University of Plymouth

PEARL https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk

07 Academic and Professional Services Library and Digital Services

2024-02-05

When we speak Faculty listen: Exploring spaces for students to contribute to the development of lecturers' academic practice.

Turner, R

https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk/handle/10026.1/21880

10.1080/19415257.2024.2307001
Professional Development in Education
Taylor and Francis Group

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

1 **When we speak Faculty listen: Exploring spaces for students to contribute to the**
2 **development of lecturers' academic practice.**

3 Rebecca Turner[a]*, Lucy Spowart[b], Harriet, C. Dismore[c], E.A. Beckmann[d], Rachael A.J.
4 Carkett[e] and Tashmin Khamis[f]

5

6 [a]*Library and Academic Development, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK. PL4 8AA
7 rebecca.turner@plymouth.ac.uk, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3953-618X @DrBeckyTurner

8 [b] Professor Lucy Spowart, Orchid ID: 0000-0001-7788-9109 @ProfLucySpowart

9 [c] Dr Harriet Dismore, University of Plymouth, UK https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2525-0589
10 @hdismore

11 [d] Beth Beckmann & Associates, Canberra, Australia. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5074-4070

12 [e] Independent HE Consultant Orchid ID: 0000-0002-1453-3233

13 [f] Dr Tashmin Khamis, Vice Provost, The Aga Khan University, Kenya

14

15 Accepted for Publication in Professional Development in Education

Lecturers’ engagement in professional development activities to enhance their academic practice is firmly embedded within the landscape of higher education. Although enhancing the student learning experience underpins teaching-related continuing professional development (CPD), interestingly the role of students in supporting such activities has been underexplored. Drawing on data captured from eight student representatives interviewed in the context of an international impact evaluation, we examine student awareness of, and attitudes towards, lecturers’ CPD. Participants recognised the value of lecturers engaging in CPD but believed it to be an activity they were removed from and had little opportunity to engage with. We consider how this perspective could be changed in two ways. Firstly, we reflect on the experiences of students at one university where their contributions to lecturers’ development were legitimised and valued. Secondly, we discuss the potential of integrative approaches, such as students as consultants or reverse mentoring. We argue that these approaches may challenge existing hierarchies that limit students engaging in lectures and create spaces through which students can positively contribute to lecturers’ CPD.

Keywords

Academic development, student voice, continuing professional development, students-as-partners, reverse mentoring

Introduction

Engaging in continuing professional development (CPD) is recognised as a ‘good thing and something all professionals should undertake’ (Roscoe, 2002: 3; Daniels, 2017; De Rijdt *et al.*, 2013). For many lecturers, however, CPD to support their pedagogic practice is perceived as conflicting with responsibilities to develop disciplinary expertise and research: hence greater esteem is attributed to disciplinary rather than pedagogic success (Gordon & Fung, 2016; Patfield *et al.*, 2022; Shaw, 2018). That is not to say lecturers do not engage in teaching-related CPD, (also referred to as academic development), but rather that the priority and status of these activities tends to remain secondary to disciplinary upskilling (Chadha, 2021; Deaker *et al.*, 2016). This position has remained largely unchanged for some time, despite recommendations to the contrary made by various reports and researchers (e.g. Daniels, 2017; Gordon & Fung, 2016), and interventions from national governments to

48 compel universities to be increasingly accountable for their student experience (e.g. National
49 Student Survey and the Teaching Excellence Framework in the UK, National Survey of
50 Student Engagement in the US, Quality Indicators of Student Learning in Australia) (Biswas
51 *et al*., 2022; Tomlinson, 2017). Indirectly, these measures of teaching quality have been
52 positioned as stimulating and supporting academic development, though the extent to which
53 such ambitions are realised is debated (Daniels, 2017; Cathcart at al., 2021; Patfield *et al*.,
54 2022).

55

56 Academic development is usually presented in two ways, formal and informal. Formal
57 accredited CPD can include postgraduate teaching qualifications for lecturers with limited
58 previous experience of teaching within HE (Daniels, 2017; Kandlibinder & Pesta, 2009).
59 Experienced colleagues can access CPD though so-called ‘experiential’ routes, which provide
60 recognition based on an evidence-base of experiences gained in supporting student learning
61 (Cathcart et al., 2021; Shaw, 2018). These formal CPD offers are usually developed by
62 institutions and aligned with external standards. For example, the Professional Standards
63 Framework for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Higher education (PSF) is widely used
64 in the UK, and increased drawn on internationally to frame the practice of teaching, learning
65 and student support in HE. The PSF includes three dimensions of practice: Areas of Activity
66 that address practical aspects of planning teaching and supporting learning, Core Knowledge
67 related to teaching and student support and Professional Values associated with HE practices
68 (Daniels, 2017; Hibbet & Semler, 2015; Advance HE, 2023). Advance HE is an educational
69 agency with charitable status based in the UK that acts as custodian of the PSF and accredits
70 formal CPD provision aligned to this standard (Advance HE, 2020). Universities provide
71 formal CPD aligned to the PSF bestowing recognition for all levels of staff, from those new
72 to teaching, to those with established track records (Cathcart et al., 2021; Shaw, 2018, Turner,
73 2013). Complementing the formal CPD offer, many HE providers deliver extensive
74 programmes of informal development, often in the form of workshops, conferences and
75 events, as well as pedagogic innovation funds, all centred on teaching and learning (Daniels,
76 2017; Hibbet & Semler, 2015). Such informal CPD is recognised as supporting a culture of
77 teaching enhancement (Advance HE, 2021).

