

Institutional Teaching and Learning Review 2023

Outcomes Report

Student Co-Creation

December 2023

**INSTITUTIONAL TEACHING
AND LEARNING REVIEW**
ITLR 2023

Outcomes Report:

Student Co-creation

December 2023

Summary

Incorporating students' feedback and reflecting on the student voice is a central component of delivering a robust and meaningful Institutional Teaching and Learning Review (ITLR). Students contributed to the ITLR process through three distinct student roles: Student Co-creation Officers, Departmental Student Leads and Student Panellists. Review panels met with students within the departments under review to invite them to reflect on their experiences. Finally, each panel evaluated relevant student engagement resources and evidence as part of their review of the department self-evaluation documents.

The student contribution to ITLR as a whole was effective and valuable, with the variety of engagement opportunities allowing a range of student views to be taken into consideration throughout the ITLR process. Students value the opportunities available to them, however some roles were more successful than others and engagement in some activities was impacted by timing and scheduling delays.

Student engagement in the ITLR has provided some valuable lessons for student co-creation:



Students want to engage

The wider community values student engagement and feels the student voice is, and should be, integral to evaluation and decision making



Timing is key

Clearly defined and understood roles are key to successful outcomes and engagement



Students value interaction and support from other students in similar roles as this reduces feelings of isolation

The ability to engage in different roles and at various levels provides variety and flexibility

Introduction

Student Co-creation

Engaging students in quality assurance and enhancement is widespread in higher education, with various overlapping terms used to describe this such as student engagement, students as partners and students as co-creators. Student engagement in the UK tends to refer to a broad range of activities that are employed to motivate and interest students to engage (Kuh, 2009). This can relate to engagement in quality assurance and governance systems or engagement in teaching and learning, however since the recent Covid pandemic this often relates to levels of individual study engagement, such as turning up to class or going above and beyond in curriculum-based activity. Students as partners builds on previous student engagement terminology, often referring to a deeper level of student engagement which is described as a more collaborative and reciprocal process of contributing to the higher education student experience (Cook-Sather, 2018). With student co-creation the emphasis is on learner empowerment. This has been described by Bovill et al. (2016) as possibly somewhere between student engagement and students as partners, noting that student co-creation results in meaningful collaboration between staff and students, creating active learners who are able to construct understanding and resources with academic staff (Bovill et al., 2016).

Student Co-creation in ITLR

The Institutional Teaching and Learning Review (ITLR) Blueprint sets out the aim to provide '*a coherent and comprehensive assessment of our recent progress, current position and future opportunities that has drawn in a wide range of staff, **student** and stakeholder voices*'. Actively engaging students as co-creators who can shape the learning environment has been a key element throughout the design and delivery of ITLR, ensuring that the student perspective is central to the review of teaching, learning and the student experience.

Student contribution to ITLR came through the Student Co-creation Officers, who contributed to the ITLR design and the development and support of student roles in ITLR, Departmental Student Leads, who worked within departments to support the SED submission and facilitate student engagement, and Student Panellists, who were full and equal members of all ITLR review panels. In addition, all academic department review panels met with students from the departments to the explore lines of enquiry student feedback was provided to support the PSS Cluster reviews.

This report provides an overview of the roles and activities that provided opportunities for student co-creation in ITLR and evaluates the three distinct student ITLR roles with the intention of feeding into the overall ITLR evaluation questions including:

- KEQ1 - Have all academic departments & PSS clusters drawn on a **wide** range of staff, **student** & stakeholder voices?

- KEQ8 - What lessons can we learn from the organisation and operation of the ITLR?

Students and ITLR - a wide range of student voices?

Student Co-creation Officer

Two Student Co-creation Officers were appointed to develop and contribute to the ITLR process, working alongside student engagement staff and other students to provide resources and hold workshops and discussions around the themes of ITLR. Student Co-creation Officers attended the Project Board to advise and share feedback from the student perspective and were invited to represent the project during activities and events to build the presence and profile of ITLR across the University. Student Co-creation Officers worked alongside colleagues to facilitate meetings between staff and students and deliver training and briefing sessions to other students.

Duties and Responsibilities:

Collaborate with staff and students to develop resources and contribute to the ITLR.

