprocity, and shared

responsibility—resonate with Māori values in teaching and learning, the term "partnership" is vexed. (See Cook-Sather 2018c and Berryman, Bourke, and Cook-Sather, in preparation, for discussions of this.) Every country and context will have its own particular associations with terms and names.

We suggested in chapter 2 that, as you explore various approaches to and models of pedagogical partnership you might want to embrace and enact, you will want to ask yourself a variety of questions about what you understand partnership to mean: what the aim, scale, and time frame of the project or initiative might be; what conceptual framing of partnership you are assuming or explicitly adopting; and what the emotions, attitudes, behaviors, and values of the participants in pedagogical partnership are and could be (Healey and Healey 2018). Connected to these questions, you may also want to ask yourself: What language should we use to describe the partnership practices, program, and participants we want to support?

What language should you use to describe the partnership practices you want to support?

The language you use to describe partnership approaches can either affirm or undermine the ethic of reciprocity (Cook-Sather and Felten 2017a) that informs what we argue pedagogical partnership should be. Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten (2014, 136) caution: "Our often unconscious use of certain terms can send unintended but unfortunate messages to students and faculty alike about what the work is about." Think about the language you use from the very first conceptualization stages. For instance, consider this: You are working to articulate your reasons for wanting to start a pedagogical partnership program. As you list your reasons, "if you talk about 'giving students voice' and 'using' students as consultants, you may convey a message that students have voice only when . . . faculty bestow it upon them and that students are a means to an end" (Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten 2014, 136).

You might also want to consider the ableist assumptions behind some of the language of pedagogical partnership. As one former student partner in the SaLT program, Sasha Mathrani, noted in a personal communication: "I have realized that a lot of language about empowerment can be

ableist—being 'seen' or 'heard,' for example." Several faculty members quoted throughout this guide unintentionally use these metaphors that potentially reinforce racist and ableist assumptions about knowledge: not-knowing as darkness and blindness; knowledge as lightness, seeing. While phrases such as "following blindly" or "I was blind to it" are not intended to be derogatory, they nevertheless have this effect (see Vidali 2010).

Such often-unintentional uses of language can not only be harmful to people but can also undermine the goals of partnership, reinforcing existing hierarchical, unequal, and discriminatory dynamics. In contrast, phrases such as "seeking student perspectives on questions of teaching and learning" or "inviting students to consult on approaches to pedagogical practice" or "collaborating with students to design courses" still recognize that faculty have more power and agency than students in some arenas of higher education, since faculty are doing the seeking, the inviting, and often the grading, but at least the intention is to work in partnership (Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten 2014, 136). Likewise, it's important to be careful about the terms used to signal perception and knowledge.

What language and ways of naming programs, practices, and people in your institutions already exist, and what do they convey about those entities? In some cases, the language of student-faculty partnership "aligns with institutional mission and values, allowing you to frame your work as returning to the fundamental goals of your department or university" (Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten 2014, 20). In other cases, you might want to work intentionally against traditional norms and practices.

What do you want to capture and convey in the name of your program?

In the "History and Structure of the SaLT Program" resource and the "How the SaLT Program Got Started" resource we offer different versions of the story of how the SaLT program got its name—through a discussion among students, faculty, and administrators who launched the program. Each of the participants in that conversation brought a different identity, set of experiences, and perspective to the decision-making process. Each

had a different take on what would feel most appropriate to students who would take on the role and students who would experience student partners working with faculty. Each had a different take on how different names would or would not resonate on campus—strike the right balance between affirming values and practices already in place and expanding into a new practice. And each had a different sense of what might be comprehensible beyond campus—to prospective employers and others. In choosing "Students as Learners and Teachers," this group wanted to link two roles that are typically divided and distinguished in a way that would not seem too aggressive or threatening within the institution but would also signal to the wider world that we were challenging traditional roles. In the "Choosing Names for Partnership Programs and Participants" resource, we discuss other choices that programs have made.

What name should you choose for faculty and student partners? Just as it is important to consider how you name your program, it is important to consider what to call faculty and student partners. For reasons of hierarchy and power, as well as the nature of the positions that faculty members keep and that students take up through pedagogical partnership, student partners may need a different level of naming from their faculty partners.

