

Hughes, Annie Livingstone, Michener, Christina, Mohamed, Kamal and Mcduff, Nona (2019) Curriculum co-creation as a transformative strategy to address differential student outcomes : the example of Kingston University's Student Curriculum Consultant Programme. *Compass*, 12(1).

<https://doi.org/10.21100/compass.v12i1.955>

Curriculum co-creation as a transformative strategy to address differential student outcomes: the example of Kingston University's Student Curriculum Consultant Programme

Annie Livingstone Hughes, Christina Michener, Kamal Mohamed, Nona McDuff
Kingston University London

Abstract

This paper examines the role that curriculum co-creation can play in creating a more inclusive higher education and, in so doing, addresses the complex challenge of differential student outcomes and attainment. It achieves this by exploring Kingston University's Student Curriculum Consultant Programme (SCCP), which is an integral part of the institution's Inclusive Curriculum Framework (ICF). Students who work as Curriculum Consultants use their own diverse lived experiences and Kingston University's ICF to collaborate with staff to create more accessible, meaningful and globally-relevant curricula at all levels of the institution. The consultants work with staff in a variety of ways to address potential barriers in the curriculum. This paper examines three instances of co-creation facilitated through the SCCP. We argue that this programme acts as a mechanism through which the institution can not only legitimate, but also actively endorse and encourage co-creation in order to create more inclusive curricula.

Introduction

Differential outcomes between student groups based on ethnicity, socio-economic class and disability have been persistent in higher education (HE) (HEFCE 2015; Universities UK, 2016). The most recent data from the newly-formed UK Office for Students (OfS) evidences the continuing reality of these perennial patterns, highlighting significant differences between students who gain a first or upper second class degree, compared to those that do not, on the basis of socio-economic status, as measured by Participation of Local Areasⁱ. Students from high participation neighbourhoods significantly outperform students who come from lower participation neighbourhoods. Similarly, age is a key demographic delineator of attainment outcomes, with younger students outperforming mature students. The most recent data also supports the existence of the most pernicious unexplained 'gap' in attainment outcomes based on ethnicity, which has become known as the BME attainment gapⁱⁱ. This data shows a staggering twenty-two percentage point difference between the proportions of White graduates gaining a first or upper second class degree compared with Black graduates and an eleven percentage point difference between White and Asian graduates (OfS, 2018). The challenge of differential attainment based on demographic status is not only confined to the UK: other HE institutions in the US and Australia report similar challenges.

Identifying and addressing these disparate outcomes has become a key challenge for HE (Millward, 2018). To date, the dominant discourse of differential attainment is one based on a model of student deficit, where students from particular backgrounds are deemed to have

particular barriers preventing them from achieving in HE. However recent research has challenged the student-deficit model and points to the fact that the causes of differential attainment are incredibly complex and multi-dimensional (Mountford-Zimdars, 2015). Whilst acknowledging the challenges faced by some students, this thesis recognises that normative cultures of/in universities can act to 'other' students from 'non-traditional' backgrounds (Crozier *et al.*, 2008, Reay *et al.*, 2010, Meuleman *et al.*, 2014). There is a growing body of work which argues that 'exclusive' institutional cultures and academic curricula (which normalise the lived experiences of so-called 'traditional' students at the expense of the backgrounds, behaviours and values of our increasingly diverse student body) have a significant part to play in differential student outcomes (Ross *et al.*, 2018). The response to these arguments must be a reflective approach to identify the (often unwritten and unrecognised) normative assumptions that are embedded in the curricula and learning cultures of higher educational institutions (HEIs) which contribute to differential student outcomes (Hughes, 2016).

The contention that a significant proportion of curriculaⁱⁱⁱ in HE is Western-centric is well rehearsed (Maila, 2010; Tange and Kastberg, 2013). Clearly curricula centred on the knowledge and lived experiences of dominant social groups do not best serve the needs of a more diverse society (Gundara and Sharma, 2010, quoted in Daddow, 2013). We argue that what is required of HE is a robust and thorough reflection of the dimensions of our curricula and how they impact on the learning experience of diverse student groups. This will no doubt involve adopting curricula that better reflect, embrace and celebrate the backgrounds of all students in their classrooms.

