ALTERIDAD
REVISTA DE EDUCACIÓN
p-ISSN:1390-325X / e-ISSN:1390-8642
http://alteridad.ups.edu.ec

July-December 2021
Vol. 16, No. 2, 194-204
https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v16n2.2021.03

Collaborative curriculum feedback, characterizing the resonances of student experiences

Retroalimentación colaborativa de currículo: Caracterizando las resonancias de las experiencias discentes

Dr. Rubén Nanclares *is a professor at Universidad Santiago de Cali (Colombia) and researcher of the research group FORMACCE and UNIPLURIVERSIDAD (runan10@yahoo.com) (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1425-4776)*

Flor Ángela Tobón-Marulanda *is a professor and researcher at Universidad de Antioquia (Colombia) (flor.tobon@udea.edu.co) (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7386-1333)*

Received on: 2021-02-22 / **Revised on:** 2021-05-04 / **Accepted on:** 2021-06-10 / **Published on:** 2021-07-01

Abstract

Universities as institutions of knowledge must have methodological pedagogical proposals that allow them to update the curriculum, although each institution adopts models that allow them to achieve this objective, one of the weaknesses is active participation of the students. This study reflects on the value of student experiences and their implications for the qualification of training processes in university education. The work is based on the qualitative paradigm from a phenomenological approach; Ethnomethodology and ethno-research-training are used. For the generation of the information, the field diary and focus groups dynamized by collaborative activities are used, and the analysis is made of a thematic and contrastive category. When characterizing the learning experiences, called resonances, it is found that the collaborative feedback of the curriculum allows to identify many resonances that normally remain unknown, i.e., they are not taken into account and that are treated as epiphenomena of the training process. In this work we consider the value and capacity of the learning experiences, which are conceived as curriculative actors, that is, co-authors of the training experiences, who have knowledge that can be used to adjust the proposals of the curricular components, improving the quality of teaching, learning, pedagogical practice and qualification of the curriculum.

Keywords: Curriculum acts, collaboration, university education, learning experience, training, feedback.

Resumen

Las universidades como instituciones de conocimiento, deben contar con propuestas metodológicas de tipo pedagógico que les permitan actualizar el currículo, si bien cada institución adopta modelos que les permiten alcanzar este objetivo, una de las debilidades es participación activa de los estudiantes; en este estudio se reflexiona alrededor del valor de las experiencias discentes y sus implicaciones para la cualificación de los procesos de formativos de la educación universitaria. El trabajo se apoya en el paradigma cualitativo desde un enfoque fenomenológico; se utiliza la etnometodología y la etnoinvestigación-formación. Para la generación de la información se utiliza el diario de campo y grupos focales dinamizados por actividades colaborativas, el análisis se hace de tipo categorial temático y contrastivo. En el ejercicio de caracterizar las experiencias discentes que denominamos resonancias, se encuentra que la retroalimentación colaborativa de currículo, permite identificar muchas resonancias que normalmente permanecen en la opacidad, es decir que no son tenidas en cuenta y que son tratadas como epifenómenos del proceso formativo. En este trabajo consideramos el valor y capacidad de alteridad de las experiencias discentes, que son concebidos como actores "curriculantes", es decir, coautores de las experiencias formativas, que tienen conocimientos que pueden ser utilizados para ajustar las propuestas de los componentes curriculares mejorando la calidad de la enseñanza, el aprendizaje, la práctica pedagógica y la cualificación el currículo.

Descriptores: Actos de currículo, colaboración, educación universitaria, experiencia discente, formación, retroalimentación.

Suggested citation: Nanclares R., & Tobón-Marulanda, F.Á. (2021). Collaborative curriculum feedback, characterizing the resonances of student experiences. *Alteridad, 16*(2), 194-204. https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v16n2.2021.03

1. Introduction: The experience of students in university education

In recent years, different researchers have reflected on the importance of student knowledge. According to Teixeira (1978), since the beginning of the 19th century, the American John Dewey identifies that in pedagogical practice, the experience of the subjects must be recognized as a basis for developing a training that promotes the generation and appropriation of knowledge; Larrosa (2002) argues that experience "is what happens to us, what changes us. Not what happens to others, or what changes others" (p. 21), also Freire (2010), points out that: "It is impossible for us to teach content without knowing how students think in their real contexts, in their daily lives" (p. 127), it is important that both teachers and students talk and share their experiences, —interact— since it is a basic principle for knowledge acquisition.

