Feedback practices and signature pedagogies: what can the liberal arts learn from the design critique?
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To examine the differences between feedback practices in liberal arts courses and in design courses, we surveyed 373 students with experiences of both. Our study found that students perceived the feedback they received in design courses as more effective in advancing their learning, and that the emotional effects of feedback presented verbally and in public did not significantly interfere with their learning experience. This article aligns our findings with existing literature on feedback in order to explore how elements of the ‘signature pedagogy’ of the design studio critique might be transformed to apply to feedback practices in the liberal arts.
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What kind of education does a student need to become a practicing member of a profession? According to Shulman (2005a, 2005b), each of the modern professions has evolved its own ‘signature pedagogy’, a distinct set of teaching practices designed to facilitate the mastery of complex processes and thinking while also transferring a specific identity to the new practitioners. The case dialogue method in law schools, for example, is a signature pedagogy that teaches a student how ‘to think like a lawyer’, just as clinical rounds shape the habits of mind of future physicians. As Shulman (2005b) notes, these pedagogies ‘nearly always entail public student performance’, which raises ‘the emotional stakes of the pedagogical encounters’ and produces a deep level of student engagement.

The mission of the university in our study centers on guiding students through the transition from student to professional for a variety of fields, including architecture and other design professions. From time to time, our colleagues in the design departments would invite us to serve as guest ‘jurors’ for final critiques (or ‘crits’) in one of their programs. Attending these events gave us a chance to witness an important component of the signature pedagogy for design fields: the formal and public delivery of feedback to students about their work at the end of the semester. From our perspective as faculty in the Liberal Arts, these summative events struck us as somewhat unfamiliar and rather exotic. Whether in architecture, fashion design, industrial design, or some other discipline, the process for giving feedback is generally the same. Typically, for reviews, students pin an array of their designs on a
Studio wall and sometimes pass around three-dimensional (3-D) models of their work – our fashion design students may even show their work on live models. The audience for the reviews generally consists of a collection of faculty members and invited guests from their field and, behind them, classmates and friends of the presenter. One by one, in this very public setting, the design students explain their projects, answer questions and challenges from the faculty members and guests, and receive their feedback.

The public performances and oral feedback we observed in these critiques contrast strongly with the feedback procedures found in the liberal arts courses that we teach. Liberal arts courses generally do not operate in a professional context and, as Shulman (2005a) points out, their ‘signature pedagogy is, by default, the large lecture’. Typically, student work in these classes takes a written, textual form, and the final versions of that work are often reviewed by just one person: the instructor. The evaluation of the work usually takes place privately, and is communicated to the student in a written form, generally consisting of a letter grade or numerical score, plus some marginal and/or summative comments.

Of course, in writing-focused courses, as in design, students often receive additional forms of feedback, prior to the final evaluation of their work. Students may confer privately with their writing instructors about their work, and they may participate in some form of organized peer review. The design disciplines also feature preliminary critiques (sometimes called desk critiques), where the instructor, sometimes alone and sometimes accompanied by other students, visits each student at her or his desk during a studio session for informal discussions about the student’s current work and its progress. These various interim responses offer opportunities for formative feedback, as opposed to the type of summative feedback that students receive on graded papers or in final critiques.

**Research questions and methodology**

As outside observers of the feedback practices in the design fields, we became curious about the ‘feedback cultures’ in the design disciplines and how they contrasted with the practices in the liberal arts courses in our general education program. On the pedagogical side, we were struck by the level of student engagement during these critiques; this is clearly an active learning approach, with student participation and opportunities for immediate feedback, dialogue, and clarification. On the emotional side, we wondered whether the stress and anxiety associated with these high stakes events might interfere with student learning. At the time of our study, the university was participating in the Integrative Learning Project sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. That opportunity led us to pay more attention to the variety of signature pedagogies practiced on our campus and to question whether our students’ immersion in the pedagogy of their professional major might complicate their efforts to connect that learning with their learning in the general education core curriculum. At the same time, we remained struck by how engaged design students were in their learning within the critique settings, and we wondered how, if at all, that pedagogical power might be harnessed to promote learning in general education.