In the main body of this paper, we explore the potential of curriculum co-creation to create more inclusive curricula that echo and acknowledge the backgrounds of our students. First, however, we define co-creation, and subsequently consider its relationship with an inclusive curriculum, arguing that curricula which students are encouraged to craft will be inherently more inclusive than one created solely by academic teachers.

Co-creation and creating an inclusive curriculum

Whilst it is true to say that academics remain the principal gatekeepers of curricula in HE, there is a growing recognition of the role that students can play in curricular co-creation' and how, in turn, this contributes to teaching excellence (McCulloch, 2009; Willis and Gregory, 2016). There is, however, no single agreed definition of 'co-creation'. Terms such as 'students as partners' (Healy *et al.*, 2014; Levy *et al.*, 2010), 'co-producers' (McCulloch, 2009) and 'co-constructors' (Fraser and Bosanquet, 2006) are used inter-changeably. What is clear is that co-creation requires the active participation of students in their learning and is not simply about 'the student voice'. Co-creation requires a fundamental shift, from the traditional lecturer-student relationship – where one party, the teacher, is seen as the 'producer of knowledge' and the other, the student, as its 'consumer' - to one in which teachers and students act together as joint constructors of knowledge (Fraser and Bosanquet, 2006). Whilst this does not mean starting from a blank canvas (and can indeed draw on existing knowledge), it implies that students are equal partners in a co-operative process of finding new knowledge and perspectives (Willis and Gregory, 2016). In other words, co-creation, rejecting that producer/consumer relationship, demands a sustained epistemological reinterpretation that is neither ad hoc nor tokenistic' (Willis and Gregory, 2016). Whilst we acknowledge the critics of co-creation, who suggest that it has the potential

to diminish the rigour and stretch of a learning experience, we argue, on the contrary, that co-creation has the capacity to enrich the learning experience for all students.

We argue that the philosophical approach of co-creation is fundamentally aligned with the epistemological underpinning of an inclusive curriculum. Both of these challenge and reverse the student-deficit model, so that “*staff take on the role of enablers of disempowered students*” (Healey *et al.*, 2014, p.15, in Willis and Gregory, 2016, p. 5). An inclusive curriculum, encompassing diverse perspectives and strategies, is more rounded, relevant and meaningful (Hockings, 2010).

Co-creation requires a profound change of practice by academic institutions and their teachers, as does robust engagement with the principles of an inclusive curriculum. Both challenge the silencing of voices in the classroom, enabling both staff and students to contribute to the curriculum and ultimately see themselves, their backgrounds and their experiences reflected in it. An ‘inclusive’, ‘co-created’ curriculum is crucial to ensuring that all students are connected to their learning and therefore more likely to achieve successful outcomes. Co-creation therefore has a fundamental role in addressing the retention, progression and attainment differentials of various student groups from a range of ‘protected characteristics’ (HEFCE, 2015) and should be considered a transformative strategy for achieving a more meaningful, student-centred learning experience for our contemporary diverse student body.

In the remainder of this paper, we explore one example of how HEIs can engage with co-creation. It presents the ‘Student Curriculum Consultants Programme’ (SCCP), a Kingston University (London) initiative developed as part of this institution’s ‘Inclusive Curriculum Framework’ (ICF). Before we present our case-studies, it is essential to contextualise them within the work on the ICF at Kingston.

Kingston University’s ‘Inclusive Curriculum Framework’ (ICF)

Kingston University is a post-1992 university in South West London with approximately 15,000 students, many of whom come from a range of ‘widening participation’ backgrounds. Specifically, over fifty per cent of students at Kingston are from black and minority ethnic (BME) backgrounds. Over the past five years, one of Kingston’s key priorities has been to reduce its BME attainment gap, by taking a strategic institutional approach to the changing of practice rather than by focusing on individual small-scale interventions (McDuff *et al.*, 2018). Since it began five years ago, the approach has been largely successful, with reductions in the attainment gap between BME and white students seen year on year from twenty-nine percentage points in 2011/12 to eleven percentage points in 2016/17 (McDuff, *op.cit.*).

