

Enhancing Academic Development: A Reflexive Exploration of Staff and Students' Experiences on Curriculum Co-Creation

Rosaline Raseboya Sebolao^a

a. Faculty of the Humanities, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

E-mail: sebolaorr@ufs.ac.za

Article Info

Received: May 30, 2023

Accepted: September 02, 2023

Published: December 25, 2023



10.46303/repam.2023.29

How to cite

Sebolao, R. R. (2023). Enhancing academic development: A reflexive exploration of staff and students' experiences on curriculum co-creation. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, 5(3), 165-179.

<https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.2023.29>

Copyright license

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0).

ABSTRACT

Academic development of students and staff is a critical element in higher education, especially with reference to their engagement in curriculum development. While higher education institutions advocate for the inclusion of students in curriculum co-creation, in practice, this has not been easily implemented. The urgency to create this collaborative ecosystem necessitates a reflexive contribution. In this article, I explore the experiences of academic staff and students on their engagement in curriculum co-creation with a specific focus on developing a study guide for the newly developed module, which is part of the decolonisation process. The emphasis on meta-cognitive skills and the social justice element in the curriculum development process ensures a responsive curriculum that meets the needs of society, students and staff in a cohesive and integrated manner. I underpin this reflective study on Schön's theory of reflection on action. I argue that engaging students in curriculum creation stimulates deep learning, an empowerment attribute which I explore as it enhances innovative and critical thinking. This study employed qualitative methods of collecting and analysing data, followed by identifying important themes from the data. The reflections and emergent themes provide pathways to enhance academic development to encourage curricula co-creation processes in higher education.

KEYWORDS

Academic development; co-creation; curriculum; decolonisation; scholarship of teaching and learning.

INTRODUCTION

Co-creation of curriculum in higher education has become one of the significant practices in teaching and learning. When a curriculum is being developed as part of the academic project, one of the factors to consider is the quality of teaching and learning. Linked to the quality aspect of curriculum development is the question of how and by whom the curriculum is developed or created for (Dube et al., 2022; Omodan & Addam, 2022; Quinn & Vorster, 2019), which is viewed as part of the academic development of both academics and students. Universities may benefit from curriculum co-creation as an aspect of academic development. This assertion is supported by Dollinger and Lodge (2020), who indicate that co-creation occurs in various ways, such as instances where students serve as peer mentors and advisors, among others. Cook-Sather, Matthews and Bell (in Quinn, 2019) further advocate for curriculum co-creation as one of the forms of academic development that increases the agency of staff and students in curriculum development. By infusing a learning-centred approach, there are multiple benefits for students and staff such as critical thinking underpinned by the active involvement of all stakeholders in curriculum design and delivery. The question is whether these students who serve as peer mentors or learning facilitators, as referred to in other universities, participate in curriculum co-creation with academics. Where they participate, it is important to know the impact of their involvement on curriculum development and delivery, both on students and on themselves.

This article reflects on the experiences of staff and students on curriculum co-creation in a traditional university faculty. As an academic developer, I reflect on the journey of designing a study guide for a newly developed interdisciplinary module (five disciplines) in the Bachelor of Social Science degree which responded to ongoing decolonial agitation as coined by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2020) as “an ongoing liberation project”. Ndlovu-Gatsheni identified one of the issues in the #feesMustFall movement as the decolonisation of knowledge and curricula. The #feesMustFall movement was initiated by students in various universities in South Africa calling for, among others, the transformation of curricula. This is a huge project which needs to take place at various levels (Santos & Meneses, 2020), and it is against this premise that I take the reader through different phases of the study guide development process, challenges experienced, different perceptions from participants and the gains of engaging different agents throughout the process. I first provide the theoretical framework and literature underpinning this study.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This article is underpinned by Schön’s reflective practice (1983), where it is essential to look at what professionals do in practice instead of only focusing on what they say. Engaging in the process of study guide development with academics and other stakeholders enabled me to analyse how the final product was constructed to identify gaps and improve the curriculum development practice. I further applied critical reflexivity as coined by Stierer (as cited in Murray, 2008), who advocates for writing about and reflecting on one’s work for improvement. Stierer