Our curiosity about these points led us to a research project focused on the design students in Philadelphia University, because they had experienced both of the
feedback settings that we wanted to study. Although we realized that students’ self-reported experiences and perceptions are only one dimension of the pedagogical process, the emotional and subjective aspects of our topic led us to focus on the following research questions:

- Compared with other academic feedback practices, do students perceive that design critiques have an emotional dimension that interferes with their learning?
- How do students perceive the effectiveness of design critiques as learning experiences, in comparison with other feedback practices?

Our study, which took place over the course of one academic year, involved gathering both quantitative and qualitative data. This process entailed acquiring the approval of the university’s Institutional Review Board for human subject research and collecting consent forms from all students and faculty filmed and/or interviewed for the study. The project began with an email to all 2nd- through 4th-year students in 10 different design fields at our institution, inviting them to complete an anonymous online survey. Out of approximately 700 students in this group, 373 completed the questionnaire. To examine the student responses in more depth, we arranged group interviews with student volunteers from three specific majors: fashion design, architecture, and industrial design. These group interviews, lasting about 45–50 minutes each and involving two to five students, were organized around the questions in the online survey, with the aim of getting a clearer sense of the student thinking behind their written responses.

The results of this investigation confirmed some of our expectations about ‘feedback cultures’ and highlighted issues we had not expected to encounter or consider. Overall, we discovered that students reported a high level of learning from the feedback activities in their design classes, with the feedback that they receive in their general education writing classes ranking somewhat lower. The student responses also gave us some insights into the factors that might account for the perceived greater effectiveness of the ‘feedback culture’ in their design classes, which in turn suggested some strategies for applying the power of these practices in learning environments outside of the design disciplines.

Feedback practices in design courses and in general education writing courses: student and scholarly perspectives

The questions in our survey asked students to reflect on the feedback practices in both their design courses and their general education writing courses. For the design courses, we asked about preliminary critiques and final critiques; for the writing classes, we inquired about peer reviews, one-on-one consultations with an instructor and receiving graded papers with written comments. For each of these five different feedback settings, the student respondents answered questions about their perceptions regarding personal comfort level, the quality of their learning experience, and whether the setting created any emotional effects that interfered with their learning. Additional questions focused on the effectiveness of peer review and instructor feedback in design courses and in general education writing courses.
While our observations of design critiques suggested that these were powerful pedagogical moments, we wanted to determine whether there were affective dimensions to the student experience in this high-stakes public setting that might undermine learning. When we asked students in the online survey about their level of comfort in the five different settings in the questionnaire, they reported the lowest level of comfort in the final critique setting, with only 44% indicating that they felt ‘comfortable’ or ‘very comfortable’ in this situation. The most comfortable setting was the preliminary critique, with 72.1% of students answering ‘comfortable’ or ‘very comfortable’ (Figure 1). A common theme in the written comments about this question was that students’ comfort levels were directly connected to the amount of work that they had put into their project and their personal satisfaction with it:

> Comfort is an obscure feeling, and the level of comfort is normally indicative of how comfortable I am with my own performance or the project itself, rather than a fear of criticism. I am my own hardest critic. (student survey response)

As might be expected, other students noted that the higher stakes involved in a final critique made it a less comfortable setting than a preliminary critique: ‘During a final critique, it is much more uncomfortable because I am worried about my presentation, my grade, and whether or not all that work that I have done was worth the effort’ (student survey response).

The feedback setting with the highest perceived level of comfort was the preliminary (or desk) critique, where 72.1% of students reported feeling ‘Comfortable’ or ‘Very comfortable’. During the group interviews, students attributed their comfort to the fact that their work was still in progress, which gave them an opportunity to clarify and respond to the feedback from their instructors. One consistent theme in the literature about feedback and learning is that feedback contributes the most to student learning when students have an opportunity for using the information to improve work in progress or that will shortly be in progress (this is sometimes referred to as ‘feedforward’); summative feedback, when instructor suggestions can no longer be applied to the student work, has less impact on learning (Carless 2006; Gibbs and Simpson 2004–2005; Hattie and Timperley 2007; Price et al. 2010).

