From fast food to a well-balanced diet: toward a programme focused approach to feedback in higher education

Practitioner Research
In Higher Education

Vol 14(1) pages 3-15

Kimberly Wilder-Davis[a], David Carless[b], Mark Huxham[c], Velda McCune[d], Joan McLatchie[c], Tansy Jessop[e] and Hazel Marzetti[a]
[a] University of Glasgow, Scotland [b]University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong; [c]Edinburgh Napier University, Edinburgh, Scotland; [d]University of Edinburgh, Scotland; [e] University of Bristol, Bristol, England.

Abstract
Feedback may be considered 'good' according to many of the criteria in the literature whilst still having little or no impact on students' learning in the longer term. Feedback in the context of this paper is defined as the process of learners obtaining information about their work in order to produced improved learning. This comes from tutors, peers, or even self-evaluation. Here we argue for greater prominence for feedback in curriculum design. Clear principles for giving guidance on assessments and feedback at the programme level, which complement those already established and widely used for single assessments, would help curriculum designers consider communication to students about assessments in a broader context. These processes should create a dialogue that aids the students' progression in their learning from one module to the next and encourages the development of autonomous learners. Based on a review of the literature on programme-focused approaches to teaching, assessment and feedback, the current paper delineates the benefits of a programme level approach to communication around assessments and proffers a list of broad principles that will help academics achieve a coherent and developmental approach to feedback.

Keywords
Feedback; programme focused feedback; feedback literacy; student engagement.

Introduction

Feedback is a staple ingredient of modern higher education and is – or should be - a core component of learning (Bransford, Brown and Cocking, 2000). Effective feedback practice must combine short term and long-term functions, helping students to learn and to change (Chappuis et al. 2012). As Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 86) note, effective communication around assessments must answer three questions: Where am I going? (What are the goals?), How am I going? (What progress is being made toward the goal?), and Where to next? (What activities need to be undertaken to make better progress?). In designing sustainable feedback practices, it is crucial to consider the kinds of learning that higher education is intended to cultivate. As Carless et al (2011) write, '...feedback is sustainable when it supports students in self-monitoring their own work independently of the tutor' (p.406) . In their future lives and roles, learners will need to work effectively on problems which are complex and unpredictable, and which require inter-disciplinary approaches (Barnett, 2007; Cantor et al., 2015). Some of the challenges which graduates will encounter– such as social inequality, environmental crises and conflict – may also bring together fundamentally incompatible value positions (Barnett, 2007).

Citation
Wilder-Davis, K., Carless, D., Huxham, M., Mccune, V., Mclatchie, J., Jessop, T., and Marzetti, H. (2021) From fast food to a well-balanced diet: toward a programme focused approach to feedback in Higher Education', *Practitioner Research in Higher Education Journal*, 14(1), pp. 3-15.

Cantor et al. (2015) describe these messy real-world problems with no single solution and multiple diverse stakeholders as 'wicked' problems. These problems can legitimately be viewed through many lenses, with the viewpoint of the stakeholder determining the possible outcomes. Cantor et al (2015) further believes that students need to learn how to apply their academic knowledge to real-world situations as soon as possible in their undergraduate career. In this context, assessment must prepare students to evaluate their own and others' work in relation to complex, unpredictable and contextually sensitive situations (Boud and Falchikov, 2006). Of course students must graduate with practical skills, but to deserve the title of a higher education, they should also, in the words of Italian critic Norberto Bobbio, understand and express 'the value of enquiry, the ferment of doubt, a willingness to dialogue, a spirit of criticism, moderation of judgement, philological scruples and a sense of the complexity of things' (Eagleton, 2003). Where Higher Educational systems adopt approaches to feedback that suggest simple, linear solutions, or imply that there is one system that will work for everyone regardless of their situation, they are failing in their responsibility to prepare students for this challenging future. The aim of this paper is threefold: to review key issues in developing a programme-focused approach to feedback, to chart some of the potentials of such an approach, and to propose principles that can assist academics in achieving it. In this paper, we use metaphor to explore the benefits of a programme level approach to assessment and feedback, recommending moving away from a 'fast food diet' of feedback towards a 'well-balanced diet'.

The feedback menu

Whilst many authors agree that feedback is a fundamental component of assessment (Rowntree, 1987; Hester, 2001; Hattie and Timperley, 2007) there are multiple definitions and interpretations of the term. For example, Kulhavy (1977) defined feedback as any of the multitude of techniques that are used to communicate to a learner if a response is right or wrong. More recently, feedback has been defined as 'information about how the student's present state (of learning and performance) relates to goals and standards' (Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). A common characteristic of the multitude of definitions is that feedback provides some illumination for the student on their performance for a given task (Carless, 2018). For the purpose of this article, feedback is defined as:

> A process whereby learners obtain information about their work … in order to generate improved work (Boud and Malloy, 2013, p.6).

