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**Abstract**

Over the last decade significant work has been undertaken to involve students more fully in the assurance and enhancement of teaching and learning quality in higher education. The role of students has developed over time from evaluator to partner, foregrounding the role of the student voice in higher education at course, institution and national level in the UK, across Europe, the US and Australia. The engagement of students has the potential to enrich the learning experience for all students but can also raise questions and challenges for staff and students to fully live out the principles of engagement. This can include how students are supported to fulfil their critical role in quality, how inclusive mechanisms are for engaging the whole student body in assurance and enhancement and how institutions can better respond to the outcomes of student participation in quality. This chapter will provide an overview of the current research and experience of student engagement for the purposes of quality and make recommendations for the better embedding of students in quality processes in the future. It will address the role of student representation in quality at course, university and sector level; student engagement in course design, approval and cycle review, and students as teaching and learning consultants and pedagogic co-researchers.

**Introduction**

When writing about the role of students in the assuring of academic quality in universities in the early 1990s, Stringer and Finlay (1993) acknowledged that, while student course evaluation was well-established in North America, the concept was at that time relatively unfamiliar in the UK. Over two decades later, not only are students central to sector and institutional quality systems but the scope of their role in quality has evolved from evaluator to one of active involvement in institutional quality processes. In 2016, the new Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) *UK Quality Code of Practice for Higher Education* set the expectation that ‘Higher education providers take deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively as partners in the assurance and enhancement of their educational experience’ (QAA, 2016, p. 6). This commitment to student involvement in UK quality processes reflects wider international trends. For example, both the recent *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (2015), within which the UK *Quality Code* operates, and the Australian Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency’s *Higher Education Standards Framework* (2015) similarly anticipate that universities will involve students in the enhancement of their learning experience as well as the governance and decision-making of their institutions.

The engagement of students in quality processes has the potential to enrich their learning experience and the quality of teaching but can also raise questions and challenges for institutions, staff and students to fully live out the principles of engagement and partnership. This can include how students are supported to fulfil their critical role in quality, how institutions can better respond to the outcomes of student participation in quality processes and how inclusive mechanisms are for involving a diverse student body in quality decisions. These issues apply equally to the assuring of the academic standards of universities as to the emerging role of students in enhancement mechanisms including students as co-creators of curriculum design, as collaborators in the professional development of their teachers, as co-researchers in pedagogic research and as partners in institutional strategic decision-making. This chapter provides an overview of recent approaches to student involvement in assurance and enhancement and addresses some of the assumptions and challenges underpinning the successful engagement of students in quality. It will conclude by making recommendations for the better embedding of students in quality processes in the future.

**Different levels of student involvement in quality**

In the context of school-level education, Fielding (2001) identified that while involving students in evaluating and shaping their learning experience was gaining ground in educational settings, the definition of what that involvement constituted remained unclear. He proposed a hierarchical model for characterising student participation in institutional review and improvement. This model includes four levels of involvement that are applicable to the different roles of students in higher education quality:

* *Students as a data source*: individuals and institutions collate and make decisions on information about students related to their demographic background, prior learning and performance as well as their attitudes towards learning, attendance and accessing of learning resources with the aim to inform teaching.
* *Students as active respondents*: individuals and institutions engage with students in discussion about their experience to enhance primarily teaching or institutional practice but also influence student learning and engagement with the institution.
* *Students as co-researchers*: individuals, institutions and students work in partnership to deepen their mutual understanding of the student experience and to identify what students can do to contribute to the improvement of the institution.
* *Students as researchers*: students initiate actions to address issues in their learning or institutional experience and the role of the teacher and institution is to learn and respond to the needs of students.

This hierarchy configures student involvement as ranging from a passive feedback role that is teacher-centric to active participation and leadership that is student-centric. It characterises the different modes of engagement in quality for enhancement, assurance and institutional governance. For Fielding, while the ‘students as researchers’ mode is highly desirable for educational transformation, teachers, students and institutions may choose to adopt different modes of involvement at different times depending on the purpose and context.

