Strengthening attainment of student learning outcomes during work-integrated learning: A collaborative governance framework across academia, industry and students

AMANDA HENDERSON[1]
Griffith University, Queensland, Australia
FRANZISKA TREDE
Charles Sturt University, Sydney, Australia

Graduate capability and employability are regarded as critical success factors for degree programs by universities, industry, and the students. Furthering work-based experiences for academic credit within degree programs is being increasingly explored to assist employability. Effective work-based experiences are reliant on good partnerships between university, industry and student. Such successful relationships assist communication and understanding important for meaningful, quality work-based learning experiences and assessments. Collaborative governance is a finely nuanced arrangement that is dependent on commitment, shared understanding and building trust across university, industry and student guided by the student learning outcomes. Collaborative governance is presented in this paper as an effective framework to guide and organize the structures and processes of university, industry and student to facilitate work-based learning that supports student capability through the attainment of desired outcomes. *(Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 2017, 18(1), 73-80)*

Keywords: University, industry, student, collaborative governance, work-based learning, graduate, employability, capability

Graduate capability and employability are regarded as critical success factors for degree programs by universities, industry, and the students. A common response by the higher education sector to the demands for employability has been developing and furthering work-based experiences for academic credit within degree programs. The interest of the university in effective work-based learning is worthwhile given the recognized benefits to professionalism and student employment (Smith, Ferns, Russell, & Cretchly, 2014). Work-integrated learning (WIL) is most frequently used when referring to the broad range and diverse experiences that students engage in these work placements (Ferns, Campbell, & Zegwaard, 2014). Patrick et al. (2008) recognize WIL as 'an umbrella term for a range of approaches and strategies that integrate theory with the practice of work within a purposefully designed curriculum', and a WIL placement as 'a type of work-integrated learning that requires the student to be situated in the workplace' (p. iv). For the purpose of this paper we use the term work-based learning which refers to student learning supported by learning and teaching strategies that occur in real world contexts under organized supervision and counts towards academic credit as part of a compulsory component of a degree course.

The problem is that such work-integrated learning opportunities, if not effectively governed and supervised, pose risks for assuring the quality of student standards of practice (Yorke, 2011). This is because while universities are responsible for managing the work-based program, the learning environment is distal to the university campus. Processes that enable student participation and attainment of learning outcomes occur within the 'work place' or 'industry'. However determining whether students have met the assessment criteria is a complex interplay between the university and the workplace (Henderson, Forrester, & Heel,

[1] Corresponding author: Amanda Henderson, a.henderson@griffith.edu.au

2006; Henderson, et al., 2010). Assurance that students have reached the requisite learning outcomes is dependent on rigorous processes to assess learning and student performance.

The imperative is therefore a shared collaborative approach to work-based learning. Collaboration across university, industry, and student is needed to progress meaningful learning experiences, and the appropriate engagement by students, and other stakeholders to ascertain the requisite learning outcomes are reached. A collaborative governance framework through the articulation of structures and processes, and clarification of necessary outcomes for all stakeholders can effectively guide communication and co-operation, thereby assisting in the creation of a shared dialogue and mutual understanding. In particular, consideration of the guidance and support given to students and how they are assisted to participate as a key stakeholder is imperative in collaborative governance.

PURPOSES OF WORK-BASED LEARNING

Work-based learning assists socialization into future work roles, professional identity development, and integration of theory and practice (Coll & Zegwaard, 2011). This is achieved through activities designed to build student self-efficacy, advance student knowledge and skills, encourage questioning and guide reflective practice of students that advances ways of knowing and working (Jackson 2014). There are no assurances that participating in 'ad hoc' work experiences, that is, impromptu opportunities that emerge in the workplace will assist students achieve the range and depth of the desired outcomes. Work-based learning experiences need to deliberately integrate knowledge and understandings previously encountered by the student through various teaching and learning modalities with practices encountered in the workplace setting (Yorke, 2011). Effective student engagement is enabled through their adequate preparation of knowledge, skills and understanding of learning outcomes prior to work-based learning, support from academics and workplace supervisors, and facilitative conditions of the real world context (that is, the workplace). The challenge is the creation of learning conditions namely, relevant experiences, time for feedback and reflection, and enterprise that encourage students to extend their understanding and demonstrate their capabilities.

Strategies and mechanisms to engage students with workplace opportunities and assist them to achieve the desired outcomes in the workplace are both abundant and diverse (Ferns et al., 2014). Despite the breadth of work-integrated learning, there is relative agreement regarding the capabilities being enhanced through student participation in this form of learning; namely skills in the areas of effective communication; collaborative and ethical practice; problem posing and solving; thoughtfully participating in team work; constructive self management, and digital literacy skills (Coll & Zegwaard, 2011). Further to this, employers are also desirous of graduates capable of managing 'real-world' dilemmas (refer to Errington 2010). A shared understanding between university, industry and student, advanced through evolving relationships, of the expected employability skills and practice capabilities for each field of practice is an imperative for effective work-based learning programs (Horstmanshof & Moore 2016). Shared understanding contributes to a common dialogue and language across university, industry and student. Through a common language students, who are central to the work place learning experience, are better placed to actively inform and shape experiences and accompanying assessment that verifies outcomes of work-based programs are met.