This definition is chosen because it focuses on the key role feedback should have in the learning process. It defines the process of feedback as something that is not merely a justification of a mark, or that comes at the end of learning a task or skill, but rather as something to be used to improve future performance, understanding and overall improved learning. This captures the dynamic, corrective feature of feedback found in the cybernetic roots of the term; for example, in the definition given by Ramaprasad (1983) of feedback as 'information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter *which is used to alter the gap in some way'* (italics added). Hence, feedback implies future change. In many circles, this forward-focused information is referred to as 'feedforward'; here, we use the word 'feedback' as these early definitions imply, to include such ideas of responsive change. This responsive change includes the ongoing dialogue that the feedback process can illicit.

Over the last two decades many studies in higher education settings have asked the question, 'What is good feedback?' These studies have focused on everything from what students want from their feedback (Hounsell et al., 2008; Beaumont, O'Doherty and Shannon, 2011; Price, Handley and Millar, 2011; Blair, Curtis and McGinty, 2013) to the best approaches to giving feedback (Higgins, Hartley and Skelton, 2002; Gibbs and Simpson, 2004; Carless et al., 2011) to guiding principles that demonstrate good feedback (Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Research has even suggested that

the ways in which feedback is presented will influence the ways in which a student studies (Gibbs, 2010; Nicol, 2010; Sopina and McNeill, 2015). Common to most of this literature are the notions that 'good feedback' will include: descriptions of the student's work; comments that evaluate the work in terms of those things linked to criteria (both features that add to, or detract from the quality of the reference); suggestions for improvement; and finally exemplars that demonstrate rather than just tell the student how to improve (Sadler, 2010; Nicol, Thomson and Breslin, 2014; Scott, 2014; Carless and Boud, 2018).

The rationale for programme level approaches to feedback

Much of what the research has in common is that it is focused on guidance and feedback practices at the individual assessment or modular levels. This emphasis on the choices of individual academics within their own modules can create a situation where students are not given coherent guidance across their programme. With so many styles of feedback, students are often left confused about how to interpret the various forms of feedback they receive, which leads them to see feedback practices as inconsistent. Students often fail to engage with the feedback in a way that will help facilitate learning for subsequent tasks. This lack of engagement is well documented in the literature (Gibbs and Simpson, 2004; Sinclair and Cleland, 2007; Carless and Boud, 2018), and the explanations for it are many and sometimes contradictory. We argue that a serious barrier to students' constructive engagement with feedback is that they often lack feedback literacy and the proper tools and opportunities needed to actively engage with the feedback that they receive (Withey, 2013; Winstone et al., 2017; Carless and Boud, 2018). Feedback literacy in this context is defined as:

> the understandings, capacities and dispositions needed to make sense of information and use it to enhance work or learning strategies. Students' feedback literacy involves an understanding of what feedback is and how it can be managed effectively; capacities and dispositions to make productive use of feedback; and appreciation of the roles of teachers and themselves in these processes. (Carless and Boud, 2018, p.1316)

What is needed to aid in successful communication around feedback is a higher-level perspective; a programme level approach which builds on the current module level focus. This approach includes structuring feedback practices so that students can make connections between current feedback and tasks in subsequent modules, and teaching students how to use the feedback they are given in useful and meaningful ways. Adopting this high level, programme-focussed approach to assessment is the informing philosophy for the Transforming the Experience of Students Through Assessment (TESTA) methodology. TESTA focuses on looking at the environments in which assessments and associated feedback contributes to further learning (Skinner, 2014). Research using the TESTA methodology has found that the modular approach to curriculum design, which is intended to provide greater freedom of choice for students in constructing their own programmes, can have serious negative effects on learning. A 'containerisation' of learning is implied, with modules becoming conceived as stand-alone learning, teaching and assessment units. This has resulting in a preponderance of summative assessments over formative, with the modular system 'having deleterious effects on assessment design and student learning through an emphasis on the module's assessment rather than the coherence of the whole programme's assessment diet' (Jessop and Hakim, 2012).

This lack of coherence makes it difficult for students to learn from feedback and see it as something that can be taken on to help in subsequent tasks. A programme level perspective will allow students to see the connections and, as Jessop, El Hakim and Gibbs (2014) note, understand that an 'undergraduate degree is subject to a curriculum design process where the 'whole is greater than

the sum of its parts' (p. 74). It is also important to give close attention to the whole guidance and feedback cycle. This includes beginning with the initial written or verbal guidance students are given before an assessment task and considering all of the communication around the assignment until students have finished processing their feedback (Hounsell et al., 2008; McCune and Rhind, 2014).

Such a programme level approach to feedback has the potential to fit assessment practices to the challenges of the modern world. Specifically, our practices need to: contribute to building students' courage and capacity for creative problem solving and critical analysis; contribute to students' resilience in the face of uncertainty and setbacks; and support students to learn how to evaluate their own and others' work in complex situations and to provide students with constructive feedback (Cantor et al., 2015). In order to best support the needs of these learners, programmes need to move away from the quick fixes and standardised packages that are currently prominent features in feedback cultures. The aim of this paper is to help academics achieve a dialogue that aids the students' progression in their learning from one module to the next and encourages the development of autonomous learners (Nicol, 2010; Boud, Malloy and Carey, 2013; Lowe, Tian and Lowe, 2013; Orsmond et al., 2013; Crimmins et al., 2016; Dunworth and Sanchez, 2016; Ajjawi and Boud, 2017).