Higher education institutions utilise a range of mechanisms to solicit information and student feedback on their experience including module, course or programme evaluations. They can also participate in large-scale sector-level surveys such as the UK National Student Survey (NSS) completed by final-year undergraduates or the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) at higher degree level. Targeted surveys such as the global Student Pulse and International Student Barometer go beyond capturing the student retrospective evaluation of their university experience to provide institutions with an understanding of the needs and expectations of students and their decision-making both as learners and selective consumers before, during and after their degree. Despite an increased openness to soliciting student feedback, the introduction of tuition fees in the UK in the late 1990s and the focus of NSS on student satisfaction as an influencer on university practice and driver for university league tables, are seen as indicative of a deliberate marketisation of higher education that is detrimental to the learner identity and academic performance of undergraduate students (Bunce, Baird & Jones, 2017). The development over the last fifteen years of alternative large-scale surveys such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in the US, the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE) and the United Kingdom Engagement Survey (UKES) all aim instead at evaluating the time and effort students invest in meaningful learning and their perceptions of the quality of their learning experience. The engagement orientation of these survey tools potentially restores a conception of the learning and teaching relationship as less transactional and more concerned with a mutual contribution of students, their teachers and their institutions to the academic quality of provision. This aligns with the more active levels of involvement defined in Fielding’s model, where students operate as partners, co-creators, experts and drivers for change within the university.

The idea of ‘students as partners’ and active ‘change agents’ within universities has been taken up by a range of stakeholders to advocate further for a different type of relationship between institutions and their students. In the UK, the National Union of Students’ (NUS) *A Manifesto for Partnership* (2009) upheld partnership as a counter to consumerist rhetoric on the basis that,

Conceiving of students as consumers is a thoroughly impoverished way of describing the relationship between students and their institutions, which ought to be one of mutual trust, care and respect. The power held by consumers is not the power to intervene and change things, it is the power to ‘like’ or to ‘recommend to a friend’, or to make a choice between five identical glossy marketing brochures.

(NUS, 2009, p. 5)

The move towards partnership, they argue, should not be based on small-scale student engagement interventions but represent a whole institution approach because ‘partnership is an ethos rather than an activity’ (p. 8). This promotion of student engagement in the quality of their educational experience as transformational for students and universities is similarly articulated in a stimulus paper published in 2010 by the UK Quality Assurance Agency on the Students as Change Agents initiative at the University of Exeter. It argues that narrow definitions of the student role in improving the quality of their experience, concerned only with seeking, listening and responding to the student voice, could lead to some benefits through greater institutional awareness of student need but also reinforce the role of students as discriminating customers. They suggest that:

The Change Agents initiative is about far more than listening to the student voice, with the associated risks of promoting a customer-oriented approach to education. It is a powerful example of the connection between research and education and the way in which this influences changes in practice and provision in students’ own learning environments.

(Kay, Dunne & Hutchinson, 2010, p. 7)

Far from simply embedding formal student representational and feedback mechanisms into the traditional governance and decision-making of UK universities, staff–student partnership has become a global agenda that ‘might be understood – and embraced – as a movement’ (Cook-Sather, Bovill & Felten, 2014, p. xxiii).

**‘Experts by experience’: The scope of the student quality role in higher education**

Student involvement in the quality of higher education has been identified not only as performing on different levels but also across a range of areas of activity. This is demonstrated through:

* student engagement in high-impact learning activities that are likely to lead to improved learning outcomes and potentially could include the role of students as not just the recipients but also the active creators of knowledge;
* student engagement in curriculum design including determining the content, teaching, learning and assessment practices as pedagogic consultants and developers;
* student engagement in the building of communities within the university including their role in governance and influencing institutional decision-making (Ashwin & McVitty, 2015; Healey, Flint & Harrington, 2014).