Part of Kingston’s institutional approach has been to develop and subsequently deliver training and support to staff to use the ICF in their teaching and learning (McDuff and Hughes, 2015). The framework identifies three key principles which together embody inclusivity. These are:

- i) to create an accessible curriculum;
- ii) to enable students to see themselves and their backgrounds reflected in the curriculum;

- iii) to equip students with the skills to contribute positively to, and work in, a diverse, global environment.

The principle of an accessible curriculum extends beyond ensuring that the curriculum 'accommodates' students with (physical and mental) disabilities and learning differences by recognising that educational practice is culturally-specific (Haigh, 2009). The challenge, therefore, is to ensure that curricula do not give competitive advantage to students with particular local knowledges. Accessibility to institutional norms and cultures becomes paramount, recognising the responsibility of academic institutions to use accessible language to ensure that all students from whatever background can be fully active members of the UK academic knowledge community (McKay and Devlin, 2014). The principle of enabling students to see themselves reflected in the curriculum operates in two domains: the first relates to the ways in which disciplines address the epistemological challenge to Eurocentric narratives; the second challenges HEIs to ensure that students see – as role models, mentors and teachers – 'people like them' (Umbach, 2006) in their everyday HE experiences, as well as in curriculum content and case studies. The final principle of Kingston's ICF is to equip students with the skills to contribute positively to and work in a diverse, global environment. The starting point here is that students who are exposed to multiple perspectives and life-worlds and learn to respect diversity and difference in the classroom will be better equipped to work collaboratively with others from a variety of cultures, backgrounds and positions in the workplace (Svensson and Wihlbord, 2010). Engaging students in the classroom gives them a sense of legitimacy and belonging; further, it enables them to learn from each other.

Kingston's philosophy is that, if academic teachers are mindful of these three principles in their curriculum design and student engagement strategies, they will be more able to facilitate students' sense of belonging to, and connection with, their learning and thus more likely to motivate them to produce their best work. The SCCP was developed as part of the ICF and is introduced in the next section along with three case studies in which the 'Curriculum Consultants' contributed to the co-creation of the curriculum. Co-creation is viewed as a central strategy to ensure that academic curricula are more inclusive or, in other words, more relevant, meaningful and accessible to our increasingly diverse student body (Hockings, 1990).

Kingston University's 'Student Curriculum Consultant Programme' (SCCP)

Following the initial success of Kingston's ICF, the idea for the SCCP was developed to involve students in institutional change, creating a more inclusive learning experience for all students in order to reduce the BME attainment gap. The main goals of this programme are to allow students to use the ICF to develop curricula, share their diverse voices and perspectives and gain valuable professional experience by working with academic staff on curriculum development.

Curriculum Consultants are undergraduate and graduate students, trained and supported by academic and professional staff to share with academic course teams and professional services their diverse perspectives on curricula. They use the principles of the ICF to review course materials and discuss how a particular course or module can work toward becoming more inclusive of and accessible to our diverse student body. Participating in such a consultation encourages staff to see their curricula from a range of student perspectives and

provides an opportunity, through collaboration with students, to consolidate their understanding of the ICF.

The 2016-2017 pilot programme trained more than eighty student consultants. Evaluation of this programme suggested that fewer, more robustly trained consultants would be more effective. In consequence, the subsequent year saw the appointment of eight undergraduate Curriculum Consultants and two Senior Consultants (Level 7 Masters students) as leaders. In accordance with a key programme principle, these were paid roles, so that students who might not, for time and money reasons, undertake them on a voluntary basis would be encouraged to participate and offer their perspectives. The appointees represented such institution-wide courses as visual arts, social sciences, business and maths; they fulfilled the key criteria of commitment to equality and the desire to contribute to making the University more inclusive. The two Senior Consultants took responsibility for mentoring the others as well as for speaking publicly and delivering workshops, in both of which opportunities they supported their team to share.

A programme of training ensured that the students were fully conversant with all aspects of the ICF, felt supported and had the confidence to share their own perspectives and speak about issues of (in)equality in HE. The training involved a session on inequality in HE and Kingston's approach, which firmly rejects the student-deficit model to differential attainment. The training also provided students with the opportunity to unpick and discuss issues such as privilege and inequality.