Fast food feedback

This section will explore the concept of fast food feedback, and the potential dangers to a students' feedback diet. Fast food feedback is designed for rapid consumption and to satisfy basic rather than sophisticated needs; whilst this might sometimes be appropriate too much will lead to serious problems. This kind of feedback can be unbalanced in that it contains only 'empty calories'; by analogy summative marks and simple directions in feedback (Adams and McNab, 2012). Fast food can be cooked and eaten quickly; it is usually standardised and mass produced, eaten alone and quickly forgotten, rich in calories but poor in nutrition. Massification and a focus on the modular level in Higher Education has led to a systemic tendency towards quick and easy feedback (Bailey and Garner, 2010). These simple directions in feedback are often very restricted, solely commenting on the specific task at hand. What may be missing is the harder to digest 'dietary fibre' of carefully worded criticism, the judicious vitamins of insightful praise and the corrective diet of comments linked to previous consumption. Fast food approaches, to nutrition or to learning, are only appropriate if they are part of a balanced programme; the danger of a fragmented modular approach to guidance and feedback is that this balance is not achieved.

Fast food feedback can appear attractive and practical to busy teachers. It may be faster to provide more homogenous and standardised packets of feedback than choosing feedback ingredients that complement other parts of a programme's menu. A lecturer with a limited turn-around time has to dedicate a significant amount of time to the process of marking in addition to other ongoing work activities. The task is particularly challenging for large classes. It can be quite problematic for a lecturer to free up the time needed to provide good, meaningful feedback (Brown, 2007; Holmes and Papageorgiou, 2009a; Ferguson, 2011). Lecturers are likely to fall back on a 'quick fix' that allows them to mark a high volume of work as fast as possible. The ongoing intensification of academic work is unlikely to improve this situation (McInnis, 2010).

Fast food feedback is not conducive to students' learning. Further, even when more nutrient rich feedback is given, students may not understand the comments they are receiving (Beaumont, O'Doherty and Shannon, 2011; Rodway-Dyer, Knight and Dunne, 2011). Lea and Street (1998) note that the expectations of written work are often context and discipline specific, yet can remain implicit, and that the vocabulary and terms that lecturers use in their guidance and feedback are often impenetrable. Students then spend their time focusing on the mark they receive, and even if

they are reading the guidance and feedback, they are often doing little with these (Ding, 1998; Gibbs and Simpson, 2004; Higgins, Hartley and Skelton, 2002). Students tend to have an understanding of what the mark means because it is used across the board to make comparative judgements, whilst formative feedback does not share that feature. This leaves both students and teachers frustrated (Bailey and Garner, 2010; Yang and Carless, 2012).

Students often find it challenging to grasp what comprises high quality work (Sadler, 2010; Carless et al., 2011). This continues to be the case even for experienced, well qualified and well-motivated learners (Smith, 2010; Cotterall, 2011). This phenomenon could be explained by seeing the academic work that students engage in as part of the tacit and situated practices of academic communities (Wenger, 1998; Anderson and McCune, 2013). From these perspectives, students cannot simply be told what high-quality work is, as knowledge cannot be seen as consisting of discrete entities which can be straightforwardly transferred from one person to another (Sfard, 1998; Anderson and McCune, 2013). Rather there is a need for dialogue where students and staff work together in relation to particular examples to gradually develop partially shared understanding (Anderson and McCune, 2013; Northedge and McArthur, 2009; Sadler, 2010). As McArthur and Huxham (2012) note, feedback as dialogue should enable students to discover and create their own path of learning. This dialogue does not necessarily need to be one-to-one or face-to-face, it could also be online and asynchronous. A dialogue like this takes time, and is not amenable to rapid fast food feedback. Making sense of the tacit practices of particular disciplinary communities is also likely to require repeated practice of creating or peer evaluating particular kinds of assessments (Sadler, 2010) rather than being something that students can grasp in one-off assessment events. This need for practice interspersed with dialogue makes a programme level approach to guidance and feedback on assessments essential.

The barriers to a well-balanced diet

While the well-balanced diet is important for student learning, there are some issues that keep both staff and students from fully embracing the diet. The modularisation of degree programmes makes keeping to a well-balanced feedback diet extremely difficult. With each module acting as a standalone, and the abundance of fast food feedback options, cohesion between different feedback practices becomes increasingly difficult. As Jessop et al. (2014) note: 'the consistency, range and types of feedback and feed-forward students experience are more meaningful when seen as a linked series of learning opportunities across the whole programme. Without the benefit of evidence which gives a whole programme view of assessment, these structural elements may be invisible to lecturers on a programme' (p.74). Price et al. (2011) add, 'fundamental beliefs about learning and the learning process will strongly influence how they [the students] see the role of feedback' (p.278-79). Lecturers may find that they are compelled to resort to quick and easy feedback options. These are options that they value based on their own experience, and given the diversity of that experience between instructors, can lead to students being presented with a confusing diversity of feedback styles (Orrell, 2006; Grainger, Purnell and Zipf, 2008).