In the SaLT program, faculty partners must certainly consider and cross the thresholds we discussed in chapter 1, but their basic position as faculty does not change. They are still the ones primarily and ultimately responsible for the pedagogical and curricular approaches they take, even if they have co-created those with student partners, and the focus of their partnerships is their own pedagogical and curricular approaches. The focus for student partners is also their faculty partners' pedagogical and curricular approaches, not their own practice as learners, although those are certainly affected by pedagogical partnership, as we discuss in the "Outcomes of Pedagogical Partnership Work" resource. Furthermore, they take on a new position, in addition to their role as student. These differences distinguish their participation in pedagogical partnership work from that of their faculty partners.

This is the case for virtually all the pedagogical partnership programs of which we are aware that focus on pedagogy and curriculum. If this is the way pedagogical partnership is likely to look in your context, then "faculty partner" may suffice as a name for the faculty role, or you may want to develop a name that references either the focus of the partnership work or the school identity. As Sophia Abbot, the creator and coordinator of the pedagogical partnership program at Trinity University, explains: "In Tigers as Partners (TaP), all participants are 'Tiger Partners' but students also hold the title of 'TaP student consultant' to legitimize their work for the external world" (personal communication).

Because of the shift in position and focus as well as role that student partners make in pedagogical partnership, we encourage you to consider how you want to conceptualize and name that shift. Language that informs such conceptualizations includes students as co-creators, consultants, partners, and change agents. All of these signal that students "become full participants in the design of teaching approaches, courses and curricula" (Bovill, Cook-Sather, and Felten 2011, 133), but they foreground different terms for that participation, some of which become names of programs and some of which become the terms used to define the student partner role.

What you choose to call student partners will depend on:

- what other positions exist for students from which you wish to distinguish this position (e.g., TA, peer mentor, research assistant);
- which ongoing debates regarding culture and practice within higher education are relevant to your context (e.g., students as consumers or customers);
- what the name will signal within your context (the intended—and unintended—effect the name might have for student partners themselves, for students who are not partners, and for faculty and staff within the culture of your institution); and
- what the name will signal beyond your context—how those outside that culture (e.g., prospective employers, readers of published works) will understand it.

As we did to decide on the name for student partners in the SaLT program, you might want to convene a group of people who are

interested in developing a pedagogical partnership program on your campus and discuss what name they all think would best capture the spirit of what you want to do, fit well with campus culture, and be comprehensible to relevant constituencies (e.g., prospective employers) beyond campus. The "Choosing Names for Partnership Programs and Participants" resource also includes a discussion of some of the most common names for students: student consultants, student partners, and students as change agents.

What might descriptions of partnership opportunities and positions include?

Colleges and universities that have developed pedagogical partnership programs include descriptions of the goals of the program and options for participation on their websites. For instance, Reed College's website explains: "Interested faculty members are paired with a student with whom they work to improve aspects of their teaching in one of their courses. This partnership provides an opportunity for faculty to reflect on their pedagogy, receive feedback from a student not in their course, and work collaboratively to meet teaching goals. Student consultants observe a class throughout a semester, take detailed notes during class, and meet weekly with their faculty partner to communicate their candid and confidential observations."

From such descriptions, faculty and students can infer what will be involved in participation. In the case of the SaLT program and others like it, it is only the student partner who assumes a newly defined institutional position, even as both student and faculty partners need to rethink their roles. Therefore, we include a description of the student partner position and application process for the SaLT program on our website. See the "Advertising Student Partner Positions" resource for a description of the SaLT student consultant position and the position description that Sophia Abbot developed for the Tigers as Partners program at Trinity University.

For programs such as SaLT, application processes are not intended to serve gatekeeping functions. Rather, they are intended to initiate the reflective process that is essential to the role of student partner. The

questions on the SaLT application—"Why do you want to be a Student Consultant?" and "What do you think would make you an effective Student Consultant?"—elicit thoughtful responses from applicants that initiate or deepen conscious, empathetic, helpfully critical awareness, which signals essential qualities for any student partner. (See the "SaLT Program Student Consultant Application Form" resource for full application form.) Students write things like this on their applications:

> I'm interested in becoming a Student Consultant because I'm intrigued by the idea of student as teacher and teacher as learner. I believe students should not be limited in their role as students. As active learners, students can be useful and support their teachers in order to help teachers see and think from different angles. Similarly, teachers are also students. Facing every new student, teachers make changes to their strategies along the way while learning more and more about their students. (Student partner, excerpt from application to SaLT program)

As you develop your pedagogical partnership program, consider how you want to conceptualize faculty and student positions, whether each needs a position description or just the student partner, and where to locate both program and position descriptions. Such position descriptions are related to but distinct from expanded descriptions and discussions of roles and responsibilities of student and faculty partners, which we detail in chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7.