By analyzing different studies defined in the field of university education in which the importance of the experience of students is addressed by taking into account their diversity, these can be grouped into three groups: the first with the researches of Oliveira, (2016) and Bia et al. (2005) that take advantage of the experience of the students before starting the training process, with the aim of adjusting the contents based on the needs identified in the students' demands; a second group with the researches of Woitowicz et al. (2014), Paula and Ortiz (2015), Rodrigues and Knupp (2012) using the experience of students during the training process, through collaborative activities and other strategies; the third group with be the researchesof Oliveira (2014), Lima et al. (2014), Silva and Arruda (2013), Thees (2011), Navarro et al. (2011), Vargas, de Souza and Dias (2007), which seek to identify elements that will improve the training experience once the curriculum component has been completed (this term is used in this paper as a synonym of subject, course, even in a general way course plan and curriculum proposal).

It should be noted that both the first and the third groups identify elements that seek to influence in the curriculum either before starting the training process or later in a new implementation of the curriculum component. On the other hand, research in the second group uses collaborative strategies as actions to improve the on-site training experience.

In addition to these researches that reflect on the importance of the experience, Oliveira (2014), when analyzing 149 narratives from students of FALE/UFJF points out that: "It is practically impossible to find any discussion on the contents learned (or not) at the university" (p. 8). We then see an almost generalized picture of university-level programs, which little consider the students' experience to strengthen the training processes, or which use it in an instrumental and bureaucratic way when applying evaluation surveys on the curricular components, that little affect their transformation.

As mentioned before, we are still far from what Hernández (1998 quoted in Paula & Ortiz, 2015) states about the organization of the curriculum, where he proposes that it should be done through projects with joint action between the students and teachers. Currently, the strategy of updating the curriculum is carried out by teachers or specialists in the field of curricular components, except in rare exceptions where there is active participation of the students, or experiences where they can transform the curricular proposal.

The experience and authority to design curricular proposals have been attributed to so-called "experts", who have "integral", specific or specialized knowledge of any subject or discipline. Nowadays, this idea is deconstructing itself in the educational field; for example, according to Oliveira (2016), experiential knowledge "is a knowledge that is devalued and often unknown by the actors of education" (p. 8-9). From this perspective, Macedo (2015) points out that: "Human experience is irreducible, it is a phenomenon mediated by multiple references, so it cannot be explained by models that pretend to be universalized" (p. 18), this authorizes us to see in

the classroom a rich environment where curriculum and training processes can be strengthened through the experience of the students.

A critical reading of this perspective allows to identify that the experience of both the teacher and the student is relevant and should be considered in implementing any educational action, including the construction or updating of the curriculum, since this allows to create a formative experience that interacts with its context, through the knowledge of those called by Macedo (2007) as "curricular" actors (teachers, students, among others), contributing to the strengthening of training proposals.

This position is not new though. According to Souza (1999), the literacy method created by Brazilian pedagogist Paulo Freire had different phases, one of which was to identify the vocabulary of students in order to prepare generating words, this whole process was created from the experience of the learners. In this regard, Gadotti (2008) states that the "initial diagnosis or assessment is a survey of students' prior knowledge of a topic, concept, procedure" (p.111). For its part, Kaplún (1998) calls this as a pre-initial phase, which should be the beginning of educational communication; its purpose is to identify the characteristics of the students in order to create the most appropriate means by improving the interaction between teachers-content-students.

In this sense, the best way to recognize the students' experience is the interaction. Thees (2011) in an article entitled: "Some implications of teaching attitudes for students' mathematical knowledge," describes a situation in which the lack of dialogue and the apparent lack of interest of the teacher in questioning the student eliminated their possibility to acquire new knowledge. From this point of view, it is found that the students 'experience offers an alternative for teachers to analyze and improve their pedagogical practice through mediation and dialogue. In this sense, Tardif (2005) points out that the experience causes "a critical (feedback) effect of acquired knowledge" (p.53).

Likewise, Woitowicz et al. (2014), find that "the dialectical interaction between teacher-content-student allows to motivate the student to want to learn and get their attention" (p. 09); therefore, it is possible to point out that dialogue favors learning, but there is an implicit factor in fostering dialogue and in turn making better use of the experience of subjects, which is collaboration.