The modularization of programmes is not the only barrier that makes a well-balanced feedback diet problematic. The diversity of students in a given programme also adds an extra layer of challenges to communication about assessments. While some of the students start the programme on day one of year one, most universities and programmes accept advanced entry students. These students typically enter the programme in year two or three, and may be forced to play catch-up with the assessment and feedback styles offered in the programme. International students may enter a programme with an experience of previous feedback that does not match the practices in their new institutions, and making the transition to a different teaching and learning culture can be very difficult. International students may also struggle with the language if the programme they are a part of is not taught in their first language (Mezirow, 1991; Ritz, 2010). There are students who are

not direct entry or international, but they may have a learning disability or extra support needs that can add an extra layer of challenge to their progression in a programme. With such a diverse range of previous experiences, it can be extremely difficult to develop consistent and developmental systems of providing feedback. Although listening to the desires and experiences of students around feedback is an essential part of any reflective and sophisticated feedback strategy, simply responding to student demands is not enough. Some students may prefer 'fast food feedback' options, and only want a quick intake of calories (in the form of summative marks, or simplistic instructions); limited and tokenistic attempts to listen and respond to 'the student voice' cannot solve problems with feedback, since students – like all people – do not always know what works best for them (see e.g. Huxham, 2007).

Working with a Well-Balanced Diet

The first step to working toward a well-balanced diet is to break the 'fast food feedback' habit. Fast food feedback has its uses, and is sometimes necessary for quick, specific comments or corrections. However, if it is the only type of feedback that a student receives, and it is unclear when the next good meal/more-comprehensive piece of feedback will take place, then unhealthy patterns of learning are formed. This makes it difficult to engage with the feedback (Holmes and Papageorgiou, 2009). Exacerbating this is the fact that modules are often treated as entirely isolable and feedback practices often do not align between modules (Carless, 2006). This means that universities should consider adopting an approach to feedback beyond the modular level, and instead focus on the cohesion and connectedness of a programme-focused approach to the way in which students receive feedback. A first step is for lecturers to know what is taught in other modules and to refer to the relevance of current feedback for future work. This alternative approach to feedback will help students to achieve a healthy diet as they progress through their given programme of study, eventually becoming connoisseurs of feedback.

In addition to staff understanding of other modules, it is important to build a relationship with the students. Genuine partnerships with students to change and improve teaching can lead to mutual learning and a much more sophisticated and challenging menu – for example students may demand more difficult and authentic assessment tasks once they understand that the feedback they receive will assist with future learning (Huxham et al., 2015). It cannot be left solely up to the students to actively engage with the feedback. Lecturers must work with diverse students to gradually build shared understanding through a range of strategies and ongoing dialogue. This means that the student has several opportunities to engage with not only the feedback, but the lecturer as well. How students will respond to the feedback is hard to predict though. Research shows that many students will acknowledge the usefulness of using different types of feedback provided to them. 'Yet they also highlighted that knowing about these strategies and opportunities is not the same as knowing how to use them effectively' (Winstone et al., 2016, p.13). Part of the ongoing dialogue between lecturer and student would need to include the strategies for not only understanding the type of feedback they are receiving, but how to use it as a learning tool.

Within this ongoing dialogue, helping students understand academic terminology and creating a sense of cohesion between markers when grading and providing feedback will make it easier for students to actively engage with their feedback (Winstone et al., 2016). One of the purposes of a programme focused approach to feedback is to foster this environment by creating links not only between assessment and learning objectives, but between modules and future learning; this requires colleagues in programme teams to work together on the feedback menu (Harland et al., 2015). The learning process should be an 'active process in which learners are active sense makers who seek to build coherent and organised knowledge' (Mayer, 2004, p.14). Students will not only have a chance to become literate in a variety of feedback options, but they will be able start thinking

about the learning process as something that they need to become an active part of; they understand the menu as well as taste the food (Baeten, Dochy and Struyven, 2013; Falchikov, 2013).

Changing our Dietary Habits

The shift from a fast food diet to a well-balanced diet will not happen overnight. It will take some dedication and determination and an adjustment to current feedback practices. These principles range from assessment and feedback mapping that comes from programme-related teaching committees and course directors, and of staff-student consultative committees so that these principles can trickle down to the teachers and students who will be providing and receiving the feedback. This discussion needs to start at the programme level though to make sure that everyone involved is working off the same menu. The following seven principles can serve as a guide for universities that are interested in developing a programme focused approach to feedback. They are aligned with the general body of research on what constitutes good feedback practice in higher education, and hence are compatible with providing useful feedback at a modular level but aim to develop programme coherence. A key feature of this set of principles lies in the role of student and creating a space for them to become actively engaged with their feedback as a learning tool.

