

Editorial

Thank you to all our authors, editors, reviewers, and readers for continuing to find time to think about student engagement in a scholarly way during a pandemic. It is not easy for anyone, but as we noted in the editorial for Volume 3, issue 1, developing our understanding of student engagement has never been more important.

Call for papers

We would like to acknowledge this need by inviting contributions for a special issue relating to the pandemic. What impact has the pandemic had on student engagement in higher education? Are there things you've been forced to do quickly which are working well which you would like to keep? How has student engagement changed? We think our readers would like to find out more about how it's been and then think about how these experiences may shape the future of student engagement.

We hope to capture all the dimensions of engagement - interactions, community-building, partnership, co-creation, design, peer learning and whatever else has affected you. We invite case studies, articles, opinion pieces and student voice pieces; we are always keen to encourage pieces co-authored with students, and provide support for student-led pieces.

Please [submit a short abstract \(up to 400 words\)](#) and choose 'Special Edition Abstracts' from the drop-down menu for the section.

Timeline

Deadline for abstracts: **30 April 2021**

Feedback on abstract: **31 May 2021**

Deadline for full papers: **30 September 2021**

This is something of a bumper issue, with a focus on practical interventions. The Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) is a UK national initiative to being to codify universities' ability to work with business and industry. In this issue's opinion piece, Lowe and Dent have spotted the need for the inclusion of student engagement and suggest a framework for doing this.

In the student voice pieces and two of the case studies, colleagues consider the involvement of students in extra-curricular activity. We have three student voices combined in a single article in the student voice section; Sum, Dimitropoulos, and Kurik all participated in a staff-student project focused on academia-industry relations and reflect on their individual experiences before bringing these together into some

suggestions for successful projects which involve people at different stages of their academic careers.

Dunbar-Morris reflects on the collaborative development process of a staff student partnership which brought together students and staff from different parts of the university and at different stages of their careers. The partnership used workshops to co-create a student charter. Kate Dunstone shares the reflections of staff and students who engaged with the Saturday Club, an opportunity for undergraduate students to lead Art and Design workshops for children aged 13-16 year old children.

There are four articles considering staff-student partnership in research, which all identify the benefits of this kind of work and make recommendations for the future. Sambell, Brown and Adamson report the findings of a pedagogic action research project run collaboratively with students. The project involved data collection and the production of resources related to the development of feedback literacy in work-based settings. Yates and Oates reflect on the experiences of working with undergraduate students on a staff-student research project as part of an assessed module in their final year. Davis and Sakr provide a detailed review of an action research project and end with a list of suggestions for future staff-student partnerships which chime closely with the other two articles. In all cases, the benefits of reflecting on process as well as product are considered, and should lead to further work by student engagement scholars. A fourth article reports on the outcomes of a joint project; Smith, Coppin and Clifford, analyse the use of students' voices in developing the curriculum, and demonstrate the impact it has had on student satisfaction.

Next we have three articles looking at particular situations which might make student engagement more challenging. Beginning with a practical intervention, Van Zyl and Fourie-Malherbe report on the provision of a dedicated space on a South African campus for commuter students and its impact on study and social interaction. The next two articles provide data on student situations. Dickson and Tennant consider the experiences of student mothers in the United Arab Emirates from both a staff and a student perspective; as well as identifying many useful development points, they find much common ground in terms of intention, and make recommendations for improving communications. Filling a gap in information about the relationship between student engagement and socioeconomic background a Greek university, Tzafea considers the implications for educators in terms of supporting with both financial and social initiatives.

We also have a selection of articles and case studies which review student perceptions of different types of engagement activity. Doyle and Nieuwoudt present an exploratory, and very timely, research project which reviews student perceptions of the value of non-assessed discussion boards and also analysed whether online students' use of the boards correlated with higher grades and; this is really important when thinking about online course design, something many more people have become familiar with. Bryson and Callaghan analyse the experience of using a whole cohort approach to staff-student partnership and discuss the benefits of a variety of approaches and practices. Arroteia,

Avramenko and Hafeez explore the impact of computerised business simulations on student's perceptions about their psychological empowerment, and consider the complex effects on student engagement.