According to Barkley et al. (2007), collaborative learning is more difficult to develop because it has a philosophical perspective, i.e., it is not a technique or imposed process, but a way of acting of people when they are in groups, therefore, these are more complex processes. For authors:

> Collaborative learning is a structured learning activity that addresses the main concerns related to improving student learning (...) it involves all students, valuing the perspective each can provide with their personal and academic experience. (p. 21)

According to the above, it is very important for a group to work collaboratively to create an environment of trust where information, ideas, and opinions are exchanged through an open and motivational dialogue, eliminating hierarchies and enabling the active participation of the members of the group. However, given the current reality of the educational system, it seems an illusion to want to develop actions that foster collaborative practices, even so, for Freire (1980), the utopian is not the unrealizable thing; on the contrary, through utopia, we can transform the dehumanizing practices that have historically naturalized in education, including favoring individualism or not speaking, for example, about relationships of gender, race or social class.

For this reason, Navarro et al. (2011) proposes that, from educational institutions, students should be trained to work collaboratively and with a multidisciplinary orientation.

Torres and Irala (2004), argue that in collaborative learning, the members of the group must participate actively and be focused on the same objective, because they are also responsible for indi-

vidual and collective learning, making collaborative learning a practice of resistance and re-existence needed by the educational system and society.

Thus, in this work, it is reflected around the value of the students' experiences, names as resonances (contributions made by students through the focus groups), which are observed by the collaborative feedback of the curriculum, when analyzing the proposals of four curricular components.

In the discussion in which the result is presented, these resonances are characterized, systematized and analyzed from macro categories: contents, activities and evaluation, and sub-categories: explicit, implicit or not included in the curricular component. In this process we find that these can be transformed into acts of curriculum, a concept developed by Macedo (2007), understood as: "Experiential creations, dense of significance, that define educational situations and structure curricular realities" (Macedo, 2013, p. 116); therefore, they do not remain as an idea or resonance, but instead manage to "interfere" the curriculum, adjusting the proposals of the curriculum components studied, improving the formative experience, and contributing to the quality of education.

2. Methodological Perspective

Taking into account the heuristics of this research, the qualitative phenomenological approach is relevant. Likewise, ethnomethodology was used (Garfinkel, 2006), which sees in the everyday life of the subjects and in their actions, i.e., in the ethnomethods, valuable in explaining their reality. According to Coulon (2005) ethnomethodology seeks "methods used by individuals to make sense and, at the same time, to carry out their daily actions: to communicate, to make decisions, to reason" (p. 32). In addition to the dialogue between phenomenology and ethnomethodology, we add another element, ethno-research-training, because in addition to being interested in the ethnomethods of the subjects investigated, this work was conducted in the classroom. According to Macedo (2010) this method is based on the anthropological principle that the members of a social group or community know their reality better than external agents or specialists, which does not mean closing themselves off to readings from the outside, but to entering into intercritical dialogue between both positions.

2.1. Participating subjects

Field work was carried out in two public universities (one in Brazil and one in Colombia). In each context, two subjects of the sixth semester were chosen, for a total of 4 professors and their undergraduate students in child education (Colombia) and education (Brazil). Participants are varied, coursing from the third to tenth semester, although most are in the sixth or seventh semester. Table 1 details the total number of participants, due to work-ethical considerations, their identity is not revealed.

2.2. Information-generating devices

These devices enabled different perspectives to be collected from training experiences, for which the following were considered:

2.2.1. Observation Involved

This is a type of observation inspired by ethnomethodology, and it recognizes that the investigator is not a neutral subject, and that his/her presence causes "interference" in the group of individuals observed.

2.2.2. Field Diary

In accompanying each curriculum component, a field diary was used to record the dynamics of the classes and systematize their development for later analysis and contrast with the information collected.

2.2.3. Focus group

To define the aspects of the curriculum that should be the subject of collaborative fee-

dback, three macro categories were created: content, activities and evaluation. Contents of the topics, which are addressed during the formative experience; the activities, understood as the forms of mediation proposed in the curriculum such as research, presentations, group work, individual, etc.; and the evaluation that has to do with the ways students are evaluated.

From these macro categories, two focus groups were conducted with students in each curriculum component, one at the beginning (AC-1) and one at the end (AC-2). Also, two sessions were held with the participating professors to filter the information using another collaborative activity (AC-3 and 4) (See Table 1). The collaborative activities, in addition to generating the information, facilitated systematization and analysis. The collaborative activities used are briefly described below:

Collaborative Activity 1 (AC-1): Brainstorming (Furnham, 2001), implemented with a variant of the world Café (Brown & Isaacs, 2007), and the objective was to identify and map the expectations that students had about their formative process, based on the description and projection of the curriculum of the courses investigated. It was taken from the guiding question: What are the expectations students have about their training in the curriculum component? in the individual exercise, 802 resonances were collected, but in the group exercise they were reduced to 179.