1.We need a 'slow food' approach; cooking up good guidance and feedback takes time and energy: Lecturers need to be allowed the time to make themselves familiar with the student work they are providing feedback on, so that the suggestions given are really going to help the students learn as they progress through their programme of study. This can be done in the form of more formative assignments (Harland et al., 2015). With regards to the feedback that they supply, tutors need to spend significant time making well-informed, digestible feedback for those that they are cooking for. We should expect lecturers to be spending a considerable amount of time across a programme providing feedback for students, and should be suspicious of the promises of 'quick fixes'. Whilst time may be liberated by reducing the number of fast food meals, and replacing them with fewer more nutritious experiences, judging and providing feedback is a process that takes time to marinate, and should be allowed the time and space to do so (Claxton, 1997).

2. We need to plan our menu to flow from one course to the next: how can assessment and feedback lead to programme-level learning outcomes? Can students see the connections that are made between the guidance and feedback that they get and the subsequent modules? To be useful to students, programme level conversations around assessment need to provide strong and clear opportunities to be directly relevant to future tasks. Feedback given after a module is complete - and with a long time gap before the next assignment to which it might possibly be relevant - is not helpful in this regard. Staged assignments, blogs and projects which can all allow dialogue about ongoing work are better ways forward (Carless et al., 2011). In a programme level approach attention should also be given to supporting students to carry forward learning from feedback to future modules. Setting up class activities or a reflective feedback portfolio, where students reflect on past feedback in relation to a current assignment may be fruitful. Programme level assessment and feedback needs to be designed such that students explicitly revisit themes and capacities over time so that earlier feedback continues to be relevant. The demands of this work on students should build progressively over the course of a programme of study.

3. Students need to taste different flavours of assessment and feedback, although a few ingredients will predominate: Through the course of their studies, students will get many types of feedback related to assessments. It is important that students are exposed to a range of assessment and feedback styles that are appropriate to the programme and discipline of study,

and that fit with the Learning Outcomes (Habeshaw, Gibbs and Habeshaw, 1993; Biggs, 2007). It is possible to give the students too many options though, and not every assessment and feedback option will be appropriate for the programme. A healthy diet is a varied one, but it also emphasises a few staple ingredients and flavours. Students need to taste the same assignment multiple times to develop skill in discerning what makes for good work in that context.

4. **Students may need to be taught to make use of the ingredients of feedback:** Many students in higher education may never have received explicit advice about how to use the feedback they receive; they need to be supported to learn to use this more effectively (Burke, 2009) and to evaluate their own work and give constructive feedback to others (Boud and Falchicov, 2006). One starting point might be exercises where students collate their feedback from several assignments and look for common themes before working with peers and teachers on interpreting these. Over time, students should become connoisseurs of feedback, able to appreciate the flavours without the aid of the lecturers.

5. **Students need the chance to develop more sophisticated palates over time:** programme-level feedback processes need to take into account the students' starting points and build gradually over time toward students being able to independently evaluate and enhance their own and others' work (Boud and Falchicov, 2006; Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick, 2006; Sadler, 2010). Students' prior assessment experiences will often have involved extensive in-class guidance, repeated redrafting of work and formative feedback from teachers (Beaumont, O'Doherty, and Shannon, 2011) so transitions away from this level of support must be gradual.

6. **Meals are a chance for conversation**: Programme level feedback needs to be part of an ongoing dialogue between students, their peers and teachers about what makes for high quality work (Anderson and McCune, 2013; Beaumont et al., 2011; Carless et al., 2011; Sanchez and Dunworth, 2015; Tian and Lowe, 2013). Students need to practice assessments tasks multiple times in the context of such dialogue. This dialogue may comprise written and oral elements as well as online and face-to-face learning (Boud and Molloy, 2013; Nicol, 2010; Orsmond et al., 2013). This might also come in the form of meetings with the students' advisor of study/personal tutor where the student has a chance to discuss their academic progress, and how the feedback that they have received across all the modules works together.

7. **We need to help students take ownership of the cooking process:** Students need to understand what feedback is, and the purpose it serves in their learning. Students need to understand that no-one produces perfect work, and that constructive feedback is an opportunity for learning, rather than an indication that students are in some way not good enough (O'Donovan, Rust, and Price, 2015; Dunworth and Sanchez, 2016). Students can take ownership by giving self and peer feedback, attending office hours to ask for clarification related to feedback, and becoming comfortable using the feedback as a learning tool informing future work rather than as a temporary and disposable experience (Bailey and Garner, 2010).

Conclusions and Further Research

This paper has argued that it is time to moderate fast food feedback with a more well-balanced diet. While fast food feedback can be useful and serve immediate dietary needs, it is not suitable for sustainable learning. Students need to learn the purpose of feedback, as well as how to use it to