ASSESSMENT IN WORK-BASED LEARNING

It is evident from student generic attribute statements and employability literature that there is significant consensus regarding learning outcomes from degree programs. [For example, these include, among other things, professional and ethical behaviors, communication and collaboration, self-management, and application of specific knowledge domains as pertinent to the student discipline; for more information please refer Learning and Teaching Academic Standards (LTAS) project (Australian Learning and Teaching Council 2010). However, the assessment of these learning outcomes does not fit approaches dominated by traditional notions of measurement. It is not academic achievement but practice performance, capabilities and employability skills that are assessed in work-based learning (Trede & Smith, 2014). Learning for practice is a collaborative, social, discursive, embodied, situated and cultural activity that makes it quite distinctive from academic learning. These core features of practice need to be operationalized in the workplace so students can practice skills and capabilities integral to their profession and achieve the requisite learning outcomes. The accompanying challenge is determining how best to structure and provide oversight to practicing capabilities and then ultimately determine when, how and what to assess.

Work-based learning assessment cannot be governed by fine discriminations but rather such assessment has to accommodate the variety of ways students demonstrate the learning outcomes (Yorke, 2011). This requires that judgments be made with respect to 'the extent to which students have been successful' (Yorke, 2011, p. 127). The dilemma is consistency in the determination of these judgments. Students can be placed in work situations where assumptions are made about uniformity of judgments between industry partners, university academics and students. Traditional modes of moderation such as inter-rater reliability, marking guides and rubrics need to be meaningful for industry and the student. Assessment in the work context should be based on both crediting higher level thinking as well as situated 'doing' capabilities (Boud, 2016). Assessment is fundamental as it verifies attainment of learning outcomes. Students need to be able to: appraise their work; articulate learning outcomes they have achieved, for example, teamwork, adaptability, problem-solving, initiative, resilience; seek feedback; locate 'gaps'; and plan for their continuing learning. Effective guidance by university and industry supervisors is instrumental in assisting students build these capacities and demonstrate they have met the requisite standards. Student assessment routinely includes a task or performance or report of project, and reflection including analysis of the process and outcome considering ethical and organizational contexts (Yorke, 2011). Multiple and rigorous sources of information for assessment processes is needed (e.g., up to date records of tasks and reflections in work-based learning, student journals, supervisors' comments, competence against the relevant industry standards and direct observation of competencies performed in workplace settings). Reflective processes may be captured through e-portfolios, portfolio building, journals and post experience reports and presentations that can be peer-assessed, self-assessed and or assessed by academics.

In Australia, the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards, 2015) specify that '…the registered higher education provider remains accountable for the course of study and verifies continuing compliance of the course of study with the standards in the *Higher Education Standards Framework* that relate to the specific arrangement.' (refer Commonwealth of Australia, Higher Education Standards Framework [Threshold Standards] 2015, Section 5.4: 'Delivery with other parties'). Therefore, higher education providers need

effective mechanisms to provide oversight for student learning and outcomes during work-based experiences to reliably report that students have achieved the requisite standards. Work-based learning, by its very nature, involves a number of different stakeholders. Accordingly, the accountability of supervision and performance of students in workplaces is more likely to rest with a composite of relevant individuals. These individuals typically from the university, workplace, and student representative body, may have different expectations of how the attainment of learning outcomes can be determined, namely, what the student should be doing, how this could best be demonstrated, and what an acceptable practice or standard looks like.

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE

The potential for disparities between the three key constituents, namely, university, industry and student regarding judgments of student work warrants careful exploration of a governance structure that ensures reliability of the attainment of standards upon summative assessment of work-based learning (Gardner, Gardner, Coyer, Gosby 2016). Collaborative governance is an arrangement explained in this paper that assists in the development of a common language and understanding, mutual respect and trust across the university, industry and student to assure attainment of learning outcomes. It is presented as an effective framework to guide and organize the structures and processes of university, industry and student to facilitate work-based learning that supports the realization of the desired student outcomes. Collaborative governance is understood as diverse entities such as, government, community and the private sector communicating and working together to achieve more than what could be achieved by the separate entities on their own. It is formally defined by Ansell and Gash (2008) as 'a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets'. In the context of this paper the collective decision-making process encompasses university, industry and student; and the aim is effective management of work-based learning programs to realize student learning outcomes. While the defined collaborative governance might appear straight forward, its realization is a delicate nuance of shared understanding, mutual benefits, collaboration, and trusting relationships (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

The presence of the core factors, understanding, collaboration and trust assists the development of goodwill that is fundamental to assuring the attainment of quality learning outcomes and consequently lasting effects and sustainability. Absence of shared values or purpose, and consequently poor working relationships, can result in distrust across university academics, industry partners and participating students. This generally results in 'one-off' or short term relationships because not all parties' needs and interests are sufficiently being met. In cases such as this, student learning outcomes can be indeterminate. The lack of long term relationships and consensus around the determination of learning outcomes has been previously identified as an impediment to sustainability and value of learning integral to work-based opportunities (Patrick et al., 2008). This often is because work-based learning experiences have not been grounded in sound governance based on the tenets of collaboration, including commitment, shared understanding and trust building. In the absence of the development of these relationships work-based learning experiences may not deliver the desired outcomes nor be sustained (Cooper, Orrell, & Bowden, 2010).