78

In most cases the perceived primary beneficiaries of formal / informal academic development provision are the students (Gibbs, 2013; Norton et al., et al., 2010; Onsman, 2011). Yet the role of students within such CPD is rarely considered. This is an interesting and potentially notable oversight, particularly given the prevalence of a discourse of student voice across the sector (Jerome & Young, 2020). Since the advent of increased fees, the concept of 'voice' has become firmly embedded within policy and practice across the sector, with a diverse range of methods and mechanisms through which the student voice in particular can feature (Jerome & Young, 2020; Seale et al., 2014). Depending on the standpoint and context there are multiple definitions of student voice that can be applied. For example, according to McLeod (2011) student voice can be an agent for empowerment, change and inclusion, aligning with the principles of progressive pedagogies. In contrast, the Quality Assurance Agency (2013) position student voice as a measurable commodity that can support monitoring and enhancement, presenting mechanisms for how student voice should be captured and used. This has resulted in a focus on student voice that is captured through surveys (Jerome & Young, 2020; Mendes & Hammet, 2020). In many cases the ways through which student voice is manifest follows guidance set out by organisations (Carey, 2018; Mendes & Hammet, 2020). This has led to student voice practices aligned with external measure of accountability, rather than stimulating enhancement and innovation, as was initially envisaged (Mendes & Hammet, 2020; Tomlinson, 2017).

Freeman (2016) reports that, while student voice has become part of the day-to-day life of UK HE, there is a lack of clarity surrounding the purpose of student voice work, which impacts on the efficacy of these practices. Despite this, student voice has taken centre stage (Seale, 2009) with English HE providers mandated to engage with student voice (Young and Jerome, 2020). Elected student representatives are integral to student voice work (Carey, 2018; Lizzo & Wilson, 2009), overseeing mechanisms for capturing feedback through systems of student representation (e.g. school and course representatives) (Matthews & Dollinger, 2022) and student feedback obtained from the various internal / external surveys administered throughout the academic year is used to inform pedagogic change (Williams, 2011).

Curiously, therefore, students and student voice are absent from the discussion and practice of lecturer CPD, with few scant examples reported within the literature. This does not mean that students do not have a role in other areas of HE practice, such as curriculum enhancement and research, as discussed by Healey et al. (2014). In recognition of the progress and the positive contribution made in these areas of HE, this study was designed to explore the contribution students could make to lecturer CPD and propose areas for future development. Drawing on data captured through a series of interviews with elected student representatives (SR) about lecturers' development as educators, we considered students' existing knowledge and attitudes toward lecturers' pedagogic development, using this to explore opportunities through which students can potentially support lecturers' CPD. This paper concludes by identifying examples of student-led contributions to HE practice which we identified as potential approaches that could be used to integrate students into lecturer CPD.

Research Design

This study was framed by the following research questions, which were based on the authors' experiences as academic developers and knowledge of student voice:

- What do student representatives know about CPD aimed at developing lecturers' expertise as teachers?
- What are student representatives' attitudes towards, and perceptions of, lecturer CPD?
- What contribution do students representatives think students could make to lecturer CPD?

Research context

The data we draw on here were collected as part of a larger, international impact evaluation commissioned by Advance HE see (*citation removed for peer review*) for full details of this work) which involved 10 HE providers. At the time this impact evaluation study was undertaken, 172 institutions were accredited against the PSF, of which 23 were outside of the UK. As noted above, the PSF was originally designed and operated within the UK context, therefore was shaped by early calls to professionalise the practice of teaching, and more recently rhetoric relating to teaching enhancement, accountability and neoliberalisation

141 (Tomlinson, 2017). It occupies a complex space which advocates development and
142 enhancement as a professional good (Cathcart et al., 2023), whilst also risking answering the
143 call to evidence excellence and promote teaching quality, often to serve league table positions
144 (Harrison-Graves, 2016). The latter may have led to increased engagement with the PSF,
145 both within the UK and internationally (Cathcart et al., 2023), as having an accredited
146 teaching qualifications for lecturers can be used to evidence teaching is benchmarked to an
147 external standard (Buissink et al., 2017). Irrespectively of the motivation, the increased use
148 internationally is taken to represent its applicability to other HE contexts. This includes
149 Australia and New Zealand where the PSF has been adapted to heed indigenous perspectives,
150 demonstrating the potential for the PSF to integrate local values, concepts, worldviews and
151 perspectives (Buissink et al., 2017). Given the growing use of the PSF, the wider evaluative
152 study from which these data are drawn, included both UK and internationally based HE
153 providers who delivered teaching related CPD accredited by Advance HE.

154

155 **Data collection**

156 Student representative from each of the 10 case study HE providers participating in the
157 impact evaluation were invited to participate in this study. The impact evaluation study was
158 undertaken at the height of the COVID pandemic in 2020. As a result, securing access to
159 student representatives was challenging; student representatives from seven of the case study
160 HE providers were available to participate in this study. In total eight student representatives
161 were interviewed from seven HE institutions—four in the UK and four outside the UK (Table
162 1). All the institutions were members of Advance HE and provided CPD accredited by
163 Advance HE. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with elected student
164 representatives. As elected representatives they have taken on a role that involves them
165 speaking and acting on behalf of their peers (Flint & Goddard, 2021). Institutional practice
166 centred on student voice often positions student representatives in this way (Carey, 2018;
167 Lizzo & Wilson, 2009), and therefore our use of elected representatives to ascertain a broader
168 student perspective is in line with such work. An interview schedule was designed to address
169 the RQ, inviting participants to share their knowledge of, attitudes toward and perceptions of
170 teaching-related CPD for lecturers. The interview schedule was flexible to allow space to
171 promote meaningful dialogue with participants over complex issues (Cousins, 2009) and
172 enabling exploration of multiple layers of meaning and experience (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

173 We heeded the advice of Turner *et al*. (2013) in limiting the number of open questions in the
174 interview to allow us to explore what was interesting in the examples respondents shared in
175 their discussions. This research was undertaken with full ethical approval from the Advance
176 HE Ethics Committee. Hereafter we use the acronym SR to refer to the participants in this
177 study.