The second question on the survey asked students to rate the effectiveness of each feedback setting in terms of their learning experience. Students perceived the

![Figure 1. Survey question 1: ‘During a [feedback setting], I usually feel …’ (responses in percentages, 373 total replies).](image)
preliminary critique setting to be the most effective learning experience, with 92.8% of students rating it as ‘Helpful’ or ‘Very Helpful’. Students gave a lower rating to final critiques, with 83.1% calling them ‘Helpful’ or ‘Very Helpful’. Peer reviews in writing classes received the lowest ratings, with only 43.7% rating them as helpful (Figure 2). Juxtaposing the first two questions in the survey indicates that the feedback setting students perceived as being the most comfortable – the preliminary critique – was also rated as the most effective learning experience. This finding is consistent with previous studies, which showed design students reporting that they learned more in informal or preliminary critiques than in the formal and final critiques (Anthony 1991). The literature on feedback in general offers similar conclusions, indicating that feedback situations with a perceived low level of threat to the student’s self-esteem produced more effective learning than high-threat conditions (Hattie and Timperley 2007). The student responses in our interviews and surveys indicated that desk critiques in design were clearly considered a less stressful and more informal setting than the final critiques. The high rating that design students gave to the learning in their preliminary critiques is consistent with other studies of academic feedback, which have shown that instructor comments that aren’t accompanied by grades lead to stronger learning gains than feedback that includes a grade (Hattie and Timperley 2007).

Another theme in the literature on the pedagogical aspects of design critiques (also referred to as juries) is the learned tendency of students to approach the final critique as a game, rather than an educational experience. Under these circumstances of summative assessment, students are reluctant to question the design instructors or professionals in the ‘jury’ or to engage in dialogue that might reveal gaps in their understanding or their design conceptualization. Instead, as Webster (2007) points out, they take ‘a strategic approach to jury presentations with the aim of “doing well” as opposed to honestly reflecting on their learning’. Kathryn Anthony makes a similar point: ‘More often than not, what students claim to have learned from design juries has more to do with presentation style, or how to “play the game”, than with design’ (Anthony 1991). Although these observations seem to cast doubt on the educational value of design critiques, other scholars highlight the importance of these experiences for helping students grow into the role of design professionals. In this view, critiques perform the vital function of giving students ‘messages of who

Figure 2. Survey question 2: ‘As a learning experience, a [feedback setting] is usually …’ (responses in percentages, 373 total replies).
they should be as a member of [the] discipline and how they should relate to others who are listening’ (Dannels, Gaffney, and Martin 2008).

Finally, some of the scholarship on the educational impact of final critiques emphasizes the ritualistic or theatrical nature of these events: this approach can either suggest that critiques are a kind of oral tradition that teaches students ‘the rituals of the design tribe’ (Dannels 2005) or else that they serve as a spectacle dramatizing the symbolic power that the instructors and professionals wield over the students hoping to enter the field (Percy 2004; Webster 2007). In the latter case, critiques are seen as opportunities for ‘the hegemonic display of power relationships between the academic members of the staff’, with the student role reduced to witnessing ‘the virtuoso performance of their tutors’ (Percy 2004). From this perspective, the critique serves as an initiation ritual; instructors model the behavior and power of members of the field and ‘[s]tudents who successfully engage in the performance of the crit become a member of the fraternity’, while ‘those who cannot find a way of participating become isolated and alienated from the discourse’ (Percy 2004). These metaphors of theater and ritual resonate with Shulman’s observation (2005b) that all signature pedagogies require students ‘to perform their roles’ and that this participation in professional performances helps students develop ‘personal identities and values’ (Shulman 2005a). In this view, the ritualistic aspects of design pedagogy may be seen as a key component of this signature pedagogy.

The third question in the survey directly asked whether the emotional strains of being critiqued verbally in a public setting were compromising student learning in that situation. Overall, the student responses did not indicate a major concern about this, but 28.1% indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the emotions that occur during a final critique interfere with their learning. This was the highest ranking, followed by preliminary critiques, with 18.2% of students perceiving some interference (Figure 3).

In the group interviews and in their written responses on the survey, students frequently noted that peers who could not master the emotional aspect of the critique process would not succeed in their design education and that students’ progress depended on their ability to work past the emotions of being critiqued: ‘If you are this “emotional”, and cannot take criticism maybe those students should not be in architecture’ (student survey response). In her work on oral genres in design
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education, Dannels (2005) quotes a professor who makes a similar connection between a student’s ability to handle criticism and her or his ability to become a professional in the design fields: ‘Someone who’s open to and welcomes response, that’s very important. It’s an emotional element to the crit that isn’t talked about much but everyone’s aware of it. Some students can get very defensive. And it’s an emotional hurdle they need to get over’.