The Curriculum Consultants' main goal is to encourage academic staff across the University to create more inclusive teaching and learning experiences for students. They focus upon curricular matters through the lens of the ICF. As part of their work in this programme, they consulted with academic staff on curriculum development, participated in staff development workshops which focused on inclusive teaching, met with course teams to give constructive feedback about the inclusivity of their programmes and delivered – to staff and students – workshops focused on such topics as the language that academics use, which can (unwittingly) create barriers for some student groups.

In the remainder of this paper, we discuss three successful case studies which together reflect the initial outcomes of a programme, still in its infancy. The case studies highlight varying degrees of co-creation between student Curriculum Consultants and academic staff and their programmes. The final section of the paper considers how the programme has been evaluated and offers an insight, from the Curriculum Consultants' own perspective, into the benefits of participating in the programme.

Co-creation: Curriculum Consultant case studies

Ensuring inclusivity in current programmes: the example of Business Management

The Curriculum Consultants worked with the Business Management team at Kingston University holistically, reviewing every module on the course. A large team of seven consultants worked closely with heads of the course and agreed to review in depth each module on the virtual learning environment (VLE) – a total of twenty-three modules. This involved two preliminary steps. First, the project manager of the Curriculum Consultant programme met with the members of the Business Management team to understand their needs and explain the role the consultants could play. This was an important part of ensuring

that the course leader supported and understood the programme and contributed to the process – in terms of providing an insight not only into her/his current concerns, but also into how the course could benefit from the feedback. Second, the Curriculum Consultants met with the project manager to understand the task and prepare for a meeting with the course team. During this meeting, the group looked at one of the modules on the VLE and used the ICF as a tool to analyse and discuss it, thereby identifying what was, from the consultants' varied perspectives, less accessible in terms of content and presentation. The project manager and the participating Senior Curriculum Consultant facilitated the conversation. The goal of the meeting was for each of the seven consultants to have a chance to analyse the module and share their thoughts about it.

At the end of the preparatory meeting, the consultants divided up the modules and each independently reviewed three or four modules over a period of two weeks. The Senior Consultant acted as a support, checking in with the others via a WhatsApp group and encouraging discussion and questions throughout their individual work, part of which was the completion of a personal report to summarise their feedback and provide a means of focusing discussion with the course team. The report included what was done well, recommendations for improvement and questions for discussion. Determining what was done well or what could be improved focused upon the criterion of inclusivity in teaching and learning, based on the principles of the ICF and as perceived by the consultants as students from diverse backgrounds.

Following the independent work, the consultants came together with the project manager for a second preparatory meeting. At this meeting, they discussed their feedback about the various modules, focusing on similarities and differences in the modules, including pertinent features that could instructively inform module design. As a team, they prepared to meet with the Business Management course leaders.

Two course leaders met with the seven consultants to discuss the review of the modules and the course more holistically. These meetings could prove challenging for less confident or inexperienced Curriculum Consultants so the project manager attends as a support, though engages very little in the actual discussion. The Senior Curriculum Consultant took a lead role in ensuring everyone was introduced and in setting a friendly and supportive tone. As a result of this meeting, the course leaders requested that the consultants should each meet individually with each module leader to go through her/his module in depth. Support from the course leaders was instrumental in ensuring that the consultants could connect with and have in-depth discussions with every module leader.

In the end, each of the consultants, having worked independently on their allocated module, met with the respective module leader for a rich personal discussion about the feedback and for relevant questions from both sides. The module leaders were thus able to explore and gain deeper understanding of diverse student experiences and perspectives of a VLE and its content.

There were some challenges to achieving co-creation in this instance. In particular, collaboration on this scale requires significant advance planning, very good communication and, certainly, buy-in from staff across the course. The initial timescale for the review was one month; however, expanding the work to include meetings with each module leader added three months to the timeline, making the work a full project from May to August. The

time of year worked well for the module leaders, as they were in the process of re-developing modules and could make time to engage fully with the process. The long timeline was necessary, as, though some module leaders were ready to meet consultants as early as June, others took over modules or returned from leave (for research or other reasons) as late as August. Advance planning is ideal, but not always possible when responding to the needs of courses.