their best advantage in improving not only their work, but also their overall learning. This paper has emphasised the importance of a programme-focused approach to feedback, and what that can mean for using feedback as a learning tool and not just a summation of an assignment. This paper has also provided a list of seven principles for creating a well-balanced feedback diet; these provide support for programmes that wish to balance out the feedback they provide and allow students to take control of their learning. These principles are not, of course, the only recipe for a well-balanced feedback diet. We suggest that they capture some of the key conceptual and empirical findings in the literature, and hope they stimulate conversation among colleagues about the best ways in which their programmes can achieve a healthy balance and progression. As medics know, moving from an addiction to fast food can be highly challenging. However, there are tools to help in doing this. For example, the TESTA methodology allows a programme to map assessment and feedback practices for the entirety of the programme. This can help in creating a logical flow of assessment and feedback practices so that students understand how to engage with feedback as a tool to aid in future learning. A space for ongoing dialogue between lecturers, between students and lecturers, and between students and their peers needs to be fostered, to allow for the gradual emergence of feedback literacy amongst a cohort of 'feedback connoisseurs'. Policy in Higher Education is rapidly changing; whilst the pressures towards atomised, fast food education continue to increase, there is growing awareness of the damage this can do to learning and to health, and an emerging 'slow learning' movement (see for example Berg and Seeber, 2013). Now is the time to champion a balanced diet for feedback, across the whole of a programme that recognises that learning takes time and that celebrates a dialogical route towards feedback – and learning – literacy.

Acknowledgements
The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive feedback and helpful suggestions.

References

Adams, J. and McNab, N. (2012) 'Understanding arts and humanities students' experiences of assessment and feedback', *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 12(1), pp. 36–52. doi: 10.1177/1474022212460743.

Ajjawi, R. and Boud, D. (2017) 'Researching feedback dialogue: an interactional analysis approach', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, 42(2), pp. 252–265. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2015.1102863.

Anderson, C. and McCune, V. (2013) 'Fostering meaning: Fostering community', *Higher Education*, 66(3), pp. 283–296. doi: 10.1007/s10734-012-9604-6.

Baeten, M., Dochy, F. and Struyven, K. (2013) 'Enhancing students' approaches to learning: the added value of gradually implementing case-based learning', *European Journal of Psychology of Education*. Springer Netherlands, 28(2), pp. 315–336. doi: 10.1007/s10212-012-0116-7.

Bailey, R. and Garner, M. (2010) 'Is the feedback in higher education assessment worth the paper it is written on? Teachers' reflections on their practices', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(2), pp. 187–198. doi: 10.1080/13562511003620019.

Barnett, M. L. (2007) 'STAKEHOLDER INFLUENCE CAPACITY AND THE VARIABILITY OF FINANCIAL RETURNS TO CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY', *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), pp. 794–816. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2007.25275520.

Beaumont, C., O'Doherty, M. and Shannon, L. (2011) 'Reconceptualising assessment feedback: A key to improving student learning?', *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(6), pp. 671–687. doi: 10.1080/03075071003731135.

Biggs, J. (2007) 'Teaching for Quality Learning at University Third Edition Teaching for Quality Learning at University', *Higher Education*, 9, pp. 165–203. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2007.09.003.

Blair, A., Curtis, S. and McGinty, S. (2013) 'Is peer feedback an effective approach for creating

dialogue in Politics?', *European Political Science*, 12(1), pp. 102–115. doi: 10.1057/eps.2012.2.

Boud, D. and Falchikov, N. (2006) 'Aligning assessment with long-term learning', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(4), pp. 399–413. doi: 10.1080/02602930600679050.

Boud, D., Malloy, E. and Carey, L. (2013) 'Review of Feedback in Higher and Professional Education: Understanding it and doing it well. Edited by David Boud and Elizabeth Malloy', *AISHE-J*, 5(3), pp. 1451–1456. doi: 10.4324/9780203074336.

Bransford, J., Brown, A. L. and Cocking, R. R. (eds) (2000) How people learn: Brain, mind, exprerience and school, in *How People Learn Brain Mind Experience and School*. Washington: National Academy Press. Available at: https://www.nap.edu/read/10067/chapter/7 (Accessed: 20 January 2021).

Brown, S. (2007) 'Feedback and Feed-Forward', *Centre for Bioscience Bulletin*, Autumn. Available at: https://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/EngageinFeedback/bulletin22_feed_forwards.pdf (Accessed: 21 January 2021).

Burke, D. (2009) 'Strategies for using feedback students bring to higher education', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, 34(1), pp. 41–50. doi: 10.1080/02602930801895711.

Cantor, A., DeLauer, V., Martin, D. and Rogan, J. (2015) 'Training interdisciplinary "wicked problem" solvers: applying lessons from HERO in community-based research experiences for undergraduates', *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 39(3), pp. 407–419. doi: 10.1080/03098265.2015.1048508.

Carless, D. (2006) 'Differing perceptions in the feedback process', *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), pp. 219–233. doi: 10.1080/03075070600572132.

Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M. and Lam, J. (2011) 'Developing sustainable feedback practices', *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), pp.395-407. doi: 10.1080/03075071003642449.

Carless, D. (2018) 'Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education Feedback loops and the longer-term: towards feedback spirals', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 44(5), pp.705-714. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1531108.

Carless, D. and Boud, D. (2018) 'The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), pp.1315-1325. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354.

Chappuis, J., Stiggins, R. Chappuis, S. and Arter, J. (2012) *Classroom assessment for student learning : doing it right -- using it well*. 2nd Edition. London: Pearson.