(as cited in Murray 2008) refers to this form of writing as a reflective tool which I use as a significant form of contributing to academic development for the purpose of improving the curriculum development practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Perspectives on academic development

Academic development (AD) in higher education globally has become an area of interest for various scholars. My interest in this article is to provide an understanding of AD, from the perspective of other scholars. The first interesting perspective by Boud and Brew (2013) is that academic development is a professional practice which might be at risk of being approached from the provider's needs instead of the needs of beneficiaries. For instance, viewing development from a deficit approach where an assumption is made that academics lack some knowledge or skills can be problematic. Mårtensson (2014) argues that while academic developers can contribute to development, they cannot do it independently. This implies that it is a phenomenon that must be dealt with holistically and integrated among various role players. It also requires understanding what it means for academics and academic developers.

What it means for Academics and Academic developers

Almost similar views are held on the meaning of AD for academics and academic developers. The idea of AD being a professional practice is endorsed by McKenna *et al.* (2022), who highlight its focus on the professionalisation of teaching in higher education and add the integration of educational technologies in teaching and learning, the development of curricula, and initiatives aimed at supporting students, as well as research into various aspects of higher education. These ideas demonstrate that in practice, we have people who participate in activities, and their quality performance in these activities requires some support and development. Hence, Mårtensson (2014) emphasised the need for us as academic developers to improve our comprehension of how we can facilitate the development of teaching and learning cultures. This implies that academics and academic developers should be impacted as critical role players in the process (see the next paragraph on role players). Leibowitz (2014), in one of her critical reflections, made the following significant observation: My sense is that 'academic development' is about the creation of conditions supportive of teaching and learning, in the broadest sense. This would include the provision of support, as well as the generation of conditions that are supportive. For me, 'teaching and learning' would also include the teaching and learning of academics and students. We learn partly by teaching and vice versa.

Similarly, we learn by conducting research, and our research, including research on teaching, should enhance teaching. This is the nexus of academic development. Academic development is not about just one thing, nor is it a one-dimensional discipline or practice, but rather an integration of various stakeholders. Therefore, it will mean one thing for an academic who identifies a developmental need of self or the student and the other thing for an academic

developer who needs to facilitate the coming together of the stakeholders to ensure that teaching and learning cultures are positively transformed.

Who are the role players in academic development?

The above perspectives make it easier to identify the role players who make academic development possible, such as students, academics and academic developers. Academic developers facilitate the development within universities, but they need academics and students, as Mårtensson (2014) indicated that we cannot do it alone. Understanding the role players in academic development will assist in addressing the social justice aspect where they are also allowed to participate (McKenna et al., 2022) in learning, teaching, provision of support and conducting research (promotion of scholarship of teaching and learning) in an integrated manner. The integration can be effective if academic developers are viewed as enablers of good teaching by the academics and not only as administrators (Vorster in Winberg et al. 2020), which is the case in some institutions of higher learning.

Perspectives on Curriculum co-creation and decolonisation

The curriculum conversations in higher education gained more attention during the #FeesMustFall, #RhodesMustFall movement (2015-2016). Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2020) identified, as one of the issues for change demanded by these movements, the decolonisation of knowledge and curricula, which needed to address Eurocentrism's resilience in universities and relegation of indigenous knowledge systems to the periphery. The universities in the Global South were challenged to shake off the chains of imposed epistemologies and start considering their knowledge as legitimate. This is a critical aspect of academic development, and as highlighted in the paragraph above, it also requires various role players for it to succeed. Hence the students took the initiative. While it has always been important to consider what and whose knowledge should be taught at the university, the student movement elevated the debates. Daniels (in Langmia, 2022) demonstrate that students of different races, gender and class consciousness collaborated and disrupted the orders of power to bring their needs for curriculum decolonisation to the fore, making them significant role players in curriculum co-creation.