Lead and contribute to group meetings between Student Co-creation Officers and the Students' Union.

Represent ITLR in any appropriate events/activities across the University, attending any meetings where updates may be appropriate.

Build the presence and profile of ITLR for students across the University of Warwick.

Build relationships to become a point of contact for students at the University who wish to engage with ITLR.

Work with colleagues to develop information/guidance documents for other students.

Organise events, where relevant and in partnership with your colleagues, to share and develop ITLR's work.

Engage in administrative tasks in support of the role and the ITLR team, facilitating meetings and delivering training and briefing sessions to students.

Examples of the tasks completed by the Student Co-creation Officers include:

- Supporting with development of job descriptions for the ITLR Departmental Student Lead and Student Panellist roles
- Supporting Student Panellist recruitment activity
- Drafting training PP slides and supporting training delivery
- Development and oversight of the ITLR Student Hub Teams site
- Attendance at Project Board
- Creating resources to support student panel members.

Both Student Co-creation Officers have submitted successful applications for the SEDA Partnership Impact Award for their contributions to ITLR.

ITLR Departmental Student Lead

As part of the Institutional Teaching and Learning Review (ITLR), each department had a set of departmental leads, including a Departmental Student Lead (DSL) nominated by the Head of Department in consultation with their student representatives. Some students shared this role, resulting in 39 DSLs. The students supported their own department's ITLR review, including contributing and consulting on the self-evaluation document (SED) where possible, and coordinating review meetings with groups of students. As such, this role provided students the opportunity to represent and engage the voice of students in their home department.

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Be the primary contact between the department and EPQ for student-related queries
- Support the drafting of the department's SED and coordinate consultation with SSLCs
- Coordinate meetings between student groups and the review panels as part of review visits
- Participate in review panel meetings alongside other Departmental Leads
- Review the report draft for factual inaccuracies

All departments nominated a Departmental Student Lead as the primary student contact. Due to timing some DSL's were recruited once the SED had been submitted., however where this was the case departments shared their drafts with SSLC to ensure student consideration.

Departmental Student Leads did not have formal training related to their role, however they were provided with guidance resources and supported by the Student Co-creation Leads and ITLR Project Team through regular drop-in sessions to ensure they could undertake the role effectively.

As noted below, all reviews included a meeting with students from the department, this was generally facilitated by the DSL, and DSLs were noted to be in attendance for at least one meeting for 24 out of the 32 review visits, with one further Departmental Student Lead engaging with the role actively, but unable to attend the review visit for their department.

It was anticipated that this role would require up to 20 hours of activity. Engagement with this role was variable with 15 Departmental Student Leads either only attending the student meetings or claiming limited hours (less than 5), and others taking an active role in all duties and responsibilities.

Anticipated hours per role	Average actual hours per review	Anticipated spend	Actual spend
20	12	£13,152	£8,077

ITLR Student Panellist

Student Panellists were allocated to all academic department and PSS cluster review panels, alongside a panel chair, internal university members and external experts. The aim of this student role was to centre the student experience, to bring diverse perspectives and knowledge, and to review work with panels to co-create the teaching and learning experience.

Duties and Responsibilities:

- A student specific training and an all-panel training
- Review their allocated department's Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and student data (e.g., NSS results and annual SSLC reports)
- Meet with the review panel to discuss findings from the SED
- Attend two review meetings with the allocated department
- Contribute to the final report to be written by the panel secretary

The response to the recruitment communication was overwhelmingly positive with 297 students applying, highlighting the level of interest from students to engage with the ITLR process, and demonstrating the importance of student involvement and co-creation in university-wide projects of this kind.

60 ITLR Student Panellists were recruited to allow for alternates in case of retention issues, including 14 PGR, 8 PGT and 38 UG students. 43 students were allocated to review panels, two of which withdrew during the process. A replacement Student Panellist was allocated to one of the reviews, however we were unable to replace the other student panellist due to withdrawing so close to the review visit for personal reasons. Some initial engagement had taken place, including input into the SED evaluation and lines of enquiry.