A Collaborative Governance Framework

The following sections outline structures, processes and outcomes, together with their sequential implementation, that form the basis of a collaborative governance framework across university, industry and student to meet each party's needs. The structures, processes and outcomes of the collaborative governance framework need to be developed in consultation with each stakeholder and clearly communicated to build confidence around the reciprocity of the elements of the framework. It is intended that the elements of the framework, namely, structures, processes, and outcomes, guide communication and collaborative provisions by universities, industries and students to foster trust and enhance sustainability of constructive work-based learning programs. Formal processes for managing work-based learning optimize student experiences so that they can attain their learning goals (Henderson, Heel, & Twentyman, 2007). It is acknowledged here that a salient aspect of collaborative governance is the provision of structures and processes that foster student agency. The capacity to act and not feel helpless is a key student disposition for productive, relevant and meaningful learning experiences in professional settings. The location of the student at the critical juncture of university learning and industry experiences means they are well placed to understand their learning needs, have an awareness of work place situations and experiences and determine how their engagement, behaviors and response best demonstrates their attainment of learning outcomes.

UNIVERSITY RESPONSIBILITIES

University Structures

Good governance requires appropriate institutional structures and curriculum design to ensure provision and clarity of procedures, rules and ultimately transparency for work-based opportunities (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Work-based learning needs to be written into the university vision and mission statement. Once the university has made the commitment to engage students in work-based learning then it needs to be embedded into the curriculum. The establishment of centers in the university to facilitate purposeful, organized, and 'assessable' work-based learning in academic programs is beneficial. Such centers provide 'lead' individuals with specific education and expertise to assist that the learning and teaching on offer are commensurate with the work-based experience, and the specified learning outcomes can be realistically achieved. Work-based learning is both, a learning and teaching strategy as well as a curriculum construct that requires deliberate embedding so that graduate outcomes can be reached.

Outlines of programs are needed that provide clear statements of aims and objectives for the different degree courses. The work-based learning component of the curricula needs to be meaningfully integrated into the curriculum (Trede & McEwen, 2015b). It is at these early stages that governance is corroborated by inviting industry and students to participate in the curricula development process, including the structuring of work-based learning in the program. Furthermore, work-based learning experiences need to be recognized in university and industry policies. Accompanying these policies are engagement agreements (Memorandum of Understanding, MOUs where necessary), risk management plans, including occupational health and safety, personal liability insurance, and protocols for orientation and engagement. Many of the reportable responsibilities of the university are specified in the *Higher Education Threshold Standards (*Commonwealth of Australia 2015). These can also be used to cross check that key issues have been addressed.

TABLE 1: a collaborative governance framework: University, industry and student

Structure	Process	Outcomes
UNIVERSITY: • Work-based learning (WBL) written in University *vision* and *mission* statement; • Learning *outcomes specified*; • *Curriculum* effectively *structured* to reach learning outcomes during WBL; • Appropriate *assessment* for WBL; • *Facilities & infrastructure* support WBL; • Sufficient *staff* complement & capabilities to support WBL; • Adequate *resourcing* for oversight during WBL; • Clear *communication plan* before, during, after WBL; • Structures to manage *student well-being*. *Contracts* and/or *agreements* with industry.	• *Communicate* with industry around student capacities, abilities, and expectations of the learning outcomes that should be achieved through WBL; • Enact and progress communication plan with industry and students (developed in Structure); • *Support* for students to build capabilities through effective teaching, learning and assessment, in particular, professional behaviors, communication, problem-solving pertinent to optimizing WBL experiences.	• Demonstrated *compliance* according to regulatory bodies e.g., Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA), and relevant accreditation agencies; • Demonstrated achievement through *feedback from students* about their learning experience; • *Feedback from industry* about the preparedness of student and their participation in work-based activities; • F*eedback from academics* about contribution of work-based learning to support their desired teaching, student learning and achievement of outcome standards.
INDUSTRY: • The *vision* and *values* statement of industry welcomes potential contribution of students; • *Contract/ agreement* with University outlines specifics; • Internal *policies* in place regarding WBL include placement, supervision and assessment regimes; • *Logistics* implementation plan e.g. time/opportunity for staff to supervise students, enacting communication plan with university around student needs/progress and escalation of concerns; • *Recognition* program for staff who supervise.	• *Discuss* learning opportunities and industry circumstances, supervision of activities and/or sequenced progression of project. • Establish a *learning culture* that accepts student, integrates them into the team, promotes belongingness, encourages exploration of knowledge and contribution of student ideas. • *Prepare staff* to engage with students, effectively supervise, provide feedback, and complete assessment (where relevant).	• Informal, less tangible benefits such as, *contemporary knowledge* and best practices based on sound evidence; • Supply of *'work-ready' graduates* that facilitates recruitment; • Opportunities for *staff professional* development, growth and mentoring; engaging with university with possible access to university facilities and resources; • *Increasing exposure* of organization through linkages with the university.
STUDENTS: • Engage with information about work-based learning structures & processes; • Locate and familiarize themselves with *learning outcomes* (in university degree information and where appropriate professional accreditation standards); • *Map* their capacities and attributes that they already possess, articulate desired capacities, and *plan pathway* to reach desired capacities during the work-based experience.	• Participate in activities to assist exploration of *self-identity*, *self-awareness,* and build *self-efficacy*, integral to student developing their *sense of agency* (opportunities ideally available through curricula and extra curricula offerings*;* • Develop insights and appreciate the *different languages* of the university and workplace; • Understand workplace norms in order to better enact *agency* and develop a sound understanding of the work of the industry setting,	• Lead, engage, participate in activities and practice that offer the opportunity to learn, reflect, appraise and ultimately demonstrate attainment of course/program completion; • Responsible for articulating learning and demonstrating their achievement in reaching requisite learning outcomes through *behaviors* (observed in practice), designated *activities* and/or *projects*, and also reflection (students critically appraise their learning process in reaching required standards).