In principle, curriculum co-creation in a student-centred university should be a core element to enable engagement between students and academic staff. Lubicz-Nawrocka (2018) believed that this engagement between staff and students should be mutual and Cook-Sather et al. (2019) argue that making student partners in curriculum development may bring some improvements.

For this article, I share the context of the desired co-creation in the Humanities faculty, which emanated from the programme review conducted in line with institutional requirements and the integrated transformation plan. The latter plan for the faculty aimed at developing guidelines for curriculum renewal, and the process of developing this study guide was a step toward this objective. One of the recommendations of the review led to the development of two new Social Science modules, but in this case, I focus on one, namely Introduction to Social

Science in Africa. The module's purpose is to enable students to attain a set of graduate attributes for employability. The process is outlined in the methodology section below.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, I followed a qualitative research approach to academic development and curriculum co-creation to highlight practices for enhancing academic development. The study guide development process that was followed infused a decoloniality paradigm. I arranged a series of workshops with the support of the academic developer from the Centre for Teaching and Learning, as Dollinger and Lodge (2020) argue that cooperation between different agents has the potential to influence the effective design and implementation of the curriculum. There was a suggestion that an external person be contracted to develop the study guide, but I disagreed with the suggestion as I believed that the people who were going to teach must be involved. I further requested some academics to provide me with the names of postgraduate students from their disciplines and received four names. The workshops were intended to enhance the scholarly engagement with curriculum development among academics and academic developers, and they were attended by a total of 16 participants comprising lecturers from the five disciplines which are part of the module, academic developers and academic facilitators, one from the latter category was also a student. The other three of the four invited students did not attend. The presentations were made to direct the conversations towards the development of the study guide, and these presentations focused on national and institutional frameworks on curriculum development to steer alignment.

The module was divided into themes which were allocated to academics from various disciplines and academic developers who invested time in analysing the themes. These participants, led by the convenor, indulged in the relevant sources to compile the themes and collaboratively consolidated the study guide.

This writing is a reflection on the process for our learning and future improvements. Since we are a learning organisation, having introduced the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the faculties, we need to constantly reflect on our actions (Mhuirí, 2017).

Ethical consideration

As part of the newly established Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) project within the faculty, I applied for ethical clearance to the Ethics Committee to conduct research in the faculty and the university. In addition to this, the Protection of Personal Information Act (POPIA) informed consent was signed by all participants to assure them of confidentiality and anonymity.

Sampling

Purposive sampling was used to identify those participants who were rich with information (Patton, 2002), as participants were drawn from all people who were involved in the development of the study guide and some from facilitators who were not involved in the development to determine the impact of the non-involvement on teaching. Interview questions

were initially sent to all 16 participants who were part of the workshops and subsequently to the facilitators of the module who were not part of the development. These participants were lecturers, facilitators and students.

Data collection and analysis

A set of questions used comprised of the biographic data in order to determine whether all disciplines participated, and the main questions focused on the following:

- What process was followed in the design of the study guide?
- If students were engaged, how did they do this?
- What is their views on the impact of co-creation on their teaching and students' learning
- Suggestions on academic development support.

These open-ended questions were able to unearth significant aspects (Fook in Lishman, 2015) as they allowed participants to reflect on their involvement in the study guide development and how this influenced and contributed to their development (Schön, 1983). They had the freedom to expand on the questions, providing more detail than expected. All responses were labelled in numerical terms from Respondent 1 to 16 to ensure that the anonymity of the respondents was maintained.

Thematic analysis was conducted in order to capture the main experiences from the reflections. In the words of Smith (2015), I identified, analysed and interpreted patterns that emanated from the data to make a meaningful contribution towards curriculum development and academic development.

FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

The findings reflected in this section constitute the responses from 7 of the total 16 participants because of their detailed responses to the questions and 4 of the facilitators who were not part of the study guide development. I purposefully included the latter in determining how facilitating without having been part of the development was affecting them.

The following section focuses on those involved and prominent themes from their responses to the questions.

Perceived roles

On sharing a detailed process, almost all respondents explained their understanding of the process, indicating that they were content with how it went. However, I want to acknowledge the different perspective from Respondent 1, who expressed the following:

“Cindy (fictitious name for anonymity) took on the project's coordinator role. The teaching manager of the Faculty should not be the coordinator of any collaborative creation and writing of a module. I am saying this not because the person lacks expertise but because of the workload this entails. In my view, the teaching manager should be an observer through the process and not be directly involved.”

This narrative confirmed the literature that academic developers are viewed as administrators (McKenna, 2022), and it drew my attention to the need for regular interactions

and conversations with academics on curriculum matters. I further agree with the notion by Vorster (in Winberg et al. 2020) that academic developers need to share their conception of their roles with academics to create clarity in their ways of working.

An academic developer who was engaged in the process shared her views that illustrated how the roles of others matter in the co-creation as follows:

"I do think that co-creation can work well if the initial planning is very clear. Perhaps the bigger group could develop the outcomes for all units before the different teams start working on their parts to create coherence and flow. It will also help the teams to see the bigger picture while they are working on their parts." Respondent 6.

I believe that this is a significant area of co-creation, knowing who are the members in the team for coherence to be created.

Student voices and knowledge gained

None of the respondents from academics were aware of students being involved in this process. I did not make it explicit in the workshops about the inclusion of students, and the fact that even those invited did not attend suggests that their inclusion in curriculum development was a new thing.

Respondent 4 confirmed Mårtensson's (2014) view that academic developers cannot work alone when he expressed his feelings about the involvement that *"It seemed laborious at times, but I felt satisfied knowing that we followed due process and that the development of the study guide was not an individual's sole domain."*

This respondent further perceived the role of students as critical by stating *"I think it will be beneficial, especially when we begin to take student voices into consideration, as well as facilitators. It is important that students are not passive in their learning process."* This was confirmed by Respondent 7, a student who felt that her voice mattered in the process and said:

"Yes, I feel that my voice was recognised, as my contributions were shared with various departments in the first feedback session. My contribution was recognised, as I believe that I would not have been part of this module development till the end of my contribution was not recognised at all." What emerges from this response is a seemingly positive relationship between her and the academics, which, Bovill (2020) says should be at the heart of co-created learning and teaching.

Literature indicates that students who are taken as partners in curriculum co-creation develop the language and commitment to participate (Cooker-Sather, 2020). Respondent 7 confirmed this by indicating that: *"Some of the jargon made it hard to understand and engage. However, it was no train smash as I would do a bit of research after any confusing session, I may have experienced"* (Respondent 7).

The respondent further confirmed this view by saying: *"Learning from them as a junior and co-creating this module with them brings together my experience as a student and facilitator with their years of experience to improve the quality of teaching from how it was done in the past, to how it should be done now and, in the future, - putting emphasis on the lacking teaching"*

skills and teaching approach. Furthermore, co-creation gives us an opportunity to learn from one another's different learning and teaching styles used in our various departments and use those inputs in packing this module."

On the question specifically directed to students on how their involvement would impact their facilitation, Respondent 7 further shows how knowledge was gained by indicating that *"If I were to facilitate learning in this module, it would have a great impact on my performance as a facilitator as I will have background knowledge of the module – what it is that the department is seeking to achieve with this module and how they wish for it to be conveyed to students."*

The same respondent highlighted the lessons in the following statement:

"I learned how to process my thoughts better and think more critically than I ever had as a student. The intimidation I felt from my seniors encouraged me to listen effectively during our feedback session and to learn as much as I could from them, as in their shoes is where I would love to see myself one day."