Ensuring that the project connected with mainstream institutional processes and programmes did help to achieve an appropriate level of student-staff collaboration. This also encouraged buy-in from the course leader and team and encouraged all staff to meet individually with the consultants. However, even with this alignment the success of the project also hinged upon the course team's recognising the value of the process and making sure that it was tailored to meet the specific needs of the Business Management course, as well as upon supporting the academic team through the process – including creating space for regular meetings between the Curriculum Consultants and the Business Management team.

It is too early to assess the impact of this initiative on differential attainment and outcomes. However, the case study provides a 'formula' as to how HEIs can support and facilitate a culture or expectation of co-creation.

Ensuring inclusivity in University documentation: The case study of the 'Guided Independent Learning' template

Developing Kingston's Guided Independent Learning template was a unique example of co-creation that gave one Curriculum Consultant the opportunity to work with the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Centre and the Student Union to influence practice at the institutional level. Undergraduate courses at Kingston typically outline a 300-hour time commitment per module, which is spent in classrooms and seminars and on field trips, placements and a variety of other activities, including guided independent study time. The Guided Independent Study template was initially drafted at the institutional level by the Directorate for Student Achievement, to provide staff with a student-facing template they could adapt to communicate clearly the meaning and expectations of guided independent study time. As a student-facing document that would be embedded in institutional quality-enhancement processes and that would become a requirement for Validation, it was important that students co-created the document to ensure that it was meaningful and relevant to them. To facilitate this work, members of the Student Achievement Directorate and the Academic Affairs Officer of the Union of Kingston Students met to discuss the nature of the document and how we could work with a Student Curriculum Consultant to develop it so that it would 'speak' to students. With the Union's support, a consultant fed back on the initial draft and contributed to the continuing development of the document.

The impact of this collaboration has been far-reaching, as the template has been rolled out across the institution. The collaboration between the University, the Curriculum Consultants and the Student Union to create a teaching and learning resource is being used as a successful case study showcasing co-creation; it paves the way for additional collaborations at Kingston. The exercise worked because of positive relationships between the Student Union, the staff members involved in the initial development of the Guided Independent Learning Hours template and the Student Curriculum Consultant team.

Ensuring inclusivity in new courses: the case study of the Sports Science Scrutiny meeting

The Curriculum Consultants worked closely with the Sports Science department on a number of exercises throughout the 2016-2017 and 2017-18 academic years. Their first collaborative task was a review of course handbooks and materials for their existing courses which the course team reported as very helpful. This engagement between the Sports Science team and the Curriculum Consultants programme subsequently led to further collaboration. The Sports Science team asked the consultants to attend and participate in a scrutiny meeting with a panel consisting of Academic Registry Quality Assurance staff, Sports Science staff and staff external to the faculty. The purpose of the meeting was for a new Sports Science Foundation course to receive feedback and scrutiny from fellow academics and Curriculum Consultants on their module descriptors and course structure.

The consultants were asked to review the new course handbook and module descriptors, considering, in particular, the accessibility and inclusivity of the curriculum, using their own lived experience and Kingston's ICF. This feedback would then directly influence the changes to and development of the new course.

The exercise was unique in that the consultants participated in a quality assurance (QA) activity that is directly embedded in University processes. This was possible because of relationships developed over the academic year between the consultants and Sports Science course team, as well as relationships created between the Curriculum Consultant team and Academic Registry staff.

One of the key limitations of the scrutiny meeting was time. With such a large panel all providing input, each academic and consultant was only able to provide a certain amount of input. In future, rather than having one large meeting, we have agreed with Academic Registry that the consultants will meet with new course teams prior to the formal scrutiny meeting to allow a) more time and in-depth discussion between students and academic teams and b) course teams more time to make initial changes prior to scrutiny by other academic staff.

Programme evaluation and student perspectives

The programme evaluation has focused on the impact and reach on both the courses and course teams who have worked with the curriculum consultants, as well as on the student curriculum consultants themselves.