178

179 **Table 1:** Student Representatives geographic location and overview of participating
180 universities

181

182 INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

183

184 Interviews took place using Zoom between May and July 2020. Each member of the research
185 team was involved in interviewing participants. The interviews lasted between 20 to 40
186 minutes, and were recorded. They were transcribed verbatim and thematically analysed using
187 NVivo. Following the staged approach of Braun & Clarke (2006), data systematically
188 analysed though iterative cycles of reading, reflection and discussion. This enabled the
189 research team to identify areas of commonality and patterns within the data. These were
190 refined through progressive readings of the data, until the core themes presented below
191 emerged (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

192

193 In presenting these data we acknowledge this is a small sample. We thus do not claim to
194 present a position that is representative of the HE sector as a whole, but rather highlight
195 relevant issues to prompt discussion and further debate. This aligns with Hammersley's
196 (1998) theoretical inference approach to generalisation in which we seek to create more
197 generalisable insights relevant to a wider population and of broader interest. We use these
198 data to suggest future innovations in lecturer CPD that could create opportunities for student
199 voice to be more effectively integrated into the enhancement of academic practice.

200

201 ***Findings***

202 We presented below the outcomes of the qualitative data analysis with reference to the
203 research questions and wider literature framing this study.

204

205 **Students' knowledge of, and attitudes towards, lecturer CPD**

206 The professionalisation of university teaching began with the ambition of raising the status of
207 teaching, and ensuring committed teachers experienced similar levels of esteem as
208 researchers (Cathcart *et al*., 2021; Patfield, *et al*., 2022). Awareness of this history does not
209 appear to have reached the student body; overall respondents' awareness of lecturers'
210 development as teachers was limited. This is a notable observation; Advance HE
211 accreditation requires institutions to evidence they have practices, policies and support that
212 signal an institutional commitment to teaching enhancement (Advance HE, 2021). Of the
213 eight students interviewed, only three had heard of Advance HE and were confident talking
214 about lecturers' CPD.

215

216 Where an SR possessed knowledge of lecturer CPD, it was regarded as valuable, as
217 respondents SR7 and SR8 demonstrate. They could discuss development opportunities
218 available to lecturers, for example:

219 > 'I can see how the [named university] supports them as I have attended some
220 > workshops that were aimed at improving teaching.'(SR7)

221 They were able to advise their lecturers how to enhance their practice:

222 > 'We said that their style was not working for us and suggest development - this was
223 > taken seriously.' (SR8)

224 These respondents showed a commitment to supporting their lecturers to develop their
225 practice. This resonates with a co-production approach recommended by Zepke (2018) to
226 foster student engagement in HE through which students can become actively involved. This
227 finding also indicates a potential role for students, with some pedagogic knowledge, to
228 support lecturers CPD. Whilst we do not know who guided these SRs to make these
229 observations, we assume that knowledge of institutional CPD enabled these students to speak
230 from a position of confidence and authority (Freeman, 2016). They also evidenced a
231 sensitivity to engaging in these conversations, echoing the work of Arthur (2004) in

recognising the challenging nature of the conversations they were engaging in with their lecturers.

> ‘We said to them their style was not working and this was a challenge for them to hear, but it helped motivate change’ (SR8).

Four respondents (SR1, SR3, SR4 and SR6) possessed partial knowledge of Advance HE / lecturer CPD – gained from their presence at institutional committees to provide the student voice, for example:

> ‘I have heard of Advance HE through sitting on [names a committee] Board, and attending Board of Governors meetings’ (SR1)

Though attendance at such committees made them aware of Advance HE, they had no awareness of its purpose, nor had they been involved in discussions around lecturer CPD. Finally, SR4 and SR2 stated that, having not previously heard of Advance HE, they had undertaken internet searches in preparation for the interview connected to this study. They highlighted the value of this newfound knowledge during their interviews, and used the interviewer as a source to find out more. Initially, both SRs asked tentative, exploratory questions: as they found out more, they visibly increased in confidence. SR2 felt empowered ‘to go back and ask questions.’

For the UK-based SRs, this limited knowledge was notable but not unanticipated. Similar frustrations have been reported in related work (e.g. Carey, 2018; *citation removed for peer review*), and it seems little progress has been made, despite moves to enhance working relationships between student representatives and university leaders (Brooks et al., 2015a). The limited awareness of lecturer CPD, or the wider systems that support it, may reflect the extent to which the role these students have taken on is being guided and managed by the institution (Matthews & Dollinger, 2022). In effect, these respondents may indicate the potential silencing rather than amplification of voice, meaning that rather than challenging institutional hierarchies, hierarchies are maintained (McLeod, 2011; Naidoo et al., 2011). This was evidenced by SR4, who highlighted not just their lack of knowledge of lecturer development but also their distance from such work:

> 'We have Programme and School Representatives, they feed into the [named committee] which I chair, and this is a way into discussion around teaching and learning. But then I'm not sure where discussions around teaching and learning are made for academics' practice, where are decisions around teaching and learning made?'

For SR1 this did not sit comfortably, and they felt it was important to address this:

> 'I have two weeks left in this job, but I would say to my replacement to find out about student input to lecturers' development. I would ask where student voice is in this process; though the university is very engaged with the student union and student voice on subjects like this, there is a sense it is left to those that know more about it.'

The limited knowledge the SRs demonstrated regarding lecturers' CPD was, respondents felt, reflective of the student population more widely. They thought students were likely to possess passive views on lecturers' development as teachers:

> 'In terms of what students know, I don't think many are going to have any clue, whatsoever' (SR1)

> 'As a student I wouldn't have known much about it because you don't think much about the processes your lecturer goes through to teach at university, rather you just assume they know everything […] you assume they have had training and have a decent understanding of how to teach' (SR6)

These comments could imply that students do not care about teaching quality, aligning with the consumerist positioning of students (Tomlinson, 2017). Indeed, their lack of engagement may be reflective of wider pressures' students have upon their time which focus their engagement on activities perceived as directly relevant to their academic progress (Mendes & Hammet, 2020). Our respondents, and related work (e.g. Matthews and Dollinger, 2022), shows this is not the case. Students are seen as being influential in challenging long held notions of teaching and learning practice (Brooman *et al*., 2015). As SR4 commented, 'the quality of teaching is a hugely important issue to students.' All the SRs provided examples of discussions in which they had participated that related to teaching quality and student experience. Sometimes these discussions addressed institutional practice (e.g. such as personal tutoring support and inclusivity), and at other times they were limited in scope (e.g. SR1 and SR5 reported responding to students' complaints). Nevertheless, there was a sense