This, for me, denotes the power of co-creation, and it is aligned with what Lubicz-Nawrocka (2018) found in a study on curriculum co-creation with students that it fosters a learning community where participants are encouraged to participate, and this is what is crucial in a student-centred university. A statement on the process by Respondent 2 below demonstrates the knowledge gained from being engaged:

"In the development of the study, the relevant theme(s) was identified. The objectives for the theme were then decided on. The relevant and appropriate reading materials were scouted and finally the assessment activities aligned with the objectives and reading material were determined."

Respondent 3 felt that if he were to facilitate this module, his participation in co-creation would help him in *"Producing better-suited graduates within the Social Science sphere and work-ready individuals."* This view made me realise that engaging other role players in co-creation benefits them with gained knowledge and ensures that the curriculum can benefit the students. I also noted that this respondent was aware that the module's main purpose was to promote a set of graduate attributes for employability.

Teamwork

Co-creation signifies a partnership, collaboration and ways of working together in meaningful ways as a team (Bovill, 2020). Some of the views in this study indicated that engaging in co-creation taught them teamwork, and I believe that, as respondents 4 and 6 above alluded that one person could not do this process, this tells that teamwork was valued. Another view on teamwork is highlighted in the statement below:

"I learned that working as a team and hearing every team member's thoughts and ideas is very important. I learned that we as people actually learn more from each other when taking on a collective project rather than doing it individually..." Respondent 7.

Responded 2 confirmed the relationship that existed in the whole process as *"Very collegial and transparent and great teamwork across the board"* and supported by Respondent 3, who said:

“The process was a collaboration between various stakeholders, namely Teaching and Learning Management, module leaders, programme directors and support staff from the Centre of Teaching and Learning.”

The findings in the next section relate to facilitators of the module (Respondents 8, 9, 10 and 11) who were not engaged in the development thereof. I decided to engage them in this study to see the impact on non-involvement and identified some themes from their narratives.

Pedagogical challenges experienced

These participants were asked about the challenges they experienced as they facilitated the module not having been part of the co-creation, and their varied responses were interpreted in line with the literature.

For instance, the three responses below demonstrate the effects of non-involvement with regard to pedagogical challenges:

“My biggest challenge was adapting to full-on online facilitation. With online facilitation come technical issues, such as the internet, which may hinder learning. Maintaining engagement is also a challenge: Students often disengage from the discussion, which can derail the session. I always have to find ways to keep students engaged and interested.” Respondent 8

“Difficulty with student engagement over blackboard- keeping students interested for an hour. Student preparedness for classes. Most students were confused as to what was expected of them; as a result, they would come unprepared, and the session would be used as a mini ‘lecture’ to ensure that no student is left behind.” Respondent 10

“Lack of engagement from students, Communication barriers” Respondent 11

While these responses might not be directly reflecting on the effects of non-involvement in the process of co-creation, it can be argued that if these respondents were part of the process, the concerns would be easily handled because the engagement of various role players provided diverse discussions on not only the content but the pedagogy as well as the assessment. This argument is in line with Billet and Martin’s (2018) view that the application of co-creation of knowledge and curriculum affords exciting possibilities in enabling deep engagement. All these respondents confirm this view, however, in the negative. Respondent 9 expressed the concern regarding content as follows:

“I had a difficult time grasping the module content and what this module entails as there was little to no orientation. The activities in the portfolio needed a lot of clarity so that I could relay it back in detail to the students.” Respondent 9

To further support this response, I need to indicate that these facilitators were appointed shortly before the module was presented hence this view of little orientation. It therefore indicates that if they had been part of the development, the orientation would not have been a reason for the pedagogical issues experienced.