University Processes

Subsequent to the establishment of structures and accompanying policy to support work-based learning, the university needs to establish a course of action to interact with industry and students to advance collaborative governance of work-based learning. This course of action needs knowledgeable academics, and the relevant course coordinators, to interact through deliberate democratic dialogue with industry personnel to develop shared understandings as to how the nature of their industry experience can converge with student learning (Benefer, 2007; Foskett, 2003; Smith, Mackay, Challis, & Holt, 2006). Furthermore, students need to be aware of program learning outcomes and explore what these outcomes may mean for professionalism and workplace practice.

Commitment to collaborative governance involves extensive communication between university and industry partners, and students (Ansell & Gash, 2008). These communications are most productive when underpinned by intentions to achieve reciprocal, mutually beneficial partnerships (Cooper & Orrell, 2016). One-way negotiations do not promise sustainable placements and productive student learning outcomes. Distinguishing between shared and distinctively different goals and intentions enables a transparent and vibrant partnership where both partners maintain their identity yet can share a common aspiration. The discussions need to include, among other things, ascertaining the 'fit', namely, the link of student abilities with industry offering and needs. This involves clarity of mutual goals and identification of diverging goals. For work-based experiences to be successful common values (i.e., that resonate as meaningful to all parties) need to be agreed.

Shared understanding and a common language is best maintained through regular communications between university, industry and student, including, before, during and after placements, and, also conducting on-site or online visits to obtain feedback about on-going placements (i.e., students' progress) and modifications for future placements. Ideally, central to these discussions are clear student learning outcomes that are agreed and understood by all parties.

University Outcomes

Broadly speaking the University determines the success of its learning and teaching endeavors through various outcome measures. Outcomes are a significant component of the collaborative governance framework as a feedback mechanism to ascertain the effective functioning of structures and processes. The measures include:

- University reporting (internal and external), that is, in Australia meeting the regulatory requirements of the Tertiary Education Standards and Quality Agency (TESQA) and, where relevant, professional and industry accreditation bodies.
- Feedback from internal and external stakeholders: e.g., Students' feedback about their learning experience; academics' feedback about their experiences of supporting work-based learning endeavors; and industry feedback about student performance (as well as their contribution to student assessment) and university support.

CONTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRY PARTNERS

For industry to collaborate they similarly need to establish their own internal structures and engage in a course of action with the university and students. When universities engage

with industries it is not sufficient for the university to specify to industry the necessary structures for assurance of quality of work-based experiences for students; but rather industry needs to want to engage with universities and their students around work-based learning. Effective and open communication on all issues relating to work-based learning in a clear and sensitive way is important. Having open communication channels within the workplace and with university representatives is crucial (Cooper & Orrell, 2016). If industry appreciates the potential gains and benefits then they are more likely to progress conversations, and commit to the necessary supervision, appraisal, and feedback for assuring quality student outcomes.

Industry Outcomes

The benefits for industry engagement with work-based learning can seem less tangible. These may include, the introduction of good practices based on research evidence presented by the student, (i.e., sites and supervisors hosting work-based learning programs can benefit from the opportunity to glean fresh ideas, knowledge, skills and approaches from students), and after the workplace experience industry staff can reflect upon new ideas and approaches introduced to them and consider how these may be useful to the industry. Other benefits include: supply of 'employable' graduates to the industry that can potentially become a source of recruitment; access to university staff and resources, that may also assist in the professional development of industry staff; and increasing exposure of the industry to a broader audience, namely students and their cohorts. Industry benefits from hosting students vary widely from workplace to workplace. Issues of organizational cultures, learning environments, organizational size and work atmospheres all impact on industry benefits (Trede et al., 2016). Industry can also benefit from learning initiatives led by the university for their students but also impact on staff in the workplace (Grealish & Henderson, 2016).