Claxton, G. (1997) *Hare Brain, Tortoise Mind: How Intelligence Increases When You Think Less*, *Journal of Consciousness Studies*. Available at: http://www.amazon.com/dp/0060955414.

Cotterall, S. (2011) 'Doctoral students writing: where's the pedagogy?', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(4), pp. 413–425. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2011.560381.

Crimmins, G., Nash, G.Opreescu, F. Liebergreen, M., Turley, J., Bond, R. and Dayton, J. (2016) 'A written, reflective and dialogic strategy for assessment feedback that can enhance student/teacher relationships', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(1), pp. 141–153. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2014.986644.

Dunworth, K. and Sanchez, H. S. (2016) 'Perceptions of quality in staff-student written feedback in higher education: a case study', *Teaching in Higher Education*. Routledge, 21(5), pp. 576–589. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2016.1160219.

Eagleton, T. (2003) *Figures of dissent : critical essays on Fish, Spivak, Žižek and others*. London : Verso. Available at: http://encore.lib.gla.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb2156781?lang=eng (Accessed: 11 April 2019).

Ferguson, P. (2011) 'Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge , 36(1), pp. 51–62. doi: 10.1080/02602930903197883.

Gibbs, G. (2010) 'Using assessment to support student learning at Using assessment to support

student learning Contents'. Leeds: Leeds Met Press. ISBN 978-1-907240-06-5

Gibbs, G. and Simpson, C. (2004) 'Conditions Under Which Assessment Supports Students' Learning', *Learning in Teaching in Higher Education*, 1(1), pp. 3–31. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2010.512631.

Grainger, P., Purnell, K. and Zipf, R. (2008) 'Judging quality through substantive conversations between markers', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(2), pp. 133–142. doi: 10.1080/02602930601125681.

Habeshaw, S., Gibbs, G. and Habeshaw, T. (1993) *53 interesting ways to assess your students*. London: Technical and Educational Services.

Harland, T., McLean, A., Wass, R., Miller, E. and Sim, K.N. (2015) 'An assessment arms race and its fallout: high-stakes grading and the case for slow scholarship', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(4), pp.528-541. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2014.931927.

Hattie, J. and Timperley, H. (2007) 'The power of feedback', *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), pp. 81-112. doi: 10.3102/003465430298487.

Hester, V. (2001) 'Responding to Student Writing: Locating Our Theory/Practice among Communities', in *Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication* . Denver. Available at: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED451539.pdf (Accessed: 29 April 2017).

Higgins, R., Hartley, P. and Skelton, A. (2002) 'The Conscientious Consumer: reconsidering the role of assessment feedback in student learning', *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(1), pp.53-64. doi: 10.1080/0307507012009936.

Holmes, K. and Papageorgiou, G. (2009a) 'Good, bad and insufficient: Students' expectations, perceptions and uses of feedback', *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 8(1), pp. 85–96. doi: 10.3794/johlste.81.183.

Holmes, K. and Papageorgiou, G. (2009b) 'Good, bad and insufficient: Students' expectations, perceptions and uses of feedback', *The Journal of Hospitality Leisure Sport and Tourism*, 8(1), pp. 85–96. doi: 10.3794/johlste.81.183.

Hounsell, D., McCune, V., Hounsell, J. and Litjens, J. (2008) 'The quality of guidance and feedback to students', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(1), pp. 55–67. doi: 10.1080/07294360701658765.

Huxham, M. (2007) 'Fast and effective feedback: are model answers the answer?', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(6), pp. 601–611. doi: 10.1080/02602930601116946.

Huxham, M., Hunter, M., McIntyre, A., Shilland, R. and McArthur, J. (2015) 'Student and teacher co-navigation of a course: following the *natural lines* of academic enquiry', *Teaching in Higher Education*. Routledge, 20(5), pp. 530–541. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2015.1036730.

Jessop, T. and El Hakim, Y. (2012) 'Introduction Why programme assessment?' Available at: http://www.winchester.ac.uk/Studyhere/ExcellenceinLearningandTeaching/research/e-journals/Documents/Transforming assessment through the TESTA Project.pdf (Accessed: 2 May 2017).

Jessop, T., El Hakim, Y. and Gibbs, G. (2014) 'The whole is greater than the sum of its parts: a large-scale study of students' learning in response to different programme assessment patterns', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), pp. 73–88. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2013.792108.

Kulhavy, R. W. (1977) 'Feedback in Written Instruction', *Review of Educational Research*, 47(2), pp. 211–232. doi: 10.3102/00346543047002211.

Lea, M. R. and Street, B. V. (1998) 'Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach', *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), pp. 157–172. doi: 10.1080/03075079812331380364.

Lowe, J., Tian, M. and Lowe, J. (2013) 'The role of feedback in cross-cultural learning: a case study of Chinese taught postgraduate students in a UK university', *Assessment and Evaluation in*

Higher Education, pp. 1–19. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2012.670196.

Mayer, R. E. (no date) 'Should There Be a Three-Strikes Rule Against Pure Discovery Learning? The Case for Guided Methods of Instruction'. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.14.