Student Panellists were invited to the general panel training which outlined the process and the expectations of the different roles. 37 Student Panellists attended the training sessions and additional sessions were provided for alternates where required. In addition, Student Panellists were provided with guidance and resources, often developed by the Student Co-creation Leads to ensure accessibility and were supported through drop-in sessions and on-going contact and support from the ITLR Project Team and the Student Co-creation Officers.

Student Panellists were noted to be in attendance for at least one review visit at 36 out of the 38 reviews. The two review visits without a Student Panellist were the Department of Physics, due to the student having to drop out close to the review visits as noted above, and the School of Modern Languages and Culture, where the Student Panellist was unable to attend the review visits due to illness, but had actively engaged in evaluation, analysis and review visit preparation.

Due to timing of some of the reviews the Student Panellist's engagement with any revisions to report drafts was limited, however all panellists contributed to the ITLR outcomes.

It was anticipated that this role would require up to 40 hours of activity and on average each review utilised the full 40 hours for Student Panellists.

Anticipated hours per role	Average actual hours per review	Anticipated spend	Actual spend
40	40	£53,048	£53,849

Meetings with students

Review visits for academic departments were expected to include meetings with departmental students in conjunction with an assessment of student engagement sources provided as part of the departments self-evaluation and evidence pack, for example student satisfaction survey results, SSLC and departmental feedback mechanisms. Meeting with a representative range of students proved challenging for some academic department reviews due to the review timing, however meeting attendance and discussion with Secretaries confirm that all 32 academic department reviews included at least one meeting with students during the ITLR process.

PSS Cluster Student Representation

The PSS Clusters reviews did include a Student Panellist, however there was not a student Lead within the cluster to replace the Departmental Student Lead role. Meeting with students also proved more challenging for PSS Cluster reviews because they don't have a defined group of 'home' students.

An attempt was made to capture the student voice through meetings where possible, with one PSS Cluster panel meeting with a group of students as part of the review process. In addition, a PSS Cluster review student survey was developed to further support this, collecting views from 9 students student survey with wider student experience questions related to personal tutor support, community and belonging, student support services, students as partners and co-creators, and the common themes. The survey results were made available to the PSS Cluster review panels.

Students as Assistant Secretaries

In addition to the student roles outlined above, 8 PGR students were recruited to support reviews as Assistant Secretaries. This provided additional student input in some reviews and enabled the students to gain valuable skills and experience through their engagement. PGR Assistant Secretaries had access to the Review Panel Training sessions and the dedicated Secretariat Training sessions, with 6 out of 7 students attending at least one of the sessions, and were provided with guidance resources and on-going support, including through dedicated Secretariat drop-in sessions.

It was anticipated that this role would require 30 hours of activity. 1 PGR Assistant Secretary was unable to continue in the role and the average hours for the 7 remaining PGR students was 38 hours and this did not generally include supporting the final report writing process.

Anticipated hours per role	Average actual hours per review	Anticipated spend	Actual spend
30	38	£4316	£6455

KEQ1 - Have all academic departments & PSS clusters drawn on a **wide** range of staff, **student** & stakeholder voices?

The exploration of the student contribution above confirms that academic and PSS cluster review panels have drawn on a range of student voices to inform the '*assessment of our recent progress, current position and future opportunities*' through consideration of student engagement evidence within the review analysis, meeting with students during the review process, and the Student Panellist and Departmental Student Lead roles, which were developed and supported by the Student Co-creation Officers.

If the roles are considered individually it is difficult to confirm that a **wide** range of views have been drawn into the ITLR process, however the combination of the various ways in which students have engaged provides assurance that consideration of the student experience has been integral to the ITLR process and the resulting outcomes. This is a result of the clear departmental and panel review of student feedback and satisfaction data, high levels of Student Panellist engagement, and confirmation that all departmental review panels met with students during the ITLR process. PSS Cluster student engagement did prove more challenging, and although further attempts were made through the PSS Cluster student survey, this did not provide a wide range of student views.

Students and ITLR - what lessons can we learn from the organisation and operation of ITLR?

A mixed method approach was taken to collect the perspective of the students, the ITLR panel members and the ITLR team to evaluate the impact of the three distinct student roles in ITLR and to identify lessons learnt as a result.