Collaborative Activity 2 (AC-2): Role Play (Brell, 2006). The objective with this focus group was to create the ideal curriculum from the experience of the students to expand the curriculum. In this exercise, 154 resonances were identified.

Table 1. Systematization result of focal groups 1 and 2

Focus group	Name of collaborative activity	Acronyms	Participants by curricular component				Total Participants	Ressonances by curricular component				Total Resonances
			1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
1	**Collaborative activity 1:** brainstorming (Expectations)	AC-1	17	15	12	14	58	41	62	34	42	179
2	**Collaborative activity 2:** Role play (ideal curriculum)	AC-2	13	16	13	14	56	36	35	43	40	154

Collaborative activities 3 and 4 (AC-3 and 4): Intercritical analysis in order to feedback the curriculum taking into account the results of the focus groups. A collaborative activity was created which was named as "intercritical analysis". This activity was inspired by Beckmarking (Spendolini, 1994), mental maps (Buzan & Buzan, 1996) and Macedo´s intercritical analysis (2015).

Once the information from focus groups 1 and 2 was systematized, a content analysis of a thematic category was made (Vásquez, 1994, p. 49), where it was found that resonances could be classified according to the categories: explicitly included in the curriculum, implicitly included in the curriculum, or not included in the curriculum. A filtered exercise was done with professors who guided the curricular components. Thus, 179 resonances proposed in focus group 1 were reduced to 131 in focus group 3 (see table 2) because some of these could be integrated, were not part of the curriculum component or were not clearly raised to be placed in any of the constituent elements of the courses. In AC-1 as a collaborative project activity, the resonances were expected not be clear, ambivalent or unspecific. In contrast to the focus group 2 where the construction of a specific experience was requested, and where it is found that of the 154 resonances, 153 remained when performing the filtering exercise (see Table 3) because it was integrated with another resonance.

Once concluded this process, a counter-analysis was made (Macedo, 2015) in two moments: first, the initial curriculum implemented by professors was contrasted as well as the resonances created by the students who provided much of the information to feedback the formative experience, identifying elements present or absent in the initial proposals of the curricular components, in contrast to the proposals of the curricular components collaboratively fed from the contributions of the students.

Table 2. Systematization result of collaborative activity 3

Intercritical analysis of resonances, expectations of focus group 1						Total Resonances
	Curriculum component	1	2	3	4	
Categories	Included in the curriculum explicitly	19	13	16	22	70
	Included in the curriculum implicitly	13	20	5	6	44
	Not included in the curriculum	2	6	3	6	17
Total		34	39	24	34	131

Table 3. Systematization result of collaborative activity 4

Intercritical analysis, focus group 2. Ideal curriculum						Total Resonances
	Componente curricular	1	2	3	4	
Categories	Categories explicitly included in the curriculum	14	13	26	22	75
	Implicitly included in the curriculum	11	15	6	13	45
	Not included in the curriculum	11	6	11	5	33
Total		36	34	43	40	153

In the second moment, discussions were created, which showed: "consensuses, often not resigned, open contradictions, paradoxes, striking characteristics, biases, transversalities, identifications and transduction" (Macedo, 2018, p. 92), convergences and divergences; giving us ideas to understand and characterize the collaborative feedback of the curriculum from the contrast of the distinctiveness of subjects of the two studied university contexts, in which the power of the students´ experiences is emphasized.

3. Results and discussion: students' experiences, on-site curriculum events

The information gathered in the field work through the follow-up involved in the four curricular components allowed to identify some acts of curriculum present in the experiences of the students, that normally remain unknown but were rescued from the collaborative feedback to reflect on its implications for training, along with the proposals of the curricular components investigated.

During the research, we found that resonances, i.e., contributions — ideas — made by participants in the focus groups, are not necessarily elements that should be considered to feedback the curriculum, as some of them are not clear or they are outside the scope of the curricular component. We also note that it is necessary to do a filtering process since although in the focus groups a lot of information was generated, and it was initially filtered by the same students, for a total of 333 resonances (see Table 1), a second filtering exercise carried out with the participating professors allowed to condense and clarify the intention of the students´ experiences, decreasing the amount of resonances to 284, leaving them clearer and more structured to visualize their connection or criticism to the curricular proposal, hence we call on-site curriculum acts.