The active student contribution to the achievement of individual quality learning outcomes is first and foremost the basis for quality education. The growth of participatory research and evaluative approaches that recognise the role of service users as ‘experts by experience’ in sectors including health and social care, however, has informed an enhanced understanding of the potential role and value of the student voice in educational settings (Skilton, 2011; Seale, 2009). As part of the university community, student participation in higher education governance and representation has a long-standing history and status in European higher education (Klemenčič, 2012). Newer roles for students in higher education quality assurance and enhancement beyond advocacy and representational activity now include involvement in curriculum design (Bovill, Cook-Sather & Felten, 2011), programme review and development (Case, Ugwudike, Haines, Harris & Owen, 2014), pedagogic evaluation (Bovill *et al*., 2010), strategy development (Healey, Mason O’Connor & Broadfoot 2010) and academic development of teaching staff (Dickerson, Jarvis & Stockwell, 2016). In these roles students are seen to ‘have access to experiences and information that can improve the quality and accountability of decision-making’ (Lizzio & Wilson, 2009, p. 70). Involvement in these enhancement processes also ‘catalyzes a revision of students’ relationships to their teachers and their responsibilities within their learning’ (Cook-Sather & Alter, 2011, p. 37). Yet implementing this step-change in understanding the role of students in assuring and improving the quality of their educational experience is recognised to be challenging for both institutions and individual staff.

Educators may deplore the perceived rise of a consumerist and instrumental approach to university ‘where students seek to “have a degree” rather than “be learners”’ (Molesworth, Nixon & Scullion, 2009, p. 278) and encourage increased involvement of students in decisions about the student experience as a counter to this rhetoric. Yet changing existing assumptions and expectations about the appropriate roles and responsibilities of teachers and students has been described as a ‘threshold concept’ in quality enhancement. Increased student responsibility for the quality of their university experience necessarily overturns prior beliefs about the dynamics of staff–student identities and behaviours in ways that can be conceptually ‘troublesome’ (Cook-Sather & Luz, 2015). Seale (2016) notes that this move from individual to institutional initiatives changes the conception of the role of students and changes the way we evaluate the success of such activities. What this can mean is that while staff, student unions and students might advocate for the transformation of student roles in the assurance and enhancement of academic institutions, Carey (2018) warns that in institutionally endorsed activity ‘student engagement is confined to what the institution allows’ and that there is also, therefore, ‘a need to address what activities the university demands, expects or permits’ (p. 13).

Despite an underpinning self-empowerment agenda in the student-as-partners movement, institutions can still retain the power to define the ultimate extent of student influence over institutional mission, strategy and practices. Carey proposes a nested hierarchy of institutional student engagement actions that both foster and limit the different levels of student involvement as defined above:

* *Institution as reactive*: the institution collects and analyses student behaviour and satisfaction to enhance institutional objectives. Student involvement is limited to evaluating their experiences or indicating their preferences.
* *Institution as responsive*: the institution consults with students as experts of their learning experience and invites their participation in university decision-making. While the relationship between students and the institution is based on dialogue and recognition of specific forms of expertise, it is demarcated by institutional needs and priorities.
* *Institution as collaborative*: the institution recognises students as active agents in the functioning of the university and students are encouraged to define and contribute to the evidence that is used and the actions that are taken to effect change in the institution.
* *Institution as progressive*: the institutional role is to respond to student-led calls to action with spaces created within decision-making processes for students to initiate, define and monitor change (Carey, 2018, p. 13).

The mutual responsibility of institutions, students’ unions and students to fulfil the principles of student involvement is a fundamental caveat for assumptions about the straightforward implementation of student engagement in quality. For example, a case study of student engagement in the process of programme review and enhancement at Swansea University determined that

full student ‘partnership’ in core departmental decisions and actions is perhaps something of a fallacy. Departments have to operate within the boundaries of the institutional mandate. In practical terms, institutional requirements and procedures may assume priority over student requirement.