How do you get your program started?

Different programs take different approaches to getting started. Consider what the goal of the partnership program is and from what level of the institution the impetus for it will come. As Takayama, Kaplan, and Cook-Sather (2017) argue in "Advancing Diversity and Inclusion through Strategic Multi-Level Leadership," there are many ways to develop initiatives, including engaging in university-wide leadership efforts (the macro level); interactions and initiatives within the school, college, or department (the meso level); and efforts by individual instructors and activists

(the micro level). In the "How the SaLT Program Got Started" resource and in the "History and Structure of the SaLT Program" resource, we offer the history of our own launch. In the "Steps in Launching Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource, we offer an overall set of steps you might consider taking that draws on examples of programs that were launched at a variety of other institutions. We recommend taking at least the following steps when preparing to launch a pedagogical partnership program:

1. Get a sense of what is happening elsewhere within and beyond your campus walls.
2. Create forums for dialogue and exploration among campus stakeholders.
3. Invite a pilot cohort of faculty and students.
4. Bring in people with experience to help guide the launch and to share experiences and advice.
5. Develop structures to support faculty and student participants.

In relation to these, you will want to consider scale and networks. "Scaling up" such work is as great a challenge as developing partnerships in the first place. There are various ways to think about scale, which we discuss in the section on sustainability below.

1. Get a sense of what is happening elsewhere within and beyond your campus walls

A first step to take is to try to get a sense of what is happening elsewhere within and beyond your campus walls in relation to partnership. If your institution has the resources, you might visit other campuses, but certainly contact people who have already undertaken the launch of pedagogical partnership programs. For instance, when Reed College was considering how to structure its soon-to-be created teaching and learning center, they sent a group of faculty and administrators to visit programs around the country. Every institution for which Alison has ended up serving as a consultant sent out preliminary inquiries regarding how to conceptualize and develop such a program.

2. Create forums for dialogue and exploration among campus stakeholders

A good way to foster such dialogue is to create a reading group or teaching circle so campus stakeholders can explore the concept and practices of pedagogical partnership before trying to put them into practice. Several campuses have used *Engaging Students as Partners in Learning and Teaching: A Guide for Faculty* (Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten 2014). After campus stakeholders have discussed ideas, you might have a book talk. This is the approach the Sherrerd Center for Teaching and Learning at Smith College in Massachusetts took.

3. Invite applications for a pilot cohort of faculty and students

We recommend starting small, inviting a hand-selected group of students and faculty who are established, confident, receptive, collaborative, and willing to experiment; they will increase the likelihood of success and model engagement for student and faculty colleagues. You may want to take into consideration how to include a range of perspectives and identities. For instance, Berea College's pilot included new as well as senior faculty members; faculty from different disciplinary divisions; faculty from historically underrepresented groups, etc.

4. Bring in people with experience to help guide the launch and to share experiences and advice

A fourth step is bringing people to campus who have expertise or experience in launching pedagogical partnership programs. Because such programs are still relatively unusual, students, faculty, and others might have trouble imagining what pedagogical partnership is, and hearing from people who have engaged in and facilitated partnership can both offer examples and reassure people. Florida Gulf Coast University and numerous other institutions have invited Alison to offer an orientation to faculty and student participants who were selected to launch their pilot pedagogical partnership programs, and both Alison and Melanie visited Muhlenberg College as they were considering developing a partnership program.

5. Develop structures to support faculty and student participants
A final step is developing structures to support faculty and student participants. Some such structures can be developed in advance, and others need to evolve in response to participant need and as appropriate for the institutional context. Alison designed a credit-bearing course for student partners and developed and facilitated a two-day summer institute for faculty participants at Smith College. (See the "Summer Institute for Faculty Participants in Pedagogical Partnership" resource). Berea College developed a quarter-credit course (equivalent to a 1-credit course elsewhere) that would combine learning about student-faculty partnerships, about teaching and learning, and about conducting observations and providing feedback. They also created a post-bac fellow position, which we discuss in the next section, "What [temporary] positions might you create to help launch or develop a partnership program?", in the "Creating Post-Bac Fellow Positions to Support the Development of Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource, and in the "Three Stages of Backward Design for Creating Post-Baccalaureate Pathways to Educational Development" resource.

See the "Steps in Launching Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource for more detail on how each of the institutions mentioned above developed its partnership program.