Each of the 284 resonances that resulted from the implementation of AC-3 and AC-4 were assigned a code and classified according to the curricular component (CC) to which they belong. They were further characterized by categories: explicit, implicit, or not included. The following discussion was created where resonances are characterized; to exemplify, some allow us to see common elements in the curricular components and demonstrate the power of the student experiences to feedback the curriculum.

3.1. Explicit Resonances

Resonances in this group can be easily placed in the proposal of the curriculum component initially implemented by professors, and in the resonances of the students proposed in the focus groups. While these resonances are easy to map, because they appear almost literally as content, activities, or forms of evaluation that must be present in the curricular components (CC), these are not always precise, for example, CC-1 appears in AC-3: "Group activities" (AC-1, Code.07), interpreted by the professor as: "Team organization for the conduction of the project". Something similar occurs in CC-2, where the professor at AC-4 interprets the resonance: "National Exams" (AC-2, Code.10), as part of the content: "Guidelines for Evaluation Systems such as ANA, PROVA BRASIL, ENEM, ENADE and State and Municipal Provinces. Analysis of national reviews (use of slides and printed material)" is already included in the course proposal. It indicates that these contents are relevant, as both the initial proposal submitted by professors and the resonances of the students coincide.

Another situation that can occur with explicit resonances is that sometimes they may be unspecific or ambiguous, for example CC-3 proposes as one of the contents: "Culture and the relationship with its inclusion, segregation and exclusion processes", and two resonances related with this topic were raised as: "Culture" (AC-1, Code.03) and "Exclusion" (AC-1, Code.04). On the other hand, in CC-4 there is: "The concept of socialization from different perspectives", while the students express it as: "Socializing Contexts" (AC-2, Code.01), even in the filtering carried out with the professors in AC-3 and AC-4, it was possible to see ambiguity and place the resonances within the curricular proposal.

Another variant presented in this type of resonances was in relation to their intentionality, in CC-2 the activity presented is: "Evaluation using the printed form with the evaluation criteria", however, students place this topic as a form of evaluation in the curriculum component, when proposing: "Evaluation adjusted to the rubric" (AC-1, Code.24). On the other hand, in CC-3 an advisory activity is conducted to present different topics, such as: "LGBTI population, homeless children and street situation, and children in protection", but the students proposed them as contents: "Vulnerable groups (LGBTI, protection, addiction, workers,…)" (AC-2, Code.04), in both cases it is observed that these topics are part of the curriculum proposal and that they are relevant topics for the students. This allowed us to reflect that the content chosen is dynamic, i.e., it can be transformed and recreated according to the pedagogical intentionality or didactic transposition, allowing other possibilities to think about the curricular proposals.

3.2. Implicit Resonances

There are resonances in a second group that are not explicitly named in the curricular proposal, but these elements were addressed tacitly. Unlike the previous ones, these resonances are more difficult to locate and for mapping them it was necessary to use the notes of the field diary, in addition to filtering with professors through the AC-3 and AC-4, which offered more support to position them.

There is dichotomy in this type of resonances, because students explicitly included them in the focus groups, but they can only be tacitly related in the proposals implemented in the curricular components investigated. It is considered that for the collaborative feedback pro-

cess, these resonances, in contrast to the curricular proposal implemented, help to visualize some topics that are not clear, i.e., are important for the students but are not explicitly included in the curricular component.

One of the reasons may be time, as it often goes deeper into other content; another cause may be the relevance these resonances are addressed, because when considering others as more important, they end up being treated tacitly or transversely.

The lack of understanding and objectivity is not seen as negative, on the contrary, there is some intentionality from collaborative activities to make this happen, because implementation, creativity, autonomy and freedom are encouraged in the heuristic process. This type of resonances indicates that there are topics that need to be given a more explicit emphasis as students consider them relevant, for which in the analysis carried out through collaborative feedback they could have more emphasis to make them more explicit.