293 the SRs perceived their role as having been to primarily present ‘the student voice’ (SR5) to
294 management, indicating a constrained delineation of the SR role, limiting their capacity to act
295 (Mendes & Hammett, 2020; Lizzo & Wilson, 2009). More broadly, amongst the peers they
296 represent, the SR respondents felt lecturer CPD was something students assumed universities
297 dealt with behind the scenes, and therefore was not something they considered:

298 ‘What other students know is very little, not sure students entirely think about it’
299 (SR3)

300 ‘Many students expect their lecturers are trained and know what they are doing, but
301 equally students don’t want to know the ins and outs of it’ (SR1)

302 Through the interviews we explored why students possess limited awareness of lecturer CPD.
303 SR3 suggested this was due to the lack of visibility associated with the development of
304 lecturers compared to the development of teachers within compulsory education settings:

305 ‘At school they [students] come across trainees, give them grief, but at university they
306 are not labelled as such, so there it is not thought of in the same way’

307 They then went on to question the implications of this:

308 ‘So, for some of them [referring to students] they will only think of lecturer training
309 when they see a deficit, like poor teaching practice or someone being unable to use
310 technology.’

311 The SRs felt that action should be taken to counter this identifying value, for example:

312 ‘There needs to be conversations between staff and students around teaching and
313 learning, where students can express what teaching they would like to receive,
314 discussing what would work well for them, and staff could perhaps understand if that
315 is not how they usually taught, they could learn about other ways to do it’ (SR4)

316 ‘People need to realise they need it: just because they have taught for 20 years doesn’t
317 mean they don’t need CPD’ (SR3)

318 ‘The learning experience has changed quite a lot from when our lecturers learned at
319 university, they don’t understand our experiences and where we are coming from’
320 (SR6).

321 Several SRs presented assumptions about lecturers' practice being dated and asked questions
322 about lecturer CPD, but lacked a framework through which to engage in such discussions.
323 The SRs went on to identify focal points for lecturer CPD based on observations made
324 through their work as SRs, and identified the potential impact of such work:

> 325 'I was involved in an internship in my final year, developing resources for first year
> 326 students. Being in meetings with staff, hearing how passionate lecturers are, how they
> 327 put the student first. We should be showing this to students, showing staff are
> 328 proactive […] this would open-up a conversation and put students at ease with what
> 329 goes on' (SR4)

> 330 'In my manifesto I had a plan for lecturer training on [names activity]; I had observed
> 331 in some areas low progression rates and lecturers couldn't always explain why
> 332 students didn't succeed. If lecturers had specific training in [names activity] they
> 333 would be able to identify when a student is struggling' (SR2).

334 As the SR discussed these ideas there was an observable change in expression, from
335 questioning and uncertainty, to speaking with confidence and passion. We interpreted this as
336 showing the students' willingness to act for the benefit of the institution, in line with their
337 role as student representatives (Brooks et al., 2015a; Carey, 2018). This suggests that
338 providing spaces for students to work in consultation or partnership with lecturers, engage in
339 dialogue, and take an active role—all practices inherent to student voice work (McLeod,
340 2011; Seale et al., 2014) – could challenge existing practice and create a productive space for
341 development. Challenging existing practice might not be easy; there are considerable power
342 dynamics at play that need to be negotiated (Bovill, 2017; McLeod, 2011). Spaces for
343 consultation and dialogue, for example, are often created and controlled by the institution,
344 which can lead to spaces that preserve rather than transform discourse (Fleming, 2007; Seale
345 et al., 2014). Indeed, Bragg (2007) cautions that the normalisation of student voice within
346 institutional practice in compulsory education resulted in a move away from the radical
347 gesturing that challenges hierarchies to the alignment of voice with institutional practice,
348 maintaining power hierarchies and regulating the conduct of those enacting voice. This does
349 not mean students cannot make a positive contribution. Rather institutions need to embed
350 student voice practices that foster empowerment and change, instead of maintaining the status
351 quo (McLeod, 2011; Seale, 2009).

352

353 ***What role could students play in supporting or promoting lecturer CPD?***

354 Overall, the SRs thought greater focus should be placed on the contribution students could
355 make to lecturer CPD. Respondents felt that meaningful dialogue could be initiated, and that
356 students should be given a choice whether to engage with such activities. However, this
357 could only happen if information regarding lecturer CPD becoming more transparent and
358 accessible:

359 ‘I’m a great believer in openness, and students knowing what their institutions does
360 and doesn’t do. In practical terms, whether people would read it, if the information
361 was out there, but still, it should be available for if students want it’ (SR3)

362 This lack of transparency could be rectified, but whether universities would go beyond this
363 may be questionable. Williams (2011) observed that in most cases, when responding to issues
364 captured through student voice, institutions either clarified their procedures to students or
365 sought to take actions to improve processes for future students. Crucially it was noted action
366 was not always immediate or visible or represented what Williams (2011) identified as ‘real
367 action.’ Consequently, those students who provide feedback could feel overlooked and begin
368 to disengage with the very channel through which they can give their voice (Mendes and
369 Hammet, 2020). Institutional concerns (e.g. student opinion considered ‘fickle’, the time
370 taken to achieve change, and a lack of awareness of the wider context) hinder rather than
371 promote action as a result of student feedback (Seale 2009; Mendes and Hammet, 2020).
372 Notwithstanding these limitations, several SRs, in what we again note is a small sample,
373 where the opportunity presented itself, were taking an active role in shaping lecturer CPD.
374 Whilst the remainder of SR responded positively when provided with basic information about
375 lecturer CPD - demonstrating the untapped potential for students to contribute to lecturer
376 CPD. The engagement of students in lecturer CPD aligns with the agenda for Students as
377 Partners presented by Cook-Sather *et al*. (2018:2) in which they call for ‘an aspiration to
378 work together’. To be successful, such an approach may necessitate the rejection of
379 traditional hierarchies and assumptions about the role of students and lecturers, repositioning
380 students’ relationships both with their institution and their peers (Healey *et al*., 2014). The
381 SR comment below is indicative of the positive relationships that develop when students and
382 staff engage in discussions around pedagogic enhancement:

383 ‘We suggest lecturers adopt the methods of staff who experiment, and we see the
384 students like these individuals better, they get better attendance and engagement than

385 those that use traditional lecturing styles – the students are positive about active
386 learning, they feel they learn more and do better than in sessions where staff don't use
387 this approach' (SR8).