What [temporary] positions might you create to help launch or develop a partnership program?

In keeping with the spirit of collaboration, redefining of roles, and sharing responsibility, Alison has encouraged several institutions to create full-time, post-baccalaureate fellow positions for recent graduates who have experience as student partners and are uniquely positioned to support the launch and development of pedagogical partnership programs at their own or other institutions. Such positions are helpful to program directors who do not have the bandwidth to start or sustain the program entirely on their own and who need or want a partner who knows what this work is like from the inside. Some such positions have been created with funding from the Mellon Foundation; others have found support from other internal or external sources. Positions like that of post-bac

fellow are ideal for confident, independent, flexible, and adaptable recent graduates. Table 1 shows the range of institutions that have created such positions and their different goals in doing so.

We put the term "temporary" in brackets because some institutions may have funding to support only a year or two of such a position in order to get the pedagogical partnership program launched. In other contexts, while such a position might be inhabited by a particular person temporarily, it can become a permanent fixture of the university, as is the case at Trinity University. If the latter approach is your goal, a question to consider is: How might a post-bac fellow position be conceptualized as a permanent rotating position for continued leadership and input from recent graduates?

In keeping with our previous discussions of naming, it is worth considering what you call this position. Several institutions call it Post-baccalaureate Fellow since the term "fellow" is familiar in higher education. As we note below and discuss in detail in the "Creating Post-Bac Fellow Positions to Support the Development of Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource, both the experience of the person holding the position and the perceptions of others trying to make sense of it are enhanced by a clear definition of the responsibilities attached to such a position.

In the "Creating Post-Bac Fellow Positions to Support the Development of Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource, we offer detailed recommendations for how program directors and potential post-bac fellows can identify the qualities and qualifications recent graduates need to flourish in the role. We also outline challenges post-bac fellows may experience as they transition between roles or institutions, and we share guidance for supervisors who will be working closely with new colleagues in this unusual role. The recommendations in this resource are based on our own experiences and perspectives and are also informed by input from Sophia Abbot, post-bac fellow at Trinity University; Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens, director of the Center for Teaching and Learning and director of faculty development at Berea College; and Khadijah Seay, Andrew W. Mellon post-baccalaureate fellow for Student-Faculty Partnerships Program at Berea College.

Table 1. A range of institutions that have created post-bac fellow positions

Name of Institution	Trinity University	Berea College	T.A. Marryshow Community College	Massey University	University of Missouri	Lahore University
Kind of institution	Private, liberal arts college	Tuition-free, liberal arts work college	Open access community college	Large, public, pre-professional university	Public, land-grant research university	Private university
Location	San Antonio, Texas, United States	Berea, Kentucky, United States	Grenada, West Indies	Palmerston North, Aotearoa New Zealand	Columbia, Missouri, United States	Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
Purpose of position	To bring pedagogical partnerships into their existing Collaborative for Learning and Teaching	To support the further development of a partnership program that had been piloted the year before the post-bac fellow arrived	To help design and develop the first Educational Development Unit based on a strong pedagogical partnership approach	To expand upon pedagogical partnership work under way through informal and formal approaches	To help design and develop a pedagogical partnership program as part of the first teaching and learning center	To design a partnership program

As with all partnership work, much will depend on context, purpose, and participants. We encourage program directors to use the backwards design template Melanie created to help people think through what they are looking for in a possible post-bac fellow role and what will be needed to support such a person. We include that template in the "Three Stages of Backward Design for Creating Post-Baccalaureate Pathways to Educational Development" resource.

How do you plan for sustainability?

It can be difficult to think about sustainability when your initial focus is on how to introduce a program that might seem to challenge well-established premises and practices. All your attention may be trained on finding a place and way to get started. However, considering from the outset how the program might be sustained over time and considering how individual partners sustain their work within any given semester will make your program more likely to succeed in the short and the long term.

Sometimes it works well to establish institutional commitments that structure partnership into the institution from the conceptualization and early stages. Linking or situating the program in an established department or center, or gathering it under an umbrella that covers a wider set of programs with similar spirit, can situate—or limit—what you are trying to do with partnership. Other times the most effective way to move toward sustainability is to create enough interest and document enough positive outcomes that others in the community, particularly faculty and administrators, seek to integrate the program into the ongoing work of the institution.