Industry Processes

For industry to realize the benefits of work-based learning experiences, appropriate processes need to be established. Streamlining and coalescence of industry and university processes expedites work-based opportunities. Industry needs to consider two key aspects: first, active engagement and participation of students in the workplace. This involves considering the current learning culture and how it can help students feel a sense of belonging (Levett-Jones & Lathlean, 2008), be integrated into teams, and that approaches to tasks are open for discussion (Henderson et al., 2012). Second, support of staff through the preparation, provision of time and remuneration to facilitate students learning (Bates, 2011; Henderson & Eaton, 2013). The establishment of a learning culture that readily assimilates students and builds staff capability in student supervision, appraisal and feedback are instrumental to optimizing learning outcomes for students.

a. Establishment of a learning culture

Before hosting students for work-based learning experiences, the industry needs to reflect on whether its physical, social, cultural and emotional environment is conducive to support student learning. Specifically:

- is the social and learning climate appropriate for students?
- are there staff available to establish appropriate projects, and assist task and related skill requirements to conduct relevant projects and activities?

- do staff believe that they may benefit from the experience of engaging with students?

Furthermore, is the climate inviting for students, for example, is it giving students a voice and accepting them as valuable yet junior colleagues, namely, inviting them to comment, share their thoughts, reflect on their experiences? And, what offerings, opportunities, and interactions, have been made available that advance learning and assist the students reach their outcomes?

b. Preparation of staff as workplace educators.

Staff need to be sufficiently prepared for mentoring, supporting and facilitating student learning during work-based learning experiences. How supervisors can interact with students and facilitate learning in practice situations should be clear to staff (Henderson et al., 2010). Common suggestions include: debrief (i.e., reflections on experience); sharing of experiences (i.e., articulating, and comparing experiences); drawing out the experiences (i.e., identifying commonalities and distinctiveness of students' experiences); and making links to the curriculum in the academy. For these learning processes to be operationalized university and industry colleagues need to work together to ensure that workplace employees are educated and supported to facilitate student learning within their role in the workplace (Billett, 2011).

Industry Structures

A partnership across industry and the university assists the establishment of appropriate structures in the work place for student learning. This is acknowledged with vision, mission and value statements that recognize the potential contribution of students. Industry needs to establish an adequate infrastructure and resources to facilitate student engagement. This should include a designated industry person to lead, that is, take responsibility (an established position or included in the role description of existing position) to communicate with university personnel to discuss the nature of work-based experiences. In particular, how the nature of industry work experiences that the students participate in can converge with student learning and reach their (industry) outcomes. Accompanying policies that support students in the workplace are needed. These largely mirror those developed in the university; namely, engagement agreements (memorandums of understanding, orientation, including occupational health and safety requirements, criminal checks, and protocols for engagement including individual behaviors, such as communication etiquette).

Industry staff whose role includes co-ordination and supervision of work-integrated learning activities may need guidance with managing student activities, behavior and performance during work-based experiences. This is acknowledged in the Higher Education Standards Framework [Threshold Statements] (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015, section 5.4). University and industry should jointly prepare supervisors to assist them extend and advance student abilities and strengths during work. Supervision may include student orientation, support during the work-based experience, debriefing and feedback after work-based experiences. The experience is not about the student just 'doing what is asked of them'. The goal of work-based learning experiences is to prepare students for future practices in an uncertain world of work (Trede & McEwen, 2016). Host supervisors' role in the development of student capabilities is to support as well as challenge students.

Industry structures need to support the work of staff members who have an oversight or supervision role. This includes time, recognition and legitimating the role of the staff

member: Time refers to allocation during work activities for the student supervisor to liaise with the student, team members, and necessary university personnel; Recognition refers to valuing the effort that staff provide in supervision and support; and legitimating refers to the support role that involves encouraging the interactions, namely, open dialogue and discussions, that contribute to knowledge development (Henderson & Eaton, 2013; Bates, 2011). These provisions need to be considered with the pragmatics of how the experience is organized. This includes organization of specific roles, times and duration of student participation each week across the semester or stipulated period, and determining staff responsibility in supervision, feedback and assessment of the students (Henderson et al., 2010).

THE VITAL ELEMENT: STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Students are the essential element in effective collaborative governance. In the governance framework students are provided with resources, that serve as structures, for the development of their capabilities needed to engage, shape and negotiate the learning on offer. Mutual understanding and collaborative university-industry arrangements are the critical processes that facilitate their access to the workplace and their integration into the work-based situations. During the workplace experience, students are offered insights into the structure and culture of the workplace and skills sets and expectations of staff employed in the facility. Students ascertain what the organization does, what it is striving to achieve, and what knowledge is important for this to happen. When students engage with the offerings of the workplace and are facilitated to reflect on experiences, then they are well positioned to demonstrate that they can reach the standards as described in the student learning outcomes detailed in the university documentation.