Perceived power relations

“The power relationship between myself and full-time academics is one of collaboration and mutual support rather than one of domination or subordination. Even though I do not have power over the course content and assessments, there is a successful collaboration between the contract facilitators and the full-time academics. Everyone understands their role and contribution to the module. The full-time academics are responsible for designing the module and making decisions about the delivery of the module. My role is to support their efforts by conducting tutorials with students.” Respondent 8

“Some of the academics were not open to understanding the weaknesses of the students from the perspective of facilitators as they are the first point of engagement. They were oblivious to the plight of students left behind in terms of not understanding concepts and basic instructions. However, there was diffuse power between the Ms Nelly (fictitious name for anonymity) and the facilitators. She was attentive and thoroughly engaged the facilitators in her theme and concepts. This ensured a uniform engagement and understanding of the theme and interpretation to the students.” Respondent 10

From these two respondents, it is clear that power relations, whether positive or negative, will impact the teaching just as they can impact curriculum creation. Bovill (2020) considers it important to change power relations between academics and students, and in this case, I would like to add facilitators to enhance co-creation. I believe that the nature of the pedagogic relations could also depend on role players' involvement in co-creation. Billet and Martin (2018) support that the co-creation of knowledge is part of a larger teaching and learning context. It is, therefore, considerable to create an atmosphere that promotes positive relationships during co-creation to enhance quality teaching and learning.

Views on the role of co-creation:

These participants were asked what their views on the co-creation of curriculum were, and their differentiated responses are recorded below:

“It could firstly lead to improved relationships between the facilitators and other academics in the department. It would help build stronger relationships as we work together towards a common goal. Secondly, co-creation allows for different perspectives to be brought to the table. This can lead to more creative and innovative solutions. Lastly, it could increase engagement and better participation from the facilitators. The facilitators would feel a lot more invested and thus produce productive outcomes.” Respondent 8

“It would result in quality engagement of content material. Facilitators and academicians would have a uniform voice, and this would decrease confusion among students” Respondent 10

“Co-creating with students, designing their own learning experience. With emphases on students' perspectives (constructivist learning theory) helping students construct knowledge and meaning from lived experiences rather than passively taking in information” Respondent 11.

I highlighted the important elements from these responses as they are aligned with what has been discussed in the literature. I believe these elements are necessary to promote quality teaching and enhance student learning. It starts with quality curriculum, and the development needs to be done collaboratively with the relevant role players such as academics, facilitators and students.

Suggestions for improving curriculum development process

The participants made some suggestions for improvement in the curriculum development process, and I found them engaging because they became beneficial in the development of guidelines or strategies for curriculum development in the faculty.

Respondent 11 highlighted *“Counselling, Dialogue with the Faculty, Access to continuous learning opportunities and professional development.”*

Respondents 8 and 10 expanded as follows:

“A collaborative approach where all stakeholders work together to develop the curriculum is more effective than a top-down approach. All the stakeholders, including the facilitators and the students, need to be involved in the co-creation process.” Respondent 8

“Quarterly meetings to understand the strengths and weakness of students. Meetings would also assist in diffusing power relations, and facilitators will be able to provide permanent staff with in-depth feedback on student readiness and engagement without being made to feel that the responsibility lies solely with them.” Respondent 10.

Academic development support suggested:

These facilitators offered valuable suggestions for development and have critical implications for academic development.

“There needs to be an orientation of the module. It is important for facilitators to understand the ideology behind the design of the study guide. We need to understand what it is that is asked for so that we can be in unison. Again, for this module, we need to meet face to face so that we can get acquainted with each other as we will be working together for the whole academic year.” Respondent 9

“Professional development programs or workshops that can provide us with opportunities to learn about curriculum development.” Respondent 8

“Content training. Teaching styles are different, and expectations differ per lecturer. If there was content training provided, facilitators would be ready to clear any confusions students may have.” Respondent 10

“Tailor curriculum to meet virtual or in-person needs. Ensuring curriculum coherence”
Respondent 11

Implications for curriculum and academic development

The findings of this study call for interventions in both academic and curriculum development. The study revealed that while students need to be included in the co-creation of curriculum, this is still in theory and not yet the practice in the faculty. A space needs to be created for student voices in curriculum co-creation. It was evident that the roles of relevant people in the process

were not clear and needed to be clarified. However, teamwork was seen to be of significance in curriculum and academic development, which is a good start for improvement.