One question for all participants—program directors, student partners, and faculty partners—to think about regarding sustainability is size. It is typically easier for those involved and more impressive for those observing if the program starts small and grows organically and responsively. Kelly Matthews of the University of Queensland, Australia, poses the question this way:

> How many partnerships can be effectively facilitated? This may seem an odd challenge to someone just starting a program, but a highly successful program might have a lot of faculty who want to be involved and then there are the issues of resources. Can the director effectively manage the program? Are there enough financial resources? One may need to develop a hierarchy—junior folks privileged over senior, those who have not done the program previously privileged over those who have. (personal communication)

Steve Volk, founding director of Oberlin College's pedagogical partnership program, takes a different angle, arguing that small numbers can create powerful outcomes (see the "Outcomes of Pedagogical Partnership Work" resource for his full discussion). The size of your program will depend on institutional and individual commitment, resources, and goals.

Linked to considerations such as size are, once again, origins and institutional structures. If your program launches with grant support, how will it be sustained after the grant is finished? It is important to begin planning early for such a transition. As you think about sustainability generally, how can you begin to structure in forward-thinking dimensions, especially those that might help institutions evolve to be more congruent with partnership practices. As Beth Marquis, Associate Director (Research) of the Paul R. MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching, noted: "We recently modified our project selection criteria, and included 'engaging new people in the program' and 'contributing to key departmental/institutional priorities' as desirable, but not required, features" (personal communication).

There are various ways to think about scale, including: involving a meaningful number of students and faculty in the work each year (i.e., impact measured by numbers of direct participants); having a small number of partnerships focus on informing the teaching and learning of a meaningful number of faculty and students (i.e., impact intentionally focused on a broader scale); or iteratively doing this work over multiple

years so that the results accrue over time (see also Cook-Sather 2020, in press).

There are also various considerations for differently positioned participants in pedagogical partnership programs. We discuss these below.

What can program directors do to work toward institutional sustainability?

At Bryn Mawr and Haverford, SaLT started out as a grant-funded pilot project designed to respond to the expressed interest of a handful of faculty members in making their classrooms more inclusive of and responsive to a diversity of students. Because of the benefits that accrued to these faculty members and with additional grant support, the program expanded to support a larger number of faculty focused on a wider range of issues (i.e., not only creating culturally responsive classrooms but also team teaching, integrating technology into teaching, and more). The positive feedback from participating faculty inspired the provosts at both Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges to dedicate the resources to support Alison in committing half of her time to running the SaLT program and associated pedagogy seminars and to offer the opportunity of participation in SaLT to every incoming, continuing faculty member at both colleges in exchange for a reduced teaching load in their first year. This is a significant institutional commitment. While not every incoming faculty member chooses or is able (for scheduling reasons) to participate, the institutional commitment sends a strong message to incoming faculty, who regularly comment on how impressed they are with the institutions' dedication to supporting teaching in this way.

Furthermore, since there is an operating budget for SaLT that supports student consultants in working with any faculty member at any point in their career, the program can be responsive to faculty and staff interests and accommodate new needs that arise. For instance, as we mentioned previously, under the leadership of an experienced student partner, the SaLT program piloted a collaboration with the access services offices on both Bryn Mawr's and Haverford's campuses to assist them in thinking about how to support the increasing diversity

of students who attend the colleges and their need for academic and other forms of support.

In the "Working toward Programmatic Sustainability" resource, we share approaches that program directors at various institutions have taken to planning for programmatic sustainability.

What can faculty partners do to work toward institutional sustainability?

Within their own institutions, faculty partners can share the outcomes of their pedagogical partnership work with faculty colleagues, department chairs, and administrators, thereby advocating for the continuation or expansion of the partnership program. At Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges, faculty enthusiasm and requests for additional opportunities to partner with students and be in dialogue with one another contributed to the expansion and institutionalization of SaLT and the inclusion of SaLT in grant proposals to outside funders.

Faculty partners who have participated in pedagogical partnership and subsequently assume leadership roles, such as chairs of departments, can play a critical role in advocating for other faculty members and ensuring that they have the opportunity to participate in pedagogical partnership. For instance, department chairs can encourage faculty who are on visiting appointments at a college to negotiate for the opportunity to work in a pedagogical partnership as part of their hiring package. It is in the institution's best interest to consider ways of supporting interim faculty members, who have extensive contact with students but little time to learn the culture and practices of the institution.