A week after the course teams met the consultants, we provided the course teams with a feedback survey containing open-ended questions focused on how their understanding of inclusion had developed and what changes they had already made or planned to make as a result of connecting with the consultants. Subsequently, we interviewed the course teams to assess the programme's longer-term impact and logged curricula transformation resulting from the teams' engagement with the consultants; at the same time, we identified any case studies of change that might be shared more widely across the University. Finally, to gain an even deeper understanding of how the programme had operated – and thus to improve it for the future – we asked all participating staff to take part in a twenty-minute interview to glean their personal experiences of the programme.

The evaluation process has suggested that co-creation *is* taking place and the didactic relationship between teacher and student *is* being successfully challenged in order to change the curriculum for the better. For example, a Curriculum Consultant commented after the Business Management work piece: *“the team were quite receptive to the feedback....they wanted to implement the changes.... the team themselves...offered alternative ideas too which was great and it was nice to be able to explain things a bit more thoroughly and answer their questions”*. Similarly, a staff member in Sports Science stated that their team’s meeting with the Curriculum Consultants *“brought to light notable differences in student and staff perspectives of the documents which was most informative to us”*. A Sports Science academic continued: *“the feedback we received was most informative and appreciated and highlighted to us how students perceive a curriculum, a worthy exercise”*. For the most part, both staff and students have embraced the principles of co-creation, recognising its value and, in particular, its capacity to enrich the learning experience for all students. The reduction in rigour in a co-created programme – an expressed concern – has therefore not materialised.

The second part of the evaluation focused on how the programme affected the participating Curriculum Consultants. We invited them to complete a survey and take part, at the end of the academic year, in an interview which focused on skills development (including their understanding of equality, diversity and inclusion issues), as well as their experiences of the programme. In future, we also plan to analyse the progression and graduate outcomes of the consultants. One key theme which arose from this part of the evaluation was the importance that the consultants placed on gaining knowledge of the University and the transferable skills that they had gained. One consultant stated: *“it’s definitely allowed me to develop myself and critically engage with systems of change in the university on a more granular level. It has definitely prepared me for the next stage of my life.”* Another explained: *“for students it’s a way to prepare for the real world by having a job where you have to conduct yourself in a professional manner.”* Indeed, one consultant was absolutely clear that *“being a curriculum consultant was key to getting the job I have now”*.

One of the common challenges the consultants highlighted was managing the power dynamics of co-creating or consulting with academics. They recommended improvements to the operation of the programme, including more regular meetings, provision of additional opportunities for development and inclusion of further training about inclusive learning and teaching. As a whole, it was clear that the consultants felt that training and support from the staff organising the scheme was integral to their confidence and success.

Perhaps one of the most significant impacts that the programme has had is to engender the principles of inclusion in the consultants themselves: they will then enter employment *“with the skills to positively contribute to and work in a global and diverse world”* (ICF). One of the consultants commented: *“I learned to think about things from not just my own perspective”*. Similarly, another consultant said: *“the job challenges you to think from various people’s perspective”*.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced the issue of the persistent and longstanding differential student outcomes evident in HE, suggesting that identifying and addressing these disparate outcomes has become a key challenge for the sector. Furthermore, we have suggested that

curriculum co-creation is an effective way of addressing differential student outcomes, by ensuring that curricula are more inclusive and reflect the backgrounds, perspectives and life-worlds of an increasingly diverse student body. By doing so, we have highlighted the alignment between the epistemological underpinnings of co-creation and the development of an inclusive curriculum, arguing that both require academic teachers to rethink, fundamentally, their relationship to students. Rather than passive recipients of knowledge, students should be viewed as ‘untapped resources’ in university classrooms, bringing with them diverse backgrounds and experiences which, when used effectively, can enrich the learning experience (Steele and Ryan, 2014).