(Case *et al*., 2014, p. 14)

This conclusion reflects the difficulties of realising student involvement in quality in a piecemeal way, at individual teacher or department level, without also revisiting, in partnership with students, the wider sector and institutionally defined requirements and quality mechanisms. Van der Velden (2012) suggests that institutional organisational culture is a significant factor in determining the extent to which an institution involves students in quality decision-making. Her analysis draws on a typology of organisational cultures developed by McNay in the mid-1990s. Within this typology, a ‘collegium’ organisational culture is one founded on academic freedom and autonomy with an emphasis on direct student participation at the department and teacher level. In contrast a ‘bureaucracy’ organisational culture operates through committee structures with student voice articulated through formal representation and surveys. A ‘corporation’ organisational culture is led by a strong executive with limited opportunities for methods of consensus-building or input from students. Within this culture, student representation has the role of monitoring and holding the institution accountable for the quality of the student experience. Finally, an ‘enterprise’ organisational culture is one in which decision-making is strategic and tactical to meet the needs of both students as clients and the higher education market.

Van der Velden suggests that while bureaucratic and corporate institutions can respond rapidly to the demands of external priorities, their

centralising cultures locate the power of decision-making away from the classroom experience to the committee or senior management level, where detailed or individual student concerns cannot be considered […] it seems much more effective to work with one’s Students Union in partnership (collegium), or as a fellow stakeholder (enterprise), either directly or through localised, empowered representation. The collegium and the enterprise culture allow for a more direct involvement with students.

(2012, p. 245)

Implementing student engagement in quality, therefore, is dependent on, or requires a commitment also to whole-institution transformation of organisational culture. The challenge remains that a devolved and agile culture that enables individual students to have direct contact with quality processes also conversely requires a transformation of the external drivers and systemic structures to facilitate genuine collaborative or progressive engagement with student voices at all levels of the institution and sector.

A further challenge to successful involvement of students in the quality of higher education is the way in which student engagement has been largely defined as performative and behavioural. Milburn-Shaw and Walker (2016) note that student engagement, as it is articulated in quality mechanisms such as the NSSE and AUSSE, focuses on measuring the quality of student behaviours such as purposeful engagement, participation and attendance as a means for achieving high-quality learning outcomes. They argue that the ‘priority afforded to behavioural engagement has the negative outcome of promoting passive compliance; (p. 5). Macfarlane (2015) goes further, suggesting that universities increasingly require evidence that students are giving

a *bodily performance* by attending class, or virtually via online forums; a *dispositional performance* through a willingness to participate in learning processes such as group work and class discussion; and an *emotional performance* in respect to social values and practices demanding compliance and confession.

(p. 339, original emphasis)

These performances, he argues are having ‘a negative effect on the rights of students as autonomous adults who have entered a voluntary phase of education’ (p. 339). While the idea of students-as-partners continues to be extolled, these coexistent expectations about the performative nature of desirable student engagement in learning are increasingly informing the definitions of what constitutes high-quality pedagogy as well as contributing to a reprioritising of the role of students as a data source for measures of quality.

The potential to track students’ physical and digital footprint as they enter and exit lecture theatres, libraries and virtual learning environments and combine it with information on their prior qualifications, current assessment grades and demographic data is increasingly promoted as a vital tool in a university’s approach to quality assurance and enhancement. For example, it is suggested that these learning analytics can provide individual teachers with information about the progress of their students or the effectiveness of their teaching and learning activities. Institutions can also use the data as a diagnostic tool on a systematic level to identify students at risk of withdrawal or failure for targeted interventions as well as to provide institutional evidence of the quality of the provision to external agencies (Sclater, Peasgood & Mullan, 2016). Similarly the concept of learning gain, or the measure of the difference of student performance at two different points in time, is identified as another way in which large-volume student data can be used to enhance teaching and learning, identify best practice and increase institutional accountability. While learning gain is seen as a potential contributor to the quality of higher education, it is also recognised that it will not be the only measure (McGrath, Guerin, Harte, Frearson & Manville, 2015). Nevertheless, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) has invested in a large-scale ongoing learning gain programme that is piloting a series of thirteen longitudinal projects to test and evaluate the validity of different ways to measure student learning gain (HEFCE, 2016).