The student roles were evaluated by exploring 5 questions through a mixed method approach including:

- How did the student roles work in practice?
- How has student engagement in ITLR been beneficial to the student and the department?
- How has student engagement in ITLR been beneficial for quality assurance and the wider academic community?
- Does student engagement with ITLR constitute co-creation?

- What lessons have been learnt for student co-creation going forward?

Methods

A mixed methods approach was utilised to collect the perspective of the students engaged in ITLR, the panel members and staff working alongside the student roles in ITLR, and the ITLR Project Team. This included surveys, reflective accounts, focus groups and interviews as outlined below.

- The Student Panel Member Survey had a 23% response rate (n=10) and consisted of 13 questions, with a mixture of multiple choice and open text questions exploring the respondents experience as part of an ITLR Review Panel, views around the training and guidance provided, and recommendations for the future.
- The Departmental Student Lead Survey achieved a 26% (n=10) response rate from the sample of 39 Departmental Student Leads. The survey included 10 questions related to the experience of being a Departmental Student Lead, the guidance and support provided, the activities undertaken and recommendations for future.
- Reflective account from the 2 Student Co-creation Officers based on 11 prompt questions exploring the motivations for applying for the role, the activities undertaken, the perceived benefits, any lessons learnt as a result of undertaking the role, and any advice for similar roles in the future. The information provided was limited in depth but did allow for some analysis and evaluation of the role. The Student Engagement Officer also provided a reflective account of their role supporting the students to engage in ITLR.
- Focus groups - various focus groups with different stakeholder groups were held including a student focus group with 2 Student Panel Member participants, a Panel Member focus group with 5 participants and an ITLR Project Team focus group with 8 participants.
- Interviews - 2 interviews took place with students (one Student Panel Member, 1 Departmental Student Lead), as well as 14 interviews with Panel Members (5), PSS Cluster members (4) and ITLR Project Roles, including a Review Sponsor (5).

A list of student questions can be found in Appendix H.

Findings - The Student Perspective

Did the roles work in practice?

The Student Panel Members reported that they understood their role as a result of a mixture of the training provided and the guidance and resources available. It was noted that the training was a useful introduction, however it was a little abstract and the information became clearer once the review process had started. When asked if they felt they fully participated in all activities related to the role 50% (5) answered 'yes', with a further 40% (4) answering 'mostly'. Consideration of any barriers leading to reduced activity included student knowledge and expertise reducing ability to input into all topics, concerns around having limited background understanding, and issues noted around

payment. It was articulated that the mix of online and in-person activity aided participation.

The Student Panel Members also felt like a valued member of the ITLR panel with 80% (8) answering 'yes' and 20% (2) answering 'maybe'. The reasons provided for this included feeling like the academics listened to their points of view and that their contributions were respected. The 2 participants who answered 'maybe' noted that they felt that sometimes they felt spoken over, or that other panel members also felt they were able to speak on behalf of the student community.

The interview and focus group with the Student Panel Member highlighted that the process could feel quite lonely as the only student on a panel, agreeing with the survey respondents that more opportunities for the Student Panel members to mix would have been beneficial. The participant confirmed they felt well prepared for the role and they felt able to impact on the discussions and outcome. It was noted that enhanced communication around meeting scheduling would have made the student feel more included. The timing of the review also impacted on the student's ability to participate fully in the report writing stages of the review.

The Departmental Student Lead role was less well understood by respondents, with only 1 (10%) stating they fully understood the role and a further 80% (8) stating they 'mostly' understood the role. Similarly, only 1 respondent (10%) found the guidance useful, with 6 (60%) stating they 'mostly' found it useful, 2 (20%) stating they did not find it useful and 1 (10%) noting that did not access the guidance. Limited further explanation was provided, although one comment did note that there was misleading information in the guidance in relation to payment and another respondent felt that the department had different information to the ITLR Team.

Of the 10 Departmental Student Lead respondents 8 (80%) were involved in the development of the department's Self Evaluation Document (SED), with the remaining 2 (20%) noting they were not given the opportunity to be involved and 9 respondents (90%) were involved in supporting the student meetings. The interview with the Departmental Student Lead confirmed that the role was unclear and that expectations for engagement were limited. It was noted that communication between the department and the ITLR Review Panel did not always include the Departmental Student Lead and that communication overall could have been enhanced.