Effectively engaging students and staff as co-creators of knowledge and learning experience is one of the most important challenges in HE in the twenty-first century and, as Willis and Gregory (2016) argue, “*the question leaders should start with is ‘why not co-creation?’ rather than ‘why?’*” (Willis and Gregory, 2016, p.1). Kingston University’s SCCP offers one mechanism through which students can drive institutional change. However, importantly, the Programme, by facilitating co-creation, puts diverse student voices and multiple perspectives at the centre of curriculum strategy and practice. It does this by using the institution’s ICF as the lens which brings student engagement clearly into focus, ensuring that University curricula strengthen the learning journey for all students. As Brink (2008, p.6) argues, “*one way or another, we all have to learn, and keep on learning. And we will learn more from those people, those ideas, and those phenomena that we do not know, than from those we know only too well.*” In this way, it moves the University beyond ‘student partnership’ initiatives which encourage students to either act as ‘ambassadors’ for the University or as the representatives of their student colleagues. Rather, it problematises the narrative of the ‘student voice’, recognising that students’ experience HE curricula in multiple, complex and often contradictory ways.

Reference list

Barnett, R. and Coate, K. (2005) *Engaging the curriculum in higher education*: Berkshire: SRHE and OU Press. ISBN 0 335 21289 1.

Brink, C. (2009) ‘Standards will drop and other fears about the equality agenda in higher education.’ *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21(1), 11-30.

Daddow, A., Moraitis, P. and Carr, A. (2013) ‘Non-traditional students in tertiary education: inter-disciplinary collaboration in curriculum and pedagogy in community services education in Australia.’ *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(5), 480-489. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2012.685765> (Accessed: 16 February 2015).

Crozier, G., Reay, D. and Clayton, J. (2008) ‘Different strokes for different folks: diverse students in diverse institutions.’ *Research Papers in Education*, 23(2), 167-177. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520802048703> (Accessed: 17 Feb 2015).

Fraser, S. and Bosanquet, A. (2006) ‘The curriculum? That’s just a unit outline, isn’t it?’ *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3), 269-84. Available at:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075070600680521?scroll=top&needAccess=true> (Accessed: 23 February 2015).

Haigh, M. (2009) 'Fostering Cross-Cultural Empathy with Non-Western Curricular Structures, *Journal of Studies*.' *International Education*, 13(2), 271-284. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1028315308329791> (Accessed: 23 February 2015).

HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council) (2015) *Differences in degree outcomes: The effect of subject and student characteristics*. Issue paper 2015/21. Bristol. Available at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE2014/Content/Pubs/2015/201521/HEFCE2015_21.pdf (Accessed: 4 February 2018).

Healey, M., Flint A. and Harrington, K. (2014) *Engagement through partnership students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. York: The Higher Education Academy. Available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/engagement_through_partnership.pdf (Accessed 21 February 2015).

Hockings, C. (2010) *Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: a synthesis of research*. York: The Higher Education Academy. Available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/inclusive_teaching_and_learning_in_he_synthesis_200410_0.pdf (Accessed 20 February 2014).

Hughes, A. (2016) 'Exploring normative whiteness: ensuring inclusive pedagogic practice in undergraduate fieldwork teaching and learning.' *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 40(3), 460-477, 1-18. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03098265.2016.1155206> (Accessed: 29 January 2017).

Levy, P., Little, S. and Whelen, N. (2010) 'Perspectives on staff–student partnerships in learning, research and educational enhancement.' In: Little, S. (ed.) *Staff–student partnerships in higher education*. London: Continuum, 1-15. ISBN 9781441119933

Maila, M. (2010) 'Curriculum as open-ended inquiry in higher education.' *Africa Education Review*, 7(2), 263-282. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/18146627.2010.515385> (Accessed: 20 February 2015).

McCulloch, A. (2009) 'The student as co-producer.' *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(2), 171-183. Available at: <https://srhe.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075070802562857#.XF20cORXWUk> Accessed: 03 March 2017).

McDuff, N., Tatam, J.C., Beacock, O. and Ross, F.M. (2018) 'Closing the attainment gap for students from black and minority ethnic backgrounds through institutional change.' *Journal of Widening Participation and Life Long Learning*, 20(1), 79-101. Available at: <https://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/40647/> (Accessed: 18 September 2018).

McDuff, A. and Hughes, A. (2015) *Kingston's Inclusive Curriculum Framework*. Available at: <http://www.kingston.ac.uk/aboutkingstonuniversity/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/our-inclusive-curriculum/inclusive-curriculum-framework/> (Accessed: 21 May 2018).