This increased focus on big data to evidence quality, while it re-establishes students as a data source within Fielding’s typology, is seen as decisive in determining the future shape of higher education internationally at the same time as student partnership is also recognised as an important external and institutional driver. There is a potential for robust measures of learning gain to become part of the metrics alongside NSS data for the new Teaching Excellence Framework in England. The danger is that not only does this underscore the role of students as data sources for quality judgements about higher education but also that, with high-stakes institutional reputation on the line, even opportunities for more active student involvement in quality may be concerned with institutional compliance and competition rather than empowerment of students (Taylor and Robinson, 2009). In the UK, the NUS called for a national boycott of the NSS in 2016 in protest at its use as a key metric in the Teaching Excellence Framework and the proposal to link student feedback to the institutional right to increase tuition fees. This highlights the tensions for students as drivers of quality. On this issue the Vice Provost of University College London, Professor Antony Smith argues that

There is a risk that it is going to drive a wedge between students and their institutions. They will feel their feedback isn’t being used to improve their experience, but as a vehicle to put their fees up.”

(Quoted in Fazackerley, 2016)

This tension highlights the sometimes unacknowledged complexities of expertise, authority, legitimacy and how student involvement will be used institutionally and at sector level in ways that complicate the straightforward commitment to involve students in quality assurance and enhancement mechanisms.

**Recognising and addressing the challenges of student involvement in quality**

As students have been involved progressively as evaluators, discussants, consultants or change agents within their programmes, institutions and national sectors, the difficulties of fostering their successful contribution and ensuring the impact this has on their own and others’ experience is increasingly recognised. The challenges include a lack of clarity about the rationale and purpose of student involvement in quality processes, the potentially complicated power relationships between students, staff and institutional structures and the inclusiveness of mechanisms for involving all students in quality. Addressing these challenges remains an imperative to ensure that student involvement in quality is more than tokenistic but leads to confidence in the student experience in higher education especially in the context of the changing quality needs of a massified and diversified sector.

As the claims for the value of student involvement have expanded, Ashwin and McVitty (2015) point to vagueness in defining what engagement constitutes and a problematic lack of criticality about the concept. Students are involved in quality processes at all levels. For example in the UK, at the sector level, external quality assurance processes require the participation of students as peer reviewers as part of QAA Higher Education Review in England and Wales, Enhancement Led Institutional Review in Scotland and the Teaching Excellence Framework. Institutions also need to demonstrate, as part of these reviews, the role that students play in institutional-level quality assurance and enhancement processes. The NUS represents the collective voice of students, campaigns and lobbies on issues relevant to the student experience and supports the representation of students at national and institutional level. Within institutions, local students’ unions, representational systems within university committees such as quality and standards committee, academic board, teaching and learning committee as well as course representation and participation of students in course design, validation, annual monitoring and periodic review all embed the student voice in local quality processes. At the individual level, student–staff relationships through teaching and assessment provide information on the quality of the learning experience and identify areas to staff for reflection and improvement. The first challenge therefore is to recognise that the motivations for engagement at the macro, meso and micro levels are informed by different ideologies and can variously function for the purposes of accountability or enhancement and compliance or transformation as well as positioning students as consumers or co-creators (Freeman, 2013). Institutional culture also plays a fundamental role in fostering different levels of student involvement in quality.

A second consideration is that, despite a language of empowerment, student–staff collaborations are based on complex, deep-rooted power relations and that staff and institutions wishing to give more voice to students in quality processes have ‘to acknowledge that our roles, expertise, responsibilities, and status are different’ from those of students (Cook-Sather *et al*., 2014, p. 7). Carey (2018) points to the challenges of inviting students into university ‘ritualised spaces that discourage involvement’ such as committee meetings as well as the expectation that student representatives can ‘manage partnership in one context with more submissive relationships elsewhere’ in their daily interactions with the university (p. 14). Simply involving students in local enhancement activities does not, in and of itself, lead to transformation of existing power structures, particularly if wider institutional culture is not conducive to collaborative or progressive engagement with student expertise (Kandiko Howson & Weller, 2016).