388

389 SR7 and SR8, based at a private teaching-focused institution, showed awareness of the CPD
390 opportunities available to lecturers and were well versed in pedagogy. They discussed the
391 benefits of active learning to student motivation and achievement, as well as the routes
392 through which they could provide feedback on lecturers' practice:

393 'Course evaluations help the lecturer to develop, and we see the impact and so we
394 provide honest feedback to the faculty' (SR7).

395 These SRs were distinct from the other respondents, which may reflect the culture of their
396 university having prioritised lecturer CPD and presented it as an activity in which students
397 could become involved. Indeed, SR8 shared their experience of presenting at the
398 University's teaching and learning conference:

399 'I presented a paper on active learning and student engagement [at the conference];
400 when students [at this institution] talk, they are taken seriously'.

401 Perhaps at this university the calls made by the other SRs participating in this study have
402 been realised; not only are there conversations around lecturer CPD taking place, but students
403 are also directing these conversations:

404 'There is a still a lot of change and improvement needed, but when we speak Faculty
405 listen: they value your perspective, and it is very humbling' (SR8).

406 Students taking an active role in lecturers' CPD at this university appeared beneficial to all,
407 with staff and students collaborating with one another. This exemplifies the ideal of students
408 at the heart of driving change and development within universities (Cook-Sather *et al*., 2018;
409 Healey *et al*., 2014).

410

411 ***Discussion: Creating Spaces for students to engage with lecturer CPD***

412 Following analysis of the interview data we undertook a search of the published literature to
413 identify mechanisms through which students could contribute to lecturer CPD. This reflects

414 the authors role as academic developers, in that we seek to offer practical, evidence informed
415 solutions to challenges in practice. This also builds on the recommendations of Seale et al.
416 (2014) which call for universities to take deliberate steps to involve students in meaningful
417 student voice work. Acknowledging potential bias in who becomes a student representative
418 (as explored by Brooks et al., 2015b), we sought to identify interventions that could be
419 extended across the student body, rather than limited to elected representatives. Students as
420 consultants (see Cook-Sather, 2009; Cook-Sather & Motz-Storey, 2016 for full details) and
421 reverse mentoring (see Browne, 2021; Morris 2017) emerged as mechanisms through which
422 students could support lecturers' CPD. Students as consultants recognises the expertise
423 students hold from their experiences of sitting in classrooms and learning, drawing on this to
424 provide a new lens through which lecturers reflect on their practice (Cook-Sather, 2009).
425 Cook-Sather (2009) highlights students' potential 'agents in transformative learning' - a
426 principle often at the heart of much student voice work (McLeod, 2011). Cook-Sather and
427 Motz-Storey (2016) detail a successful student as consultants project which paired lecturers
428 with students from a discipline outside of their own to ensure attention was placed on
429 pedagogy rather than content (Cook-Sather and Motz-Storey, 2016). Participants engaged in
430 discussions to determine the pedagogical focus of their work through a process of
431 negotiation, which was considered as essential to build trust. Students undertook classroom
432 observations over a term, then discussed the outcomes of their review, considering what
433 worked and why, as well as areas for improvement (Cook-Sather and Motz-Storey, 2016).
434 This approach was recognised as providing timely reminders of core values (e.g. active
435 learning, inclusivity and sustainability) which are integral to promoting student learning
436 (Stentiford and Koutsouris, 2021).

437

438 Reverse mentoring involves a junior colleague mentoring a senior employee (Browne, 2021;
439 Chaudhuri and Ghosh, 2012). This develops leadership skills and organisational knowledge
440 in the junior colleague whilst the senior colleague benefits from gaining fresh cultural
441 insights, exposure to recent content knowledge and enhanced technical skills (Browne, 2021).
442 Approximately 25% of UK companies report using reverse mentoring (Eaves, 2018) due to
443 its reported efficacy in bringing together diverse employee groups (Browne, 2021). It is seen
444 as a mechanism through which experienced colleagues can simultaneously give back to the
445 workplace and learn and fulfils the drive for younger employees to engage in professional
446 development and have an influence on workplace practice from an early stage in their career

447 (Browne, 2021). Studies have also reported accounts of established colleague experiencing
448 unexpected insecurity as they are repositioned to learn from junior colleague (Browne, 2021).
449 This has led to both parties needing to engage in careful negotiation of their roles, the
450 contribution they will make to the mentoring process, and how the process will be managed
451 (Browne, 2021). If this does not happen, they caution that established hierarchies can
452 surface, limiting the learning and development that can take place (Browne, 2021). Given the
453 power imbalance that exists between students and lecturers, this is an important
454 consideration. Morris (2017) highlighted the potential of reverse mentoring to promote
455 students' academic integration and to prompt reflection on practice. If applied to support
456 lecturers' CPD, as with students as consultants, the approach would involve a student
457 mentoring a lecturer. This may counter perceptions of academics as being distanced or
458 lacking an understanding of the current life of a student, which was noted by some SRs in this
459 study. Reverse mentoring has already been used in several UK universities, although in
460 slightly different contexts. For example, Middlesex University used reverse mentoring to
461 allow university leaders to learn about issues of equality, diversity and inclusion by being
462 mentored by a student from a minority ethnic background. The process stimulating change
463 and signalled a commitment to race equality (Middlesex University, undated). Three
464 universities in the West Midlands, England, implemented reverse mentoring with students
465 from underrepresented groups to address persistent issues of underemployment of students
466 from these backgrounds. Student mentors consulted on recruitment processes, leading to the
467 removal of barriers these students commonly encountered when seeking employment (OfS,
468 2021). Evaluation demonstrated the student mentors held organisations to account and
469 actions implemented changed practice (OfS, 2021). Based on these successes we feel there is
470 real potential for reserve mentoring to be applied in the context of lecturer CPD.