McArthur, J. and Huxham, M. (2012) 'Feedback Unbound: from master to usher', in Merry, S., Price, M., Carless, D. and Taras, M. (eds) *Reconceptualising Feedback In Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

McCune, V. and Rhind, S. (2014) 'Understanding Students' Experiences of Being Assessed: The Interplay between Prior Guidance, Engaging with Assessments and Receiving Feedback', in *Advances and Innovations in University Assessment and Feedback*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 246–263. doi: 10.3366/edinburgh/9780748694549.003.0013.

McInnis, C. (2010) 'Traditions of Academic Professionalism and Shifting Academic Identities', in Gordon, G. and Whitchurch, C. (ed.) *In Academic and Professional Identities in Higher Education*. Abingdon, Oxford: Taylor and Francis.

Mezirow, J. (1991) *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.*, *Review & Expositor*. doi: Retrieved from EBSCO HOST.

Nicol, D. (2010) 'From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), pp. 501–517. doi: 10.1080/02602931003786559.

Nicol, D. J. and Macfarlane-dick, D. (2006) 'Formative assessment and self-regulated learning : A model and seven principles of good feedback practice . Formative assessment and self-regulated learning : A model and seven principles of good feedback practice .', *Studies in Higher Education (2006),* 31(2), pp. 199–218. doi: 10.1080/03075070600572090.

Nicol, D., Thomson, A. and Breslin, C. (2014) 'Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: a peer review perspective', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), pp. 102–122. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2013.795518.

Orrell, J. (2006) 'Feedback on learning achievement: rhetoric and reality', *Teaching in Higher Education,* 11(4), pp. 441–456. doi: 10.1080/13562510600874235.

Orsmond, P., Maw, S.J., Park, J.R., Gomez, S. and Cook, A.C. (2013) 'Moving feedback forward: theory to practice', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), pp. 240–252. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2011.625472.

Price, M., Handley, K. and Millar, J. (2011) 'Feedback: focusing attention on engagement', *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(8), pp. 879–896. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2010.483513.

Ramaprasad, A. (1983) 'On the definition of feedback', *Behavioral Science*, 28(1), pp. 4–13. doi: http://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830280103.

Ritz, A. A. (2010) 'International Students and Transformative Learning in a Multicultural Formal Educational Context', *The Educational Forum*, 74(2), pp. 158–166. doi: 10.1080/00131721003608497.

Rodway-Dyer, S., Knight, J. and Dunne, E. (2011) 'A Case Study on Audio Feedback with Geography Undergraduates', *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 35(2), pp. 217–231. doi: 10.1080/03098265.2010.524197.

Rowntree, D. (1987) *Assessing Students-How shall we know them*. London: Kogan Page.

Sadler, A. (2010) 'Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 35((5), pp.535-550. doi: 10.1080/02602930903541015.

Scott, S. V. (2014) 'Practising what we preach: towards a student-centred definition of feedback', *Teaching in Higher Education*. Routledge, 19(1), pp. 49–57. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2013.827639.

Sfard, A. (1998) 'On Two Metaphors for Learning and the Dangers of Choosing Just One', *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), pp. 4–13. Available at: http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0013-189X%28199803%2927%3A2%3C4%3AOTMFLA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0 (Accessed: 29 April 2017).

Sinclair, H. K. and Cleland, J. A. (2007) 'Undergraduate medical students: who seeks formative

feedback?', *Medical Education*, 41(6), pp. 580–582. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02768.x.

Skinner, K. (2014) 'Bridging gaps and jumping through hoops: First-year History students' expectations and perceptions of assessment and feedback in a research-intensive UK university', *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 13(4), pp. 359–376. doi: 10.1177/1474022214531502.

Smith, J. (2010) 'Forging identities: The experiences of probationary lecturers in the UK', *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(5), pp. 577–591. doi: 10.1080/03075070903216650.

Sopina, E. and McNeill, R. (2015) 'Investigating the relationship between quality, format and delivery of feedback for written assignments in higher education', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(5), pp.666-680. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2014.945072.

Wenger, E. (no date) 'Communities of practice and social learning systems: the career of a concept'. Available at: https://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/09-10-27-CoPs-and-systems-v2.01.pdf (Accessed: 20 January 2021).

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R.A. Parker, M. and Rowntree, J. (2016) 'Supporting Learners' Agentic Engagement With Feedback: A Systematic Review and a Taxonomy of Recipience Processes', *Educational Psychologist, 52(1),* pp. 1–21. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538.

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R.A., Rowntree, J. and Parker, M. (2017) '"It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it": barriers to university students' feedback seeking and recipience', *Studies in Higher Education*. Routledge, 42(11), pp. 2026–2041. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2015.1130032.

Withey, C. (2013) 'Feedback engagement: forcing feed-forward amongst law students', *The Law Teacher*, 47(3), pp. 319–344. doi: 10.1080/03069400.2013.851336.

Yang, M. and Carless, D. (2012) 'The feedback triangle and the enhancement of dialogic feedback processes', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), pp. 1–13. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2012.719154.