The Student Co-creation Officers were able to articulate a number of tasks undertaken within the role including working with the Project Board, recruiting student members to participate in the reviews, liaison with student societies to promote the recruitment campaign and development of guidance and resources, including the ITLR website.

Was the role beneficial?

The Student Panel Member Survey highlighted that students found the ITLR process valuable to participate in, with 90% (9) answering 'yes' and the remaining participant answering 'mostly'. They noted finding the process interesting, and they valued the

opportunity to see the things students do not always get to see. One student commented that "...the process also served as a confidence boost, a challenge to critically think and a way to get the school understand certain issues from the students' perspective." The respondent who answering 'mostly' noted that they felt it was a great opportunity with clear benefits, however they felt the timeframe made it difficult "to push for a more nuanced and detailed understanding of certain aspects".

One interviewee noted that they felt the role was beneficial to them as they were able to meet new people and gain experience of the other side of student life. They again noted this provided a 'confidence boost'. They felt the role had the potential to impact positively on the Warwick student experience going forward, which was one of the aims of applying, however they would have liked to have contributed further.

The majority of the Departmental Student Lead respondents also found the role to be valuable (30%), or mostly valuable (60%) to participate in. The reasons provided included the role feeling like a worthwhile endeavour that provided an understanding of the broader student experience, however the role was felt to be a strange position, feeling like neither staff nor student. One respondent noted that they found it 'incredibly rewarding' and another noted that they felt 'honoured to have been a part of it'. The interview participant did not feel that they had impacted significantly on the process beyond their engagement in the actual student meeting that took place as part of the review process.

The Student Co-creation Officers noted the role was beneficial to them due to the skill development opportunities, including relationship building, project management skills, experience of training and recruiting, and graphic design and website editing skills. One of the Student Co-creation Officers noted that they felt transformed by the role, noting it was initially daunting, however they felt they grew with the project, with one of the most rewarding aspects being the opportunity to see that growth in other students due to the training for the student roles. It was felt the role was beneficial to the wider process to ensure the student view was taken into consideration from the initial development stages and students were able to shape the subsequent student roles and add a different perspective to the key stakeholder discussions.

Advice for future student roles

Both the Student Panel Members and the Departmental Student Leads advised future students in this role to be proactive, to manage the time effectively and encouraged students to ensure they are fully prepared and to have the confidence to ask for help and support if required.

When asked what advice they would give to the ITLR Project Team for supporting similar roles in the future both survey and interview respondents noted that they would have appreciated wider communication with other panels to be able to share the experience. It was also noted that a clear executive summary of the department, further personalised support check-ins during the process, and more training for panel members on the expectation and value of the student role, would have further enhanced the roles. One

Departmental Student Lead also noted that they felt there could have been more focus on PGR students.

Both the Student Panel member and Departmental Student Lead roles highlighted dissatisfaction in relation to the fee payments for the role. A number of respondents mentioned the change from the originally intended flat fee payment to a hourly rate and the negative impact this had on their experience in the role.

The Student Co-creation Officers encouraged students to have the confidence to apply for these types of roles in future and to make suggestions, whilst having patience and understanding that there will be challenges. The Student Co-creation Officers also advised the ITLR Project Team that earlier communication with students and staff generally would have been beneficial and that a clearer articulation of student co-creation initially may have helped understanding of the expectations. Both Student Co-creation Officers were incredibly positive about their experience and would recommend continuing to offer these types of opportunities.

Findings - Other Stakeholder Perspectives

The common themes across the various interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders, including panel members, departmental leads, a review sponsor, and the ITLR Project Team when answering questions related to student engagement in ITLR are outlined below.