471

472 Employing either of these approaches is a time intensive process. Staff and students will both
473 need to dedicate time to engaging in training, planning and preparation in order to negotiate
474 power dynamics and maximise chances of success. They also need to be mindful that
475 traditional power dynamics and practices can easily re-emerge (Cook-Sather and Motz-Story,
476 2016). That said, our research suggests students want to find out more about teaching and
477 learning. With an increasingly diverse student population we should also place value on the
478 diversity of experiences upon which students draw on and how knowledge of these could
479 benefit our institutions (Stentiford and Koutsouris, 2021). Engaging students through either

480 of these approaches could benefit all involved. For example, a meta-analysis conducted by
481 Tomlinson et al. (2023: 13) reported students having expectations of teaching and learning at
482 university that were 'uncertain, misaligned and unrealistic' with implications for attendance,
483 autonomy and success. These activities could support students to foster more realistic
484 expectations of university, as well as signalling an institutional commitment to dialogue and
485 partnership with students.

486

487 ***Conclusion***

488 In this paper we report the outcomes of the interviews conducted with eight student
489 representatives to explore their views on lecturer development focused on teaching. Though
490 small-scale, we focus here on the often-overlooked issue of student views on lecturers'
491 development as teachers, considering how this connects to agendas that seek to
492 professionalise of university teaching and enhance the student voice. It became apparent that
493 participating in the interviews provided a much-needed space for these SRs to engage in
494 reflection and discussion about teaching and learning. As representatives, it is likely they
495 received appropriate and relevant training, as advocated within the literature (e.g. Matthews
496 and Dollinger, 2022). Critics of student voice work have noted that the remit of training for
497 students is often limited in scope (Carey, 2018; Mendes & Hammet, 2020), resulting in them
498 conforming to the practices and processes supported by the institution rather than fostering a
499 sense of criticality and empowerment (Fleming, 2015). Empowerment emerged through the
500 interview process: SRs wanted to find out more about lecturer CPD within their own
501 institutions. This was an interesting outcome; although SRs occupy a role centred on
502 representation of the student voice, they appear ill-equipped to fully participate in
503 conversations around teaching and learning. This is a tension recently recognised within
504 related work focused on student representative that has yet to be fully resolved (Matthews
505 and Dollinger, 2022).

506

507 There is a need to carefully consider where and how the contribution of students to lecturers'
508 CPD is positioned. CPD is on-going, and therefore lecturers are expected to engage with it on
509 a regular basis to maintain currency (De Ridjt *et al*., 2013; Daniels, 2017). The development
510 new lecturers undergo is generally centred on initial teaching qualifications (Gibbs, 2013;
511 Parsons *et al*., 2012); it is a platform for lecturers to experiment with their practice in a

512 supportive and safe space, be introduced to pedagogic theory and engage in reflective
513 practice (Kandlbiner and Peseta, 2009). In contrast, on-going lecturer CPD is often
514 grounded in local needs or policies, and is therefore potentially more flexible, as it is not tied
515 to the expectations of an accreditation body or academic regulations (citation removed for
516 peer review). It represents a way through which we can respond to the call to engage
517 students in their higher education (Zepke, 2018). Nevertheless, as Bovill (2017) reports, we
518 recognise that students working in partnership with staff is not always an easy process given
519 the cultures that exist in universities. However, our data demonstrate there is an appetite for
520 students to contribute to lecturers' development. Indeed, where students took an active role,
521 positive change was reported.

522

523 As this is an area of academic development practice that has received limited attention,
524 further research is clearly needed. As this work presents a snapshot of the student voice, the
525 attitudes of academic staff and other key stakeholders (e.g. teaching and learning leads)
526 should also be sought. This would enable us to develop a comprehensive picture of the
527 potential challenges as well as opportunities that may shape future practice in this area.
528 Equally, the implementation of CPD activities that seek to actively involve students should
529 have an explicit evaluation plan to gather evidence of impact that is sensitive to the roles and
530 remits of both students and staff (Bamber, 2013).

531

532 The positioning of lecturer CPD as an activity distanced from students counters the goals of
533 much academic development practice, particularly that for new lecturers, namely, to promote
534 student centred methods embracing principles of innovation, reflection and development
535 (Hanbury, 2008). Despite this student-centred mantra, it appears that most pedagogic
536 development is lecturer centred. Whilst for certain activities this is appropriate, particularly
537 when you consider the anxiety new lecturers often report as they begin to teach (Arthur,
538 2004), this may also be a missed opportunity to engage the student voice. Many studies have
539 shown the positive contributions students can make to pedagogic change and curriculum
540 enhancement activities (e.g. Brooman *et al*., 2015 *et al*., Bovill *et al*., 2017: Healey *et al*.,
541 2014; Seale et al., 2014). Specifically, engaging students in activities to promote lecturers'
542 CPD could counter narratives about the low status of teaching compared to research (Deaker

543 et al., 2016) and foster potentially inclusive and mutually beneficial relationships between
544 students and staff (Cook-Sather *et al*., 2018; Seale et al., 2014).

545

546 **Disclosure statement.**

547 The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

548

549 **Acknowledgements.**

550 The research presented in this paper was supported by an impact evaluation grant from
551 Advance HE, awarded in 2020. We also thank the students who participated in this study for
552 giving their time, as well as the contributions made by participating institutions to the wider
553 project.

554

555 **Biographical notes.**

556 Dr Rebecca Turner is an Associate Professor in Educational Development at the University
557 of Plymouth and Principal Fellow of the HEA. In addition to researching the
558 professionalisation of teaching and academic development practice, Rebecca is also
559 interested examining the role of student voice and student unions in promoting change, as
560 well as inclusivity and widening participation.

561 Lucy Spowart PhD is a Professor of Educational Enhancement at the University of
562 Plymouth's Peninsula Medical School UK. Lucy was awarded Principal Fellowship in 2018
563 and a National Teaching Fellowship in 2020. Lucy's main research interests are in Continual
564 professional development, teaching accreditation and impact evaluation.