McKay, J. and Devlin, M. (2014) 'Uni has a different language ... to the real world: demystifying academic culture and discourse for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.' *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(5), 949-961. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07294360.2014.890570?src=recsys> (Accessed: 20 January 2016).

Meuleman, A., Garrett, R., Wrench, A. and King, S. (2015) 'Some people might say I'm thriving but...: non-traditional students experiences of university.' *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 19(5), 1-15. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2014.945973> (Accessed: 21 August 2017).

Mountford-Zimdars, A., Sabri, D., Moore, J., Sanders, J., Jones, S. and Higham, L. (2015) *Causes of differences in student outcomes*. Report to HEFCE by King's College London. ARC Network and The University of Manchester. Available at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/Independentresearch/2015/Causes_of_differences_in_student_outcomes/HEFCE2015_diffout.pdf (Accessed: 9 August 2017).

Millward, C. (2018) Keynote, Addressing barriers to Student Success Programme, Annual Conference, 24 May 2018.

Office for Students (2018) *Differences in student outcomes*. Available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/data-and-analysis/differences-in-student-outcomes/> (Accessed: 18 August 2018).

Reay, D. Crozier, G. and Clayton, J. (2010) 'Fitting in or standing out: Working-class students in UK higher education.' *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(1), 107-124. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1080/01411920902878925> (Accessed: 20 January 2015).

Richardson, J. (2015) 'The under-attainment of ethnic minority students in UK higher Education: what we know and what we don't know.' *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 39(2), 278-291. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0309877X.2013.858680> (Accessed: 12 December 2016).

Ross, F., Tatam, J., Hughes, A., Beacock, O. and McDuff, N. (2018) 'The great unspoken shame of UK Higher Education: Addressing inequalities of attainment.' *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(1), 104-115. Available at: http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahUKEwiiiv8LF1azgAhXAUxUIHUB7BIcQFjABegQIABAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fajobe.journals.ac.za%2Fpub%2Farticle%2Fdownload%2F172%2F172&usg=AOvVaw2_wwF6oR4nUDPR4zO13PTm (Accessed: 12 November 2018).

Steele, D. and Ryan, P.A. (2014) 'Students perceptions of internationalisation in higher education.' *SRHE Annual Research Conference-Inspiring future generations; embracing*

plurality and difference in higher education. Available at: <https://www.srhe.ac.uk/conference2014/abstracts/0188.pdf> (Accessed: 19 September 2016).

Svensson, L. and Wihlborg, M. (2010) 'Internationalising the content of higher education: the need for a curriculum perspective.' *Higher Education*, 60, 595-613. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/40930313?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents (Accessed: 20 February 2012).

Tange, H. and Kastberg, P. (2013) 'Coming to terms with *double knowing*: an inclusive approach to international education.' *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(1), 1-14. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13603116.2011.580460?src=recsys> (Accessed: 08 March 2015).

Umbach, P. (2006) 'The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education.' *Research in Higher Education*, 47(3), 317-345. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-005-9391-3> (Accessed: 13 April 2016).

Universities UK (2016) *Working In Partnership: Enabling Social Mobility In Higher Education, the final report of the Social Mobility Advisory Group*. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2016/working-in-partnership-final.pdf> (Accessed: 1 September 2017).

Willis, P. and Gregory, A. (2016) 'Making the road while walking: co-creation, teaching excellence and university leadership, Stimulus paper.' *Leadership Foundation for Higher Education*. Available at: <https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/research-resources/research-hub/2016-research/making-the-road-while-walking-cocreation-teaching-excellence-and-university-leadership.cfm> (Accessed: 23 March 2017).

ⁱ POLAR classifications are a measure by the OfS of the likelihood that a young person will participate in higher education based on the area in which they live. Areas are assigned to quintiles with 5 representing the highest rates of young people participating in higher education and 1 representing the lowest rates. Further details can be found on the OfS website: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/data-and-analysis/polar-participation-of-local-are>

ⁱⁱ The so-called 'BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) attainment gap' represents the difference in attainment between UK domiciled minority ethnic students and their White counterparts (Richardson, 2015).

ⁱⁱⁱ We use the term 'curricula' to mean students' engagement with their learning experience, and not simply the curriculum's content (Barnett and Coate, 2005).