- Student involvement was considered to be vital and generally valuable. Participants articulated the value of engaging students to ensure that their voice was integral to the process. Various stakeholders note the valuable interactions with students and the positive impact of the Student Panel Member role in particular, noting they asked sensible questions and engaged effectively. One participant noted they did not have a Student Panel Member, however as noted above this was for one review panel only due to unavoidable circumstances.
- The impact of timing was noted across various focus groups and interviews. Participants stated that the timing of the reviews impacted on the ability to recruit students to take part in student meetings, and also that timing impacted on the ability of the Student Panel Member fully participating in their role, in particular during the report writing stage.
- Some participants also noted that further engagement would have been beneficial and that there were concerns around whether the engagement was fully representative of the student body, particularly as a result of timing as outlined above.
- The Student Departmental Lead role did not appear to work as expected, this was noted in focus groups with the ITLR Project Team and is also apparent from the discussions related to difficulties recruiting students, as this was part of the Student Departmental Lead's role.

Discussion

Student Co-creation Officer

The Student Co-creation Officer roles ensured student co-creation during the design phases of the ITLR project and resulted in the development of dedicated resources to support the student role. It is difficult to evaluate the impact of the role, however the students engaged in ITLR were positive about the resources developed and the clarity of the Student Panel Member role. The Student Co-creation Officers benefitted through skill development, potentially impacting on future employability and helped create a sense of belonging and increased confidence. The impact beyond development and support for the student roles is limited, however this did ensure that the roles for students were designed by students and that the student perspective was included at the Project Board.

The description of the activities undertaken suggest this role does constitute student co-creation as explained by Bovill et al. (2016), as meaningful collaboration between staff and students is apparent. The Student Co-creation Officers were active learners who constructed understanding and resources alongside staff.

Student Panel Member

The Student Panel Member role was generally well understood and provided a student perspective during the SED analysis and throughout the ITLR review visits. The students generally felt valued and able to participate effectively and key stakeholders agree that the role added to the ITLR process. Effective engagement in the report writing stage of the process is less clear, partly due to timing, however the findings were agreed as a panel, with the Student Panel Member in agreement. The students benefitted from engaging in the role through increased knowledge and understanding, alongside skill development which would potentially aid future employability. The role can be considered as student co-creation, as again students were empowered and active learners, working alongside staff to analyse the information provided and to reach judgements on outcomes.

Departmental Student Lead Role

The Departmental Student Lead Role was less well understood and students were not always able to complete the tasks identified within the role, partly due to timing and communication, and potentially partly due to the role itself requiring further thought. The value to the students in this role is also less clear. There is some skill development potential, however the student perspective suggests the value came more from feeling involved in a worthwhile process, rather than from actual activity. The stakeholders were also less able to articulate the impact and value of this role.

The role does constitute a level of student engagement, but on more of an operational and practical level than actively adding to understanding and resources. Where students in this role were able to engage actively in the SED submission process this does become more active and could be considered student co-creation, however this was not always possible due to timing.

Student Meetings

The meetings with students during the review visit are a positive example of student engagement in the ITLR process. There is some concern around the representation of students in these meetings, again partly due to review timing, however all departmental reviews included meetings with some students, ensuring they were engaged in the process. The engagement of students in the PSS Cluster reviews proved more challenging, and further engagement activity would have been beneficial.

Overall

The analysis of the student and stakeholder perspectives suggest that student contributions to ITLR were vital and generally effective. The student roles within the ITLR process were successful to varying degrees from a practical perspective, with the Student Co-creation Officers and Student Panel Members being more effective than the Departmental Student Lead role. Two of the roles are easily identifiable as constituting student co-creation in the form outlined by Bovill et al. (2016), with the other role and the input of students in review visit meetings being positive examples of student engagement where undertaken effectively. Student engagement in the PSS Cluster reviews proved to be less successful, suggesting an alternative approach may have been beneficial to engagement outside of the department.

KEQ8 - What lessons can we learn from the organisation and operation of the ITLR?

- Students want to engage for various reasons, including knowledge and skill development and the desire to have an impact. This can be seen from the high levels of students applying for the student roles and the reasons provided for applying.
- The wider community values student engagement and feels the student voice is and should be integral to evaluation and decision making. This can be seen from the stakeholder views around the student contributions to ITLR, however there is still some work to be done to ensure that all stakeholders showcase this effectively to students.
- Clearly defined and understood roles are key to successful outcomes and engagement. It is important that roles are valuable to both the process engaged in, and to the individual students and that the benefits are clearly articulated. This includes the importance of ensuring payment information is accurate.
- Timing is key. Students need to be engaged early in a process and it is essential that planning includes sufficient timing to develop roles that are in place for the initial stages of a project. It is also essential to consider the impact of delays in timing on student availability during the process.
- Students value interaction and support from other students in similar roles as this reduces feelings of isolation.