Encouraging students to seek insights can provide further evidence of learning outcomes such as problem-solving and creative thinking. This responsive and arguably fluid approach to determining the demonstration of learning outcomes is imperative because work-based learning does not fit not regular university programs nor the standard facilitation and assessment of learning (Lester & Crosley, 2010). Lester and Crosley (2010, p.566) suggest assessment of work-based learning should 'avoid undermining the nature of the learning'. This is possible when the learning and assessment is driven by the student. This is imperative if learners are to be 'map-makers' or 'self-managing practitioners' not purely 'mapreaders' (Lester & Crosley, 2010; Yorke, 2011). The problem is that the reflection and analysis required by the student implied in these forms of assessment approaches is not well understood nor practiced (Yorke, 2011). Students are largely an untapped resource of collaborative governance. Given the premise that students are 'agentic' learners (Billett, 2011), and should be actively engaged to be co-creators of determining and assessing their learning (Trede & McEwen, 2015a) they are a key stakeholder of the collaborative governance framework.

The Student as Partner

Students need to be suitably located in the space across university and industry to be co-creators, that is, to identify the relevant learning experiences, responses, and outputs commensurate with specified learning outcomes. For students to be co-creators of the learning and assessment during work-based learning experiences it is imperative they are well informed about the requisite learning outcomes and adequately supported through structures and processes (and accompanying resources) that sufficiently prepare them to

positively engage in workplaces. A well developed sense of self-efficacy and agency is instrumental for students to constructively interact to co-produce learning goals and achieve assessment thresholds that are indicative of the specific learning outcomes (Harvey et al., 2012).

At the outset, students need to be confident and demonstrate self-efficacy to positively engage in workplace experiences. Students therefore benefit from a well-developed sense of agency (Bandura, 2006). A sense of agency assists students to manage their practice capabilities and professional image, gain insight into how they interact with others and represent themselves, and their ability to reflect, assisted through seeking feedback on their behaviors. Reflections that assist the transformation of experiences into learning advance students' career-wide development. These types of skills help students develop attributes that industry is seeking in graduates. Student preparation for partnering therefore includes: insights into their capabilities and how they present; knowledge and shared understanding of the requisite learning outcomes with academics and host supervisors; and opportunities to explore how these can be accomplished and demonstrated through achievements of work-based learning experiences.

OPERATION OF THE COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

Continuing communication and established collaborative structures and processes across university and industry that involve students ensure the positive contribution of university, industry and student in the governance framework. Students understanding of the learning outcomes, exploration of their capacities, and their specific progress plan for which they should be responsible ideally informs sequential structured 'episodes' of learning. The effective sequencing of episodes of learning is possible when the university clearly communicates prior student learning, levels of attainment and enables student engagement in the workplace. Furthermore, partnerships are sustained across university and industry when relevant staff across both sectors clarify expectations in an open and respectful environment. This assists mutual understanding and potential for on-going collaboration. Progressive building of student capability through meaningful work-based experiences is instrumental in developing their confidence. Student confidence is critical to advancing their sense of agency. A sense of agency is fundamental to students driving their own learning.

Students can become drivers of learning and inquiry supported by the appropriate supervisors in the workplace and at the university. Drawing on the cycle of inquiry (Timperley, 2011) students can lead processes whereby they engage with partners in the workplace, supported by agreements with the university, to participate in work practices and, also important issues that they can meaningfully engage. In the conduct of work-based practices and also the investigation of issues students seek relevant knowledge. Further to this they reflect on their behavior, their understanding and their interpretation of work practices. Their responses to situations, events and issues are important for their subsequent learning and development. In the collaborative governance framework the responses are learning opportunities progressed in joint consultation with university and industry. A continuing cycle of inquiry that explores such things as, what is already known, what is the evidence of this, where has it come from, how do I incorporate this into my practice, what behaviors and actions demonstrate that I have made sense of knowledge, and what should I do now, is effectively jointly supported by university and workplace supervisors. It is acknowledged that this support is provided in both direct and indirect forms depending on

the circumstances, types of supervision, models of work-based learning and the opportunities on offer. As information is forthcoming it is important that students appraise situations, namely, explore whether it is useful to their purposes, why or why not, and what are they going to do differently (if anything) in the future. These discussions ideally are conducted concurrently with workplace and university supervisors.

CONCLUSION

Collaborative governance is an important part of effective and reciprocally productive work-based learning programs. Governance structures need to be realized through human agency and good will by all three players, university, industry, student involved in work-based learning. In the absence of collaborative governance and shared understanding of learning activities and outcomes, work-based learning experiences can present a risk for all involved. Reputation, time, work safety are just a few items on the long list on the risk register of poor work-based learning experiences. There is no doubt that collaborative governance flourishes when it is understood as a finely nuanced network that is underpinned by commitment, shared understanding and building trust across university, industry and student guided by the student learning outcomes. The benefits of successful collaborative governance include a more purposeful work-based learning program that can better enable student capability and increase their employability, both are important outcomes to the university, industry, and the student.