565 Dr HARRIET DISMORE is a Lecturer in Education at the University of Plymouth. As a
566 teacher and researcher of lifelong and life wide learning, she has been involved in many
567 teaching and learning initiatives, including those on educational transitions and student
568 experience. She is currently working in the areas of interdisciplinary learning and
569 community engagement.

570 Dr Rachael Carkett is an Independent HE Consultant with extensive experience in academic
571 development. Rachael has worked with many UK and international institutions as an advisor

and External Examiner/Reviewer, informing insitutial policies and strategies, and encouraging the embedding of best practice in a variety of learning contexts. She is an Advance HE accreditor and was awarded a National Teaching Fellow award in 2019.

Dr Elizabeth Beckmann Beth Beckmann is an independent higher education consultant recognised as a Principal Fellow of the HEA and Senior Fellow of the Staff and Educational Development Association. A biologist, writer and, above all, teacher, Beth has national and institutional awards for innovation in university teaching, academic development and gender equity.

Dr Tashmin Khamis is the Vice Provost for Quality, Teaching and Learning and The Aga Khan University where she is responsible professional development for faculty across all campuses of AKU. She is also a Principal Fellow of the HEA and a judge for the Advance HE global Teaching Excellence Award.

References

Advance HE. (2023). Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education 2023. https://advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/professional-standards-framework-teaching-and-supporting-learning-higher-education-0?_ga=2.150122678.1079608860.1693298269-588672563.1637836319 Accessed 29th August 2023.

Advance HE (2021). Advance HE Accreditation Policy. Accessed 24th February 2022.

Advance HE. (2020). Helping HE shape its future. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/about-us Accessed 22nd September 2022

Arthur L (2009). From performativity to professionalism: lecturers' responses to student feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 14 (4), 441-454.

Biswas, K., Bose, S., Chang, M., and Shams, S. (2022). Determinants and consequences of student satisfaction in Australian Universities: Evidence from QILT Surveys. *Accounting* and *Finance*. 2022;00:1–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12930

600 Brooman, S. Darwent, S & Pimor, A. (2015) The student voice in higher education
601 curriculum design: is there value in listening?, Innovations in Education and Teaching
602 International, 52:6, 663-674, DOI: 10.1080/14703297.2014.910128

603 Bovill, C. (2017). A framework to explore roles within student-staff partnerships in higher
604 education: which students are partners, when, and in what ways? *International Journal for*
605 *Students as Partners,* 1(1):

606 Bovill, C. and Felten, P. (2016) Cultivating student–staff partnerships through research and
607 practice*, International Journal for Academic Development,* 21 (1), 1-3.

608 Buissink, N., Diamond, P., Hallas, J., Swann, J., & Dee Sciascia, A. (2017) Challenging a
609 measured university from an indigenous perspective: placing 'manaaki' at the heart of our
610 professional development programme, *Higher Education Research & Development,* 36(3):
611 569-582.

612 Bragg, S. (2007). "Student Voice" and Governmentality: the production of enterprising
613 subjects? *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education.* 28 (3), 343-358.

614 Brooks, R., Byford, K. and Sela, K. (2015a), 'The Changing Role of Students' Unions within
615 Contemporary Higher Education', *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(2): 165-181.

616 Brooks, R., Byford, K. and Sela, K. (2015b), 'Inequalities in Students' Union Leadership: the
617 role of social networks', *Journal of Youth Studies,* 18(9): 1204–1218.

618 Browne, I. (2021). Exploring Reverse Mentoring; "Win-Win" Relationships in The Multi-
619 Generational Workplace. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring,*
620 S15, 246-259.
621 Carey, P. (2018). 'The impact of institutional culture, policy and process on student
622 engagement in university decision making', ***Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher***
623 ***Education,*** 22(1): 11-18.

624 Cathcart, A., Dransfield, M., Floyd, S., Campbell, L-A., Carkett, R., Davies, V., Duhs, R. and
625 Smart, F. (2021). Tick-box, weasel words, or a transformative experience? Insights into what
626 educators consider the real impact of HEA Fellowships. *International Journal for Academic*
627 *Development,* DOI: 10.1080/1360144X.2021.1938075

628 Chaudhuri, S. and Ghosh, R. (2012). Reverse mentoring: A social exchange tool for keeping
629 the boomers engaged and millennials committed, *Human resource development review*, 11
630 (1), 55-76.

631 Cook-Sather, A. 2009. From Traditional Accountability to Shared Responsibility: The
632 Benefits and Challenges of Student Consultants Gathering Midcourse Feedback in College
633 Classrooms. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 34 (2): 231–241.

634 Cook-Sather, A., Matthews, K.E., Ntem, A. and Leathwick, S. (2018). What We Talk About
635 When We Talk About Students as Partners. *International Journal for Students as Partners,* 2
636 (2), 1-9.

637 Cook-Sather, A. & Motz-Storey, D. (2016) Viewing Teaching and Learning from a New
638 Angle: Student Consultants' Perspectives on Classroom Practice, College Teaching, 64:4,
639 168-177, DOI: 10.1080/87567555.2015.1126802

640 Cousin, G. (2009). *Strategies for Researching Learning in Higher Education: An*
641 *Introduction to Contemporary Methods and Approaches*. New York: Routledge.

642 Daniels, J. (2017). Professional learning in higher education: making good practice relevant,
643 International Journal for Academic Development, 22:2, 170-181, DOI:
644 10.1080/1360144X.2016.1261352

645 Deaker, L., Stein, S.J. and Spiller, D. (2016). You can't teach me: exploring academic
646 resistance to teaching development. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 21 (4),
647 299-3

648 Eaves, N. (2018) Can reverse mentoring transform your business. Stanton House. Available
649 at: https://www.stantonhouse.com/white-paper-can-reverse-mentoring-transform-your-
650 business.11.

651 Fleming, D. (2015). Student Voice: an emerging discourse in Irish education policy.
652 *International Journal of Elementary Education,* 8 (2), 223-242.

653 Flint, A and Goddard, H. (2021). Power, partnership, and representation. In L. Mercer-
654 Mapstone and S. Abbot (eds)., *The Power of Partnerships: students, staff and Faculty*
655 *Revolutionizing Higher Education.* Elon University Centre for Engaged Learning.