A third issue for student involvement in quality mechanisms is the question of who actually participates in these processes. The extra-curricular nature of many student engagement activities such as curriculum co-design, student peer review, student pedagogic consultancy and course representation can be a significant barrier. For some initiatives, merit-based selection criteria such as previous academic performance likewise can exclude some of the very students least served by the existing curriculum, pedagogies and representational systems. In different contexts, this can mean students in frequently marginalised demographic groups such as students from ethnic minority or low socio-economic backgrounds, but it could also exclude students who are time-poor such as part-time and commuter students, students with caring or employment commitments, students away from the university on placements or study abroad and students who do not have the confidence or social capital to successfully volunteer for opportunities. Drawing on Fielding’s (2004) conceptualisation of the student voice in school settings, Kandiko Howson and Weller (2016) suggest that the sometimes

pragmatic decision to work in partnership with a few students as representatives of all students means that student pedagogic consultants are potentially co-opted into the normative practice of speaking *for* and *about* others as subjects, rather than as transformative agents that challenge existing beliefs about the learning needs of a diverse student cohort.

(p. 2, original emphasis)

There is a danger that student involvement in quality processes can, therefore, only offer insights from a limited number of perspectives, can deliberately or unintentionally exclude already-silenced voices and potentially reinforce modes of representation that fail to acknowledge difference.

There are a number of ways in which both individuals and institutions can start to address these challenges:

* Define the scope of the role students will have in quality assurance and enhancement activities and provide structured support to enable all students to understand and participate equally within the ‘ritualised spaces’ of the university (Lizzio and Wilson, 2009).
* Reflect on how student involvement in individual quality processes fits within the wider organisational culture of the university in relation to Carey’s (2018) hierarchy of institutional actions. Identify at the outset how to negotiate between the aims and outcomes of student involvement and institutional or external regulation or obligations.
* Discuss questions of power, authenticity and differential expertise openly as part of the process of involving students in quality assurance and enhancement processes and validate the distinctive knowledge and perspective diverse stakeholders bring to understanding complex issues as ‘experts by experience’.
* Explore the ways in which macro-, meso- and micro-level opportunities for student involvement in quality processes work together to ensure that individual and local engagement feeds into programme-level and institution-level quality assurance, decision-making and enhancement and vice versa.
* Consider critically the selection criteria and expected modes of participation for student involvement in quality processes, particularly where narrowly-defined, performative measures of engagement or extra-curricular commitments might further exclude unheard voices (Bovill, Cook-Sather, Felten, Millard, & Moore-Cherry, 2016).

**Conclusion**

While student involvement in quality assurance and enhancement in higher education has the potential to transform the relationship between universities and their students and undermine the student-as-consumer rhetoric of recent policy drivers, there is a danger that student engagement in practice can be tokenistic and reinforce a compliance culture. Failing to acknowledge and address the challenges of implementing effective student involvement at individual, programme, institution and sector level will limit the impact of seeking and responding to the needs of students as ‘experts by experience’ in higher education. The current direction of international higher education is simultaneously reconfiguring the role of students-as-partners while also conceptualising students as a data source within big data sets. This could offer the opportunity for targeted and personalised learning provision but also an even more sophisticated picture of institutional effectiveness in relation to institutional competitors and benchmarks in the higher education market. How institutions manage the potential tensions between these two agenda is central to the future of student involvement in quality and their relationship to their institutions. Clarifying the role of students and the impact of their involvement within quality processes, making quality processes understandable to students, acknowledging and mitigating the power differentials between students, staff and institutions and paying deliberate attention to making quality assurance and enhancement processes more inclusive are also fundamental to creating a progressive organisational culture of quality.
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