REFERENCES

Ansell, C., & Gash A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543-571.

Australian Learning and Teaching Council. (2010). *Learning and teaching academic standards project: Final report*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Author . Retrieved from http://nla.gov.au/nla.arc-127341

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1,* 164-180.

Bates, M. (2011). Work-integrated learning workloads: The realities and responsibilities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Co-operative Education, 12*(2), 111-124.

Benefer, R. (2007). Engaging with employers in work-based learning: A foundation degree in applied technology. *Education + Training, 49*(3), 210-217.

Billett, S. (2011). Integrating experiences in workplace and university settings: A conceptual perspective. In Billett, S. & Henderson, A. (Eds.) *Developing learning professionals.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Boud, D. (2016). Taking professional practice seriously: Implications for deliberate course design. In F. Trede & C. McEwen (Eds). *Educating the deliberate professional: Preparing for emergent futures*. Gewerbestrasse, Switzerland: Springer International.

Coll, R., & Zegwaard, K. (2011). *International handbook for cooperative and work-integrated education: International perspectives of theory, research and practice* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.

Cooper, L., & Orrell, J. (2016). University and community engagement: Towards a partnership based on deliberate reciprocity. In F. Trede & C. McEwen (Eds). *Educating the deliberate professional: Preparing for emergent futures*. Gewerbestrasse, Switzerland: Springer International.

Commonwealth of Australia. (2015). *Tertiary education quality and standards agency act 2011. Higher education standards framework (Threshold standards) 2015.* Federal Register of Legislative Instruments F2015L01639: Canberra, ACT, Australia: Author

Cooper, L., Orrell, J., & Bowden, M. (2010). *Work integrated learning: A Guide to effective practice*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Errington, E. P. (2010) *Preparing graduates for the professions using scenario-based learning.* Brisbane, Australia: Post Pressed.

Ferns, S., Campbell, M., & Zegwaard, K. (2014). Work integrated learning. In Ferns, S. (Ed.) *Work Integrated Learning in the Curriculum*. Milperra, NSW, Australia: HERDSA.

Foskett, R. (2003). *Employer and needs-led curriculum planning in higher education: a cross sector case study of foundation degree development* Retrieved from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003182.htm.

Gardner, A., Gardner, G., Coyer F., & Gosby H. (2016). Educating for health service reform: Clinical learning, governance and capability – a case study protocol. *BMC Nursing*. *15*(32) doi: 10.1186/s12912-016-0152-8.

Grealish, L., & Henderson A. (2016) Investing in organisational culture: Nursing students' experience of organisational learning culture in aged care settings following a program of cultural development, *Contemporary Nurse*, *52*(5), 569-575.

Harvey, M., Baker, M., Bosanquet, A., Coulson, D., & Semple, A-L, Warren, V. (2012, October - November). *Moving beyond the diary: Innovation in design and delivery of reflection*. Paper presented at the Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN) National Conference, Geelong, Victoria, Australia.

Henderson, A., Alexander, H., Haywood, A., Stapleton, P., Cooke, M., Patterson, E., Dalton, M., & Creedy D. (2010). Promoting and providing expert guidance in work-intensive clinical settings, *Vocations and Learning, 13*(2), 141-150.

Henderson, A., Cooke, M., Creedy, D., & Walker R. (2012). Nursing students' perceptions of learning in practice environments: A review. *Nurse Education Today, 32*(3), 299-302.

Henderson, A., & Eaton, E. (2013). Assisting nurses to facilitate student and new graduate learning in practice settings: What 'support' do nurses at the bedside need? *Nurse Education in Practice, 13*(3), 197-201.

Henderson, A., Forrester, K., & Heel, A. (2006). The establishment of structures and processes for the safe and effective clinical placement of nursing students, *Nurse Education in Practice, 6*(5), 275-280.

Henderson, A., Heel, A. & Twentyman, M. (2007). Enabling student placement through strategic partnerships between a health-care organization and tertiary institutions, *Journal of Nursing Management, 15*(1), 91-96.

Horstmanshof, L, & Moore, K. (2016). Understanding the needs of all stakeholders: Issues of training and preparation for health care students and their clinical educators *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 17*(2), 93-100.

Jackson, D (2014) Employability skill development in work-integrated learning: Barriers and best practice *Studies in Higher Education*. *40*(2), 350-367. doi:10.1080/03075079.2013.842221.

Lester, S., & Crosley, C. (2010). Work-based learning at higher education level: Value, practice and critique'. *Studies in Higher Education*, *35*(5), 561–575.

Levett-Jones, T., & Lathlean, J. (2008). Belongingness: A prerequisite for nursing students' clinical learning. *Nurse Education in Practice, 8*(2), 103-111.

Patrick, C-j., Peach, D., Pocknee, C., Webb, F., Fletcher, M., & Pretto, G. (2008). *The WIL [Work Integrated Learning] report: A national scoping study [Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) Final report]*. Brisbane Qld, Australia: Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from www.olt.gov.au.