As mentioned above, there are resonances in this group that are not clear and those that were raised more generally, so we had to start from their intentionality to relate them to the curricular components, for example in CC-1 there is an activity: "Pedagogical workshop: What to work with nursery and preschool children? Experiences and languages in the curriculum of early childhood and pre-school education: Photography/cinema/theater/dance/body movement", the resonance proposed by the students associated with this activity is "ludic" (AC-1, Code.25). Also on CC-2 an activity proposed is:

> Tools and forms of evaluation: Exam (written, oral, objective, dissertation), research work, seminar, debate, report, observation, game, production of texts, artistic production, experimentation, knowledge fair. Evidence Analysis and Comment Workshop. How to build evidence as an evaluation tool. (PCC-2)

The resonance associated with this activity was "Innovative proposals in the evaluation" (AC-2, Code.21), and as seen in both cases the topic proposed by the curriculum component and the resonance of the students can be associated, despite not having an explicit relationship.

In this category, there are also some resonances that may be associated or complementary, unlike the contents of the initial curriculum proposal as seen in CC-3, where the content raised is: "Minor offenders, addictions to technologies, child workers", in the resonances is seen: "Strategies for Working with Disabled Populations" (AC-1, Code.08), both topics can be associated in a topic that talks about special educational needs or vulnerability. On the other hand, in CC-4, the topic addressed is: "How do children develop school social knowledge?" In the resonances is observed: "Problems around the notion of childhood" (AC-2, Code.21), in this case both themes can be complementary, integrating them could deepen the construction of the social and subjective dimension of childhood.

3.3. Resonances not included

Finally, a third group of resonances were not included in the proposals of the curricular components; after the analyzes carried out by professors through AC-3 and AC-4, it was determined that resonances classified in this group are not part of the discussions of the curriculum component, because their ambiguity did not allow them to be placed in any of the macro categories (content, activities, evaluation), therefore they were rejected, explaining why they were not included.

Some of the resonances that remained in this category are not included in the curriculum component proposal or are not part of the discussions that are intended to be developed, for example in CC-4, the resonance presented was: "Cartographies" (AC-1, Code 40) as an activity, however, the professor does not believe that these are relevant to be introduced into the curriculum component proposal because: "a superficial activity would be made without epistemic training in research," i.e., it is a research that needs spe-

cific training to be used; therefore, and because there are other strategies, it is not used in the proposal of this curriculum component.

This group also includes resonances that are contrary to what was intended to be addressed in the curriculum component, in CC-2 is proposed: "Assess techniques so the students do not know that are being evaluated" (AC-1, Code.57), the reason for not including it is because, according to the professor: "We do not reinforce this idea, we fight it, because students need to know and even build the criteria by which they will be evaluated", as mentioned above, in the curriculum component, there are elements that allowed students to know the different ways of evaluating and being evaluated, but in no way it is intended to evaluate without the student knowing that it is being evaluated, as was proposed in the resonance; therefore, it was not included in the curriculum feedback; however, this gives rise to the teacher's explicit interaction with students about this situation.

Another type of resonances that are located in this group are those that are part of the contents of another curricular component, as is the case presented in CC-2, with the resonance: "Evaluation of people with special educational needs" (AC-2, Code 29); in the professor's justification is found: "There are no specific evaluative activities for special or inclusive education student in this semester, but it was already thought and will be added for the next one along with the other professor of the area." In this case, resonance is not included in the proposal of the curriculum component studied, but instead the professor suggested this topic to another professor who teaches a component on special education, which was considered relevant by the students but which directly affected another subject.

Finally in this group are placed the resonances that cannot be included in the proposal of the curriculum component due to logistical difficulties, as is the case of CC-3, where there is a proposal: "Field trips - 5 trips to different spaces" (AC-2, Code 41), the professor concludes that proposing five field trips is difficult, as there are limits like time (they typically last more than two to four hours of the weekly program of the components), economic (resources available to the university and students are limited), and social (many students have part-time or full-time jobs).

However, out of the four curricular components investigated, no field trip occurred in CC-2, a trip was done in CC-4, in CC-3 two trips, and a micropractice was performed in CC-1. It is indeed a strategy used but not as often as it is mentioned in the resonance proposed by the students.

These are some of the characteristics of the resonances created from the experiences of the students; the analyses helped us to contrast and have intercritical analysis of the formative experience, to have a broad view of these realities through collaborative feedback of the curriculum, where we were able to observe the formative dynamics, evidencing the successes and blunders lived by students during the formative process, thus being able to generate alterities that qualify the formative experiences of the curricular components.

4. Conclusions

Professors must present the proposal for the development of curricular components before starting classes and must socialize it with students. However, according to the dynamic of collaborative feedback, there should be no complete, unfinished proposals, but rather a space for collective construction on-site, i.e., from the expectations and