656 Freeman, R. (2016) Is student voice necessarily empowering? Problematising student voice
657 as a form of higher education governance, Higher Education Research & Development, 35:4,
658 859-862, DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2016.1172764

659 Hanbury, A., Prosser, M. and Rickinson, M. (2008). The differential impact of UK accredited
660 teaching development programmes on academics' approaches to teaching. *Studies in Higher*
661 *Education,* 33 (4), 469-483.

662 Harrison-Graves, K. (2016). Universities in Australia and New Zealand are working with the
663 higher education academy to reward and recognise great teaching.
664 from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/blog/universities-australia-and-new-zealand-are-
665 working-higher-education-academy-reward

666

667 Healey, M., Flint, A. and Harrington, K. (2014). *Engagement through partnership: Students*
668 *as partners in teaching and learning in higher education.* York: HEA.

669 Hibbert, P. and Semler, M. (2016). Faculty development in teaching and learning: the UK
670 framework and current debates. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International,* 53 (6),
671 581-591.

672 King, H. (2019). Continuing professional development: what do award-winning academics
673 do? *Educational Developments,* 20 (2), 1-5.

674 Lizzo, A. & Wilson, K. (2009). Student participation in university governance: the role
675 conceptions and sense of efficacy of student representatives on departmental committees,
676 Studies in Higher Education, 34:1, 69-84, DOI: 10.1080/03075070802602000

677 McLeod, J. (2011). Student voice and the politics of listening in higher education. *Critical*
678 *Studies in Education,* 52 (2), 179-189.

679 Mendes, A.B. and Hammett, D. (2020). 'The new tyranny of student participation? Student
680 voice and the paradox of strategic-active student-citizens', *Teaching in Higher Education,*
681 DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2020.1783227

682 Middlesex University. (undated). Asking the questions that leaders need to hear themselves
683 answering: Middlesex University Reverse Mentoring Framework.
684 https://www.mdx.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0032/584096/mdx-reverse-mentoring-
685 framework.pdf Accessed 23rd September 2022.

686 Morris, L.V. (2017) Reverse Mentoring: Untapped Resource in the Academy? *Innovative*
687 *Higher Education* 42, 285–287.

688 Naidoo, R., Shankar, A. and Veer, E. (2011). The consumerist turn in higher education:
689 Policy aspirations and outcomes, *Journal of Marketing Management,* 27 (11-12), 1142-1162.

690 OfS. (2021). Transforming the West Midlands through 'reverse mentoring'.
691 https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/promoting-equal-
692 opportunities/effective-practice/transforming-the-west-midlands-through-reverse-mentoring/
693 Accessed 23rd September 2022.

694 Parson, D., Hill, I., Holland, J. and Willis, D. (2012). *Impact of teaching development*
695 *programmes in higher education.* Higher Education Academy, York.

696 Patfield, S., Gore, J., Prieto, E., Fray, L. and Sincock, K. (2022). Towards quality teaching in
697 higher education: pedagogy-focused academic development for enhancing practice,
698 *International Journal for Academic Development*, DOI: 10.1080/1360144X.2022.2103561

699 QAA. (2018). UK Quality code for Higher Education part B: assuring and enhancing
700 academic quality.

701 Roscoe, J. (2002). Continuing professional development in higher education. *Human*
702 *Resource Development International,* 5 (1), 3-9.

703 Rubin H.J. and Rubin I.S. (2005) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing the Data.*
704 SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA.

705 Seale, J. (2009) Doing student voice work in higher education: an exploration of the value of
706 participatory methods, *British Educational Research Journal,* 36 (6), 995-1015

707 Shaw, R. (2018) ‘Professionalising teaching in HE: The impact of an institutional fellowship
708 scheme in the UK’, *Higher Education Research and Development,* 37 (1), 145-157.

709 Reference removed for peer review

710 Stentiford, L. and Koutsouris, G. (2021). What are inclusive pedagogies in higher education?
711 A systematic scoping review. *Studies in Higher Education,* 46 (11), 2245-2261.

712 Tomlinson, A., Simspon, A. & Killingback, C. (2023). Student expectations of teaching and
713 learning when starting university: a systematic review. *Journal of Further and Higher*
714 *Education,* https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2023.2212242

715 Tomlinson, M. (2017) Student perceptions of themselves as 'consumers' of higher
716 education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 38 (4), 450-467

717 Turner, N, Oliver, M, McKenna, C, Hughes, J, Smith, H, Deepwell, F and Shrives, L (2013)
718 *Measuring the impact of the UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and*
719 *Supporting Learning (UKPSF).* York: Higher Education Academy.

720 Young, H. and Jerome, L. (2020), 'Student Voice in Higher Education: Opening The Loop',
721 British Education Research Journal, 46(3): 688-705.

722 Zepke, N. (2018). Student engagement in neo-liberal times: what is missing? *Higher*
723 *Education Research and Development,* 37 (2), 433-446.

724

725 **Table 1:** Student Representatives geographic location and overview of participating
726 universities

Student Representative (SR)	UK / International	Institution type	Overview of CPD offer
SR1	UK	Publicly funded, teaching-focused university. AHE accreditation since 2018	CPD Scheme (D1-D3) / Taught postgraduate course
SR2	UK	Research-led, publicly funded. AHE accreditation since 2007	CPD Scheme (D1-D3) / Taught postgraduate course
SR3	UK	Publicly funded, Teaching focused. Advance HE accreditation since 2016	CPD Scheme (D1-D3)
SR4	UK	Publicly funded, research-intensive	CPD Scheme (D1-D4) / Taught postgraduate course

		university. Advance HE accreditation since 2016	
SR5	International	Publicly funded, research university. Advance HE accreditation since 2013	CPD Scheme (D1-D4)
SR6	International	Publicly funded, research University. Advance HE accreditation since 2016	CPD Scheme (D1-D4) / Taught postgraduate course
SR7 and SR8	International	Private, non-profit teaching focused university. AHE accreditation since 2019	CPD Scheme (D1-D2)

727

728

729

730