Extending their reach beyond their institutions, faculty can share their experiences with colleagues through writing about their partnership work. By doing so they contribute to both informal and scholarly conversations about pedagogical partnership work, helping that work not only be sustained but also to spread. Publishing reflective essays in venues such as *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education* and the *International Journal for Students as Partners* contributes to the growing conversation about pedagogical partnership within educational development, and publications in journals in faculty members' own fields (e.g.,

Lillehaugen et al. 2014; Rose and Taylor 2016) introduces the notion of partnership into other disciplines.

What can student partners do to work toward institutional sustainability?

Student partners can also play a vital role in sustaining and spreading the spirit and practices of pedagogical partnership work. They can encourage other students to apply and participate as student partners, they can share the powerful impact of their experience with those in positions such as dean, provost, president, and institutional researcher, and they can share their experiences with prospective students.

Students can also take the work of pedagogical partnership beyond the program. With the confidence and eloquence they develop through participating in pedagogical partnership, they can engage more actively in conferences in their own disciplines (see Mathrani 2018, for a discussion of this point), and they can participate in educational development conferences (see Ntem 2017). For instance, with support from an Arthur Vining Davis Foundations grant, four student partners in the SaLT program went to an annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, attended multiple sessions, then came back to Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges and designed a workshop for faculty members focused on developing more inclusive and responsive practices. During that workshop, faculty not only gathered new ideas and expanded upon existing strategies for their own classrooms and departments, they generated new ideas for extending and expanding pedagogical partnership options at the colleges.

Like faculty partners, student partners can contribute to wider conversations about and scholarship on pedagogical partnership. Presenting at conferences, serving as consultants for other institutions starting up pedagogical partnership programs, and writing reflective essays, scholarly articles, and this book are all examples of student partners taking an active role in sustaining and spreading practices, understandings, and possibilities of pedagogical partnership work.

What helps participants sustain this work as it is unfolding?

For the program directors, faculty partners, and student partners involved in pedagogical partnership work, it is important to think about sustainability as the work is unfolding. We explore in detail in chapter 4 ways of facilitating and supporting partnership, and as we suggest in that chapter how you conceptualize facilitation of pedagogical partnership—how you frame it, why affirmation is so important, and what some useful approaches to conceptualizing feedback might be—will contribute not only to the support but also to the sustaining of the work. Similarly, being clear on and discussing who has what roles and responsibilities in pedagogical partnership can help lay a strong foundation to begin the partnership work as well as help make it sustainable over time. Finally, keeping a focus of partnership work on developing relationships built on listening and deep engagement can help energize participants and ensure ongoing communication.

There are some particular strategies that program directors can use to support faculty and student partners and thereby contribute to sustainability as partnerships are unfolding. As we discuss in detail in chapter 5, program directors can make clear that they are available for consultation, provide guidelines and feedback mechanisms, and make space in the regular meetings of student partners to explore challenging issues as well as celebrate accomplishments. Student partners can also encourage, support, and affirm one another in these meetings and in confidential discussions outside the meetings. Other student partners are the only ones who will understand the work and the only ones with whom program directors can speak, since pedagogical partnership work is confidential.

The final way to think about sustainability is to think about approaching pedagogical partnership work at every stage with clarity and candor. As we discuss in chapter 8, it is important to address head on the logistical and emotional challenges pedagogical partnership can present. Taking an organized but flexible attitude and approach to scheduling, discussing the complexities that can emerge regarding the diversity of identities and roles of participants, and supporting all participants in managing

the emotional labor involved in partnership can go a long way toward ensuring sustainability for everyone involved.

YOUR TURN

Thinking about structure:

Might you convene groups of campus stakeholders, including students, and ask them:

How will a pedagogical partnership program fit into the larger institution (e.g., in relation to reporting, other programs, and promotion and tenure)?

Where should it be located?

How should you compensate student and faculty partners' work?

Deciding on terminology:

What you call your program and its participants matters, and it will depend on context. What kinds of campus-wide and more focused discussions might you have in which you invite stakeholders to discuss what you might call what you want to do?

Considering the names of other programs and partners, which terms resonate for you and your campus, which do not, and why?

Planning to launch and to sustain partnership programs:

Given the advice in this chapter, in the "How the SaLT Program Got Started" resource, and the "Steps in Launching Pedagogical Partnership Programs" resource, what set of steps can you generate for yourself for planning a pilot program?

Are there [temporary] positions, such as post-baccalaureate fellow, that you might create to help launch, develop, or sustain a partnership program?

What are the key considerations regarding sustainability in your context?