The challenges expressed by facilitators who were not involved in the co-creation were related to pedagogy, power relations between facilitators and academics, and student engagement. The implication was that co-creation could mitigate these challenges and provide students an opportunity for deep engagements. One of the lessons learned by a facilitator was expressed as:

“Adequate preparation is needed for the module. The module was interdisciplinary, requiring one to have had at least three disciplines as their major in the third year. This will benefit the facilitator and the quality of content delivered to students. Learning is not linear- one does not only learn within the institution but as co-creators of knowledge; some learning takes form outside – highlighting the importance of community engagement. There is a need for practicality. If students had a community project they were engaged in, it would enhance their research skills.” Respondent 10

I believe that this respondent shared valuable lessons which need to be incorporated into the planning of the faculty to prevent frustrations among facilitators and students, as reflected by the respondent below regarding the feeling of facilitating without being involved in the design:

“Overwhelmed and out of place. As a facilitator, I would have benefited from content training instead of content debriefing. Academicians would rush through the content or their expectations of the theme without holistically including the facilitator in the preparation. To expect a facilitator to prepare tutorial slides without first meeting with the lecturer proved detrimental to students. In some sessions, students would point out contradicting statements between the facilitator and the lecturers.” Respondent 10.

Furthermore, it is clear from the reflections that co-creation can enhance and strengthen pedagogical relationships, create an opportunity for different perspectives from various role players, increase engagement by all role players and improve outputs. Productivity is what every endeavour aims at, and the same applies to the Faculty of the Humanities, especially in academic and curriculum development. To address the findings and create an enabling environment, I have conducted a workshop with academics to discuss principles for curriculum development, transformation and renewal with the purpose of developing process guidelines. With the inputs from the workshop, I developed the curriculum transformation and renewal process with the following guiding principles:

- Curriculum renewal will follow two lines of processes- formal and informal.
- The formal lines would be aligned with the institutional policies and processes.
- The informal/Organic may follow a bottom-up approach where a culture of conversations is established.
- Identify faculty champions and decolonial experts to enhance the conversations and debates.

- Form small groups of conversations using clusters that are already existing in the faculty.
- The faculty must engage students in issues of curriculum transformation and renewal. Various platforms, such as student indaba, can be utilised.
- All academics must attend the curriculum renewal programme (CRP) offered by the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) as part of their staff development.
- Curriculum-related workshops will be conducted within the faculty on aspects not covered in the CRP.
- The faculty will participate in the programme reviews as scheduled by the Directorate for Institutional Research and Academic Planning (DIRAP) and respond to recommendations made by the review panels, with specific reference to curriculum renewal.
- Improvement and monitoring plans will be developed and reported on at the Academic Committee meetings.
- Engaging in interdisciplinary research on mutual curriculum matters and sharing these at various scholarly platforms.

Following the approval of these guidelines, I conducted a workshop with academics to familiarise them with the guidelines and processes. I need to highlight that I encourage student engagement in my engagements with academics to start to build a culture of student engagement.

Through the principle of conversations, roles will be clarified, and processes will be known for enhanced curriculum and academic development in the faculty.

CONCLUSION

This study concluded that the inclusion of students as partners in curriculum co-creation was not effectively implemented as only one student participated and even those invited did not attend. This is something that cannot be ignored if we are to have relevant and responsive curricula that contribute to the production of globally competitive graduates. The principles highlighted above as part of the developed guidelines, are meant to assist with the process of transforming curricula together with students and while this study was conducted in the faculty, the principles shared can assist any faculty or university. The limitation of this study is that focus of co-creation was on a study guide of one module in a faculty and may require a further study that will focus on either a full module or programme co-creation.