- Students can and should be able to engage across various levels. Student co-creation is valuable, but so are all the levels of student engagement from feedback or consultation through to co-creation and partnership.
- It would be beneficial to provide more opportunities for students to engage beyond their department and consider strategies and resource to enable this to take place more regularly, systematically and meaningfully.

References

Bovill, C., Cook-Sather, A., Felten, P., Millard, L., & Moore-Cherry, N. (2016). Addressing potential challenges in co-creating learning and teaching: overcoming resistance, navigating institutional norms and ensuring inclusivity in student-staff partnerships. *Higher Education*, 71(2), 195-208.

Cook-Sather, A. (2018). Listening to equity-seeking perspectives: how students' experiences of pedagogical partnership can inform wider discussions of student success. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 37(5), 923-936.

Kuh, G. D. (2009). High impact activities: what they are, why they work, who benefits. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning through the curriculum* (pp. 20-39). Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford Brookes University.

Appendix H: Student Evaluation Methods Questions

Student Panel Member Survey Questions

1. Did you feel like you were a valued member of the ITLR panel? Yes/No/Maybe
2. How and why did you feel valued/not valued?
3. Did you fully understand your role as a student panel member? Yes/No/Mostly
4. Did you find the training useful for the role? Yes/No/Mostly/Didn't attend
5. Did you find the guidance useful for the role? Yes/No/Mostly/did not access/could not find
6. Can you explain what you found useful/not useful and how this could have been improved?
7. Do you feel you fully participated in all activities related to the role? Yes/No/mostly
8. Were there any barriers to your engagement in the role? If so, what were they?
9. Did you find the ITLR process to be valuable to participate in? Yes/No/Mostly
10. Why/why not?
11. What advice would you give anyone undertaking a similar role in the future?
12. What advice would you give to the ITLR Team if supporting a similar role in the future?
13. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide about the role or the ITLR process?

Departmental Student Lead Survey Questions

1. Did you fully understand your role as a ITLR Student Lead? Yes/No/Mostly
2. Did you find the guidance related to the role useful? Yes/No/Mostly/did not access/could not find
3. Were you involved in the development of the department's self-evaluation document (SED)? Yes/I was not given the opportunity to be involved/I was given the opportunity but was unable to participate
4. Were you involved in supporting student meetings? Yes/No
5. If you have responded no to any of the above please provide detail.
6. Did you find it a valuable process to participate in? Yes/No/Mostly
7. Why/why not?
8. What advice would you give anyone undertaking a similar role in the future?
9. What advice would you give to the ITLR Team if supporting a similar role in the future?
10. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide about the role or the ITLR process?

Student Cocreation Lead Reflective Questions

1. Why did you apply for the role and what were you hoping to get from the role?
2. What is your understanding of the aim of the role?
3. Can you describe the activities that you have undertaken as part of your role?
4. What skills have you developed whilst completing this role?
5. In what ways has this role has benefitted you as an individual?
6. In what ways do you think the role was beneficial for the ITLR process?
7. What has been the most rewarding part of this role?
8. What have you found most difficult about the role?
9. What advice would you give anyone undertaking a similar role in the future?

10. What advice would you give to the ITLR Team if supporting a similar role in the future?
11. Do you have any other comments you would like to provide about the role or the ITLR process?

Focus Group Questions

Main questions

1. What was the student co-creation journey like? Can you explain your understanding of the role?
2. Did you feel well prepared for the role and how could this have been further improved?
3. What impact did your role have on the ITLR process - were you able to influence and be listened to?
4. Did you feel there were any barriers related to your role and how could these have been addressed?
5. Is there more you would have liked to have done within the process?

Additional questions if required

1. How has undertaking the role been beneficial for you?
2. How do you think having these roles in place benefitted the process?
3. Would you do the role again if you were asked? Why/why not?