Shulman’s work (2005b) on signature pedagogies likewise emphasizes the ‘emotional stakes’ involved in the effective education and training of professional practitioners, arguing that ‘an absence of emotional investment, even risk and fear, leads to an absence of intellectual and formative yield’, but he also warns that the affective components of the pedagogy must be carefully managed, ‘so that teaching produces learning rather than paralyzing the participants with terror’. Based on the student responses in our study, the design faculty at Philadelphia University generally seemed fairly successful at maintaining that balance in emotional energy.

When surveyed about the types of feedback used in writing courses, the students reported feeling much less emotion in these settings than in their design critiques: ‘When I get my paper back with comments, there is an emotional distance, and I don’t have to worry about getting emotionally jolted in front of others’ (student survey response). In the videotaped interviews and in the survey responses, however, some students did report feeling more vulnerable presenting and discussing their written work than their design work:

Public discussions are great for design work, because a lot of different inputs can be beneficial, but public scrutiny of written work is harder to swallow. I think it is because your intelligence is being evaluated, and, unlike design work where the interpretation is all in the viewer’s eyes (giving some leeway [sic]), written words are more easily taken at face value. They are more identifiable and unique to the writer, so when my ideas are scrutinized in a public manner, I get embarrassed [sic] easier. (student survey response)

We did not find evidence that this sense of discomfort extended to peer reviews in writing courses. Peer reviews received the lowest interference rating, 6.2%, which, when combined with the earlier responses about this feedback practice, may indicate that students felt that emotions could only disrupt learning in a situation where learning was actually occurring!

A survey question asking about motivation found that 74.8% of the student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that public, spoken feedback provided them with high motivation, compared with a total of 54.4% for private, written feedback. In their qualitative comments, some students referred to the higher stakes of a public setting as a motivational factor: ‘A verbal, public critique is definitely the most challenging and emotionally stressful. It is also where I do my best work. I want to impress my professor and his colleagues. I want to look like I know what I’m talking about in front of my peers’ (student survey response). In this case, the extra emotional charge of the feedback setting is seen as intensifying the student’s learning and effort, a possibility that reinforces Shulman’s thoughts (2005a) about the power of signature pedagogies to engage students deeply: ‘I would say that without a certain amount of anxiety and risk, there’s a limit to how much learning occurs. One must have something at stake’.
A common response to this question was that motivation was an internal force, or that it was provided by factors other than the feedback setting: ‘My motivation has nothing to do with how a project will be critiqued or graded. Motivation is something that I have for myself and my goals’ (student survey response). Another student had a similar response: ‘I am motivated to do my best work when I find the project engaging, well thought out, and it has well described objectives. Self-motivation is what drives me more than another person’s words’ (student survey response). In these cases, the work itself or the students’ own ambitions determined their level of motivation and the responses of these students provide a good example of the power of intrinsic motivation (Gagne and Deci 2005), which is perhaps easier to activate with the creative freedom afforded by some design projects.

A final set of questions asked students to compare design courses with writing classes in terms of the helpfulness of feedback from peers and instructors. On the issue of peer feedback, writing courses did not fare well: only 39.7% of students felt that peer writing feedback was helpful or very helpful, while the response for peer design feedback was 92.5%, creating one of the starkest contrasts in our study. Based on the written feedback and the videotaped group interviews, this disparity seems to involve several factors: level of student engagement in peer reviews, level of student expertise, and level of trust and community among students.

According to the student comments, the level of student engagement in peer reviews in writing courses can be low not only among the reviewers, but also on the part of the student whose work is under review. A type of negative feedback loop appears in some versions of peer reviews in writing courses, as the student reviewers’ lack of engagement in the critique seems matched and influenced by the student author’s lack of confidence and interest in the reviewers’ comments. In these cases, both parties in the peer review relationship have low expectations of the usefulness of the exercise.

This pattern is directly related to the second factor, which is the students’ perceived level of expertise in writing courses versus those in design. Student comments included numerous variations on this theme: ‘I feel like design peer review is often more helpful than writing peer review, only because it seems like in a design class your peers know more about the subject than in a writing class’ (student survey response). As one architecture student noted in a group interview, when students are taking one of the required writing courses, no one in the class is majoring in that discipline, so there is no expectation of authority or expertise among the students. An industrial designer dismissed peer reviews in writing in these terms: ‘I might not take it seriously, because, you know, what do they know’ (student interview response: industrial design)?