REFERENCES

- Billett, P. & Martin, D. (2018). Engaging students in co-creation of sociological knowledge and curriculum design as a form of deep engagement. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 15(5), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.15.5.7>

- Boud, D. & Brew, A. (2013). Reconceptualising academic work as professional practice: implications for academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 18(3), 208–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2012.671771>
- Bovill, C. (2020). Co-creation in learning and teaching: the case for a whole-class approach in higher education. *Higher education*, 79(6), 1023-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00453-w>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Respecting voices: How the co-creation of teaching and learning can support academic staff, underrepresented students, and equitable practices. *Higher education*, 79(5), 885-901. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00445-w>
- Cook-Sather, A., Matthews, K. E. & Bell, A. (2019). Transforming curriculum development through co-creation with students, in Quinn (ed) *Re-imagining Curriculum: Spaces for disruption*, 107-126.
- Daniels, G. (2022). Decolonising curricula: Unravelling the master signifier in students' discourse from their demands during the # FeesMustFall protest in South Africa. *Decolonising communication studies*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 1-20.
- de Sousa Santos, B. & Meneses, M. P. (Eds.). (2019). *Knowledges born in the struggle: Constructing the epistemologies of the Global South*. Routledge.
- Dollinger, M. & Lodge, J. (2020). Student-staff co-creation in higher education: an evidence-informed model to support future design and implementation. *Journal of higher education Policy and Management*, 42(5), 532-546. <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjhe20>
- Dube, B., Makura, A., Modise, A., & Tarman, B. (2022). COVID-19 and the Quest for Reconfiguration of Disciplines: Unpacking New Directions. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 5(1), i-viii. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2002.12>
- Fook, J. (2015). Reflective practice and critical reflection, in Lishman, J. *Handbook for practice learning in Social Work and Social Care: Knowledge and Theory*. London and Philadelphia.
- Leibowitz, B. (2014). Reflections on academic development: What is in a name?. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 19(4), 357-360. <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rija20>
- Lubicz-Nawrocka, T. M. (2018). Students as partners in learning and teaching: The benefits of co-creation of the curriculum. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1), 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijasp.v2i1.3207>
- Mårtensson, K. (2014). *Influencing teaching and learning microcultures. Academic development in a research-intensive university*. Lund University.
- McKenna, S., Hlengwa, A., Quinn, L. & Vorster, J. A. (2022). From affirmative to transformative approaches to academic development. *Teaching in higher education*, 27(8), 1005-1017. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2119077>

- Mhuirí, S. N. (2017). Considering research frameworks as a tool for reflection on practices: Grain-size and levels of change. In *CERME 10*. <https://hal.science/hal-01949098>
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2020). African Decolonization's Past and Present Trajectories. *Current History*, 119(817), 188-193. http://online.ucpress.edu/currenthistory/article-pdf/119/817/188/400723/curh_119_817_188
- Omodan, B., & Addam, B. (2022). Analysis of Transformational Teaching as a Philosophical Foundation for Effective Classrooms. *Journal Of Curriculum Studies Research*, 4(2), 15-29. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2022.9>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*, 3rd edn. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks.
- Quinn, L. & Vorster, J. (2019). Why the focus on curriculum? Why now? The role of academic development, in Quinn, L. (ed) *Re-imagining Curriculum: Spaces for disruption* (pp. 1–22). SuN PReSS: South Africa.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Temple Smith.
- Smith, J. A. (2015). Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods. *Qualitative psychology*, 1-312
- Stierer, B. (2008). Learning to write about teaching: understanding the writing demands of lecturer development programmes in higher education, in Murray (ed) *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education*, (pp.34-45). New York: Open University Press
- Vorster, J. A. (2020). Academic development: Autonomy pathways towards gaining legitimacy, in Winberg (ed) *Building Knowledge In higher education* (pp. 272-289). Routledge.