Smith, R., Mackay, D., Challis, D., & Holt, D. (2006). Seeking industry perspectives to enhance experiential education in university-industry partnerships: Going beyond mere assumptions. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 7(2),* 1-9.

Smith C., Ferns, S., Russell L., & Cretchly P. (2014). *Final Report: Assessing the impact of work-integrated learning (WIL) on student work readiness*. Retrieved from www.olt.gov.au.

Timperley, H. (2011). *Using student assessment for professional learning: Focusing on students' outcomes to identify teachers' needs*.(Paper no. 21) Education Policy and Research Division Office for Policy, Research and Innovation , Department of Education and Early Childhood Development: Melbourne, Australia: Retrieved from *www.eduweb.*vic.gov.*au*.

Trede, F., & McEwen, C. (2016). Scoping the deliberate professional. In F. Trede & C. McEwen (Eds). *Educating the deliberate professional: Preparing for emergent futures*. Gewerbestrasse, Switzerland: Springer International.

Trede, F., & McEwen, C. (2015a). Critical thinking for future practice. In M. Davies and R. Barnett (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education* (pp. 457-475). New York, NY: Palgrave.

Trede, F. & McEwen, C. (2015b). Early workplace learning experiences: What are the pedagogical possibilities beyond retention and employability? *Higher Education*, 69, 19-32. doi 10.1007/s10734-014-9759-4.

Trede, F., & Smith, M. (2014). Workplace educators' interpretations of their assessment practices: A view through a critical practice lens. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(2), 154-167.

Yorke, M. (2011). Work-engaged learning: Towards a paradigm shift in assessment. *Quality in Higher Education*, *17*(1), 117-130.

Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education
ISSN 1175-2882
www.apjce.org

About the Journal

The Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education publishes peer-reviewed original research, topical issues, and best practice articles from throughout the world dealing with Cooperative Education (Co-op) and Work-Integrated Learning/Education (WIL).

In this Journal, Co-op/WIL is defined as an educational approach that uses relevant work-based projects that form an integrated and assessed part of an academic program of study (e.g., work placements, internships, practicum). These programs should have clear linkages with, or add to, the knowledge and skill base of the academic program. These programs can be described by a variety of names, such as cooperative and work-integrated education, work-based learning, workplace learning, professional training, industry-based learning, engaged industry learning, career and technical education, internships, experiential education, experiential learning, vocational education and training, fieldwork education, and service learning.

The Journal's main aim is to allow specialists working in these areas to disseminate their findings and share their knowledge for the benefit of institutions, co-op/WIL practitioners, and researchers. The Journal desires to encourage quality research and explorative critical discussion that will lead to the advancement of effective practices, development of further understanding of co-op/WIL, and promote further research.

Submitting Manuscripts

Before submitting a manuscript, please unsure that the 'instructions for authors' has been followed (www.apjce.org/instructions-for-authors). All manuscripts are to be submitted for blind review directly to the Editor-in-Chief (editor@apjce.org) by way of email attachment. All submissions of manuscripts must be in Microsoft Word format, with manuscript word counts between 3,000 and 5,000 words (excluding abstract, references, and tables).

All manuscripts, if deemed relevant to the Journal's audience, will be double-blind reviewed by two or more reviewers. Manuscripts submitted to the Journal with authors names included with have the authors' names removed by the Editor-in-Chief before being reviewed to ensure anonymity.

Typically, authors receive the reviewers' comments about 1.5 months after the submission of the manuscript. The Journal uses a constructive process for review and preparation of the manuscript, and encourages its reviewers to give supportive and extensive feedback on the requirements for improving the manuscript as well as guidance on how to make the amendments.

If the manuscript is deemed acceptable for publication, and reviewers' comments have been satisfactorily addressed, the manuscript is prepared for publication by the Copy Editor. The Copy Editor may correspond with the authors to check details, if required. Final publication is by discretion of the Editor-in-Chief. Final published form of the manuscript is via the Journal website (www.apjce.org), authors will be notified and sent a PDF copy of the final manuscript. There is no charge for publishing in APJCE and the Journal allows free open access for its readers.

Types of Manuscripts Sought by the Journal

Types of manuscripts the Journal accepts are primarily of two forms; *research reports* describing research into aspects of Cooperative Education and Work Integrated Learning/Education, and *topical discussion* articles that review relevant literature and give critical explorative discussion around a topical issue.

The Journal does also accept *best practice* papers but only if it present a unique or innovative practice of a Co-op/WIL program that is likely to be of interest to the broader Co-op/WIL community. The Journal also accepts a limited number of *Book Reviews* of relevant and recently published books.

Research reports should contain; an introduction that describes relevant literature and sets the context of the inquiry, a description and justification for the methodology employed, a description of the research findings-tabulated as appropriate, a discussion of the importance of the findings including their significance for practitioners, and a conclusion preferably incorporating suggestions for further research.

Topical discussion articles should contain a clear statement of the topic or issue under discussion, reference to relevant literature, critical discussion of the importance of the issues, and implications for other researchers and practitioners.

Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education
ISSN 1175-2882
www.apjce.org

EDITORIAL BOARD