Research suggests that student perceptions of the quality of feedback is influenced by ‘familiarity with the work unit’ (Strijbos, Narciss, and Dunnebier 2010); students working together in a design studio would be expected to rank higher in this measure than would students collaborating in a general education course in the liberal arts. In design classes, everyone involved has demonstrated commitment to the discipline by the act of majoring in it, so the perceived levels of student expertise and engagement may be higher, which, in turn, may incline students to take each other’s input more seriously. Previous research on student learning in design studios has found a similar trend, with students reporting that reviewing their work with fellow students often leads to more learning and progress than desk or final
critiques with their instructors (Anthony 1991). Shulman (2005b) describes signature pedagogies as ‘not only active but interactive’, because students are accountable ‘not only to teachers, but also to peers’. The student responses in this study clearly display that sense of accountability and interaction.

In the case of the industrial design students, there is an added dimension to the authority of peer reviewers; namely, the students also represent the potential consumers of the designed objects. In our focus groups, one industrial design student framed this point as follows:

We are product design, we’re making products for the public, so anything that they say is right – we’re designing for them anyway. So, their input is what we’re trying to work around in the first place. So, I would take any peer’s input from that – I would take it into account very seriously. (student interview response: industrial design)

The final factor is the sense of community and trust that develops among design students who spend long stretches of time together each week in studio classes and therefore become very familiar with the people in their cohort over multiple years of designing together. This social but quasi-professional setting often seems to inspire a level of mutual trust and gives students a rich sense of context for processing peer feedback: ‘You know all of these people you’ve been with, you know; you’ve spent 12 hours a week with these people, and you know exactly where they come from and their design background’ (student interview response: architecture). A writing class with a random assortment of students meeting three hours per week for one semester simply cannot be expected to generate the level of trust that design students develop from long familiarity and shared experiences in their discipline-specific contexts. Without this sense of mutual commitment and shared expertise and aspiration in a writing class, peers simply are not likely to be seen as reliable sources of feedback.

When the focus shifts from peer review to instructor feedback, the helpfulness gap between writing and design classes shrinks somewhat. Asked about the helpfulness of instructors of writing classes, 69.1% of students agreed or strongly agreed that feedback from their writing instructors was helpful, while 90% agreed or strongly agreed that feedback from their design instructors was helpful. Although the difference is not statistically significant, it is noteworthy that design students rated peer review as slightly more helpful than instructor feedback in design (92.5% vs. 90%). One student described peers as providing a baseline of continuity that remains steady amid a series of instructors with varying standards and expectations: ‘Professors come and go, peers stay with you’.

Writing instructors are at somewhat of a disadvantage here, as they do not spend long hours with the students in a studio setting, and because students do not see them as professional role models whose careers or work they can learn from or emulate:

In the beginning of the design process, I get a lot of help from peers and from my professor as well. As the semester [progresses], less help is needed from the professor, yet their help is still very useful. This differs from writing, because I do not have as personal of a relationship with writing professors as my design professors. Therefore, I hardly ever have one-on-one meetings with them. (student survey response)

Our professors, they all have their own design history, and anything they say is gold. (student interview response: industrial design)
Because they do not define themselves as future writers, design students in general education classes seem not to identify as strongly with their instructors or place as much value on their feedback. If, as researchers like Webster (2007) and Percy (2004) have argued, the final critique serves as an initiation ritual or a hegemonic display of the power of the design profession, then the feedback procedures in general education classes either would not be fulfilling these purposes or the students would be much less invested in the outcomes of these performances.

Conclusions
Given the positive assessments that design students give to the feedback practices in their fields, we could not resist wondering how elements of the ‘signature pedagogy’ of the design studio critique might be transformed to apply to feedback practices in the liberal arts. When we consider this question seriously, several limiting factors become apparent. One of these factors was not covered in the survey, but it seems significant: unlike writing, design work is generally presented in a visual medium, which can make it quicker to comprehend and assess and easier for multiple people to experience the same piece of work simultaneously. The visual nature of the work also lends itself better to oral feedback, since details can be pointed to, and because observations can be clarified if they are not initially understood. Reading a piece of writing is usually a more linear and often a solitary process, which makes it more difficult to synchronize among multiple readers, and, depending on the length of the work, the act of reading and responding may take significantly more time to complete.

Transforming and then applying feedback practices from design critiques to general education settings for feedback is also limited by the commitment and interest that students bring to these different components of their education. As the results of our study show in several different ways, students are generally more engaged by and devoted to their design work than to academic work outside of that curriculum. This has implications, as we have seen, in terms of the confidence that students have in their instructors and peers and the emotional investment that they have in their work. Design students view their peers as collaborators and colleagues with shared interests and aptitudes, and they regard their instructors as professional role models with valuable real-world experience. In general, the results from our project suggest that these positive perceptions are not evident in students’ relationships with their peers and instructors in general education writing courses.

Having acknowledged these limitations, however, reflection on our study suggests two possible strategies for harnessing some of the pedagogical power of the design studio feedback practices. The first approach would be to re-engineer our general education courses to replicate the studio experience in terms of shared experiences, stronger social bonds, and effective pedagogical interventions. One of the characteristics of a design studio class is that students are actually doing their work, over an extended period, during the class itself, with the instructor present to supervise and intervene when needed. Imagine a composition or history class meeting for six hours a week, with students doing most of their written work on site as the instructor floated from desk to desk to review the student works in progress and offer feedback. These longer class sessions could devote time to more frequent formal and informal review activities (or ‘crits’), and the extended contact hours and workshop
atmosphere might strengthen the relationships and trust among students and between the students and the instructor. This is not to suggest that many liberal arts faculty do not already create learning environments that involve collaboration as a normal activity, but in light of our findings regarding the special student learning benefits that preliminary critiques offer, this studio model would likely provide general education instructors in the liberal arts with more opportunities to review work in progress, and thus provide more feedback before students have finished their assignments. The results of our study could also be used to support the concept of learning communities that cluster students across multiple sections and semesters to build a culture of camaraderie and trust. The increased familiarity and sense of shared experiences these communities produce might generate some of the affective results of the studio experience in design courses.

The second strategy for bringing the advantages of the signature pedagogy of design to general education courses may be more difficult to carry out: raising students’ estimations of their peers’ expertise and of their instructors’ value as professional role models. Adopting the studio model proposed above, however, could be a first step towards building trust and skills simultaneously, making students more trusting of and confident in the feedback of their peers. Another approach might apply the insights of the industrial design student quoted earlier, who valued feedback from his peers because they represented potential consumers of his designs: designing our courses and assignments so that they position student peers convincingly as the potential readers or ‘consumers’ of their fellow students’ written work should help heighten the perceived value of their feedback. Raising the profile of the instructor as a professional role model may be a more subtle and individual process. Instructors might consider spending more time in class describing the professional context of their work, and how they apply their academic skills to mastering the various challenges that they encounter, just as design instructors might use their past clients and projects as examples in their teaching or to model their professional behavior to their students. This might involve faculty members sharing their own published work as the basis for an assignment in critical reading, or presenting a problem that they are struggling with in a work in progress as a topic for classroom discussion. This insight into the work and practices of faculty in the liberal arts could allow students in general education courses to better appreciate their instructors as effective professionals, even if the discipline is different than the students’ own.

Given that instructor feedback has been statistically identified as one of the most significant factors in learning (Hattie and Timperley 2007), any improvements that we can make in this area will pay rich dividends. The results of our study suggest that the signature pedagogy of the design disciplines includes feedback practices that students perceive as educationally effective, with an emotional component that does not seem to outweigh the attendant benefits for learning. In light of the significantly lower ratings given to the practices often employed in general education writing classes, the design studio and its critique procedures may offer a model for more effective feedback in other parts of the university curriculum, if we are willing to rethink our approach to feedback and to begin intentionally developing signature pedagogies for the liberal arts that go beyond the ‘default’ lecture mode noted by Shulman (2005a). In conclusion, we pose this question to our colleagues as a guide to further research and practice: What kind of pedagogy (and feedback) do students
need to develop into engaged practitioners of writing, critical thinking, close reading, and the other skills and behaviors that we associate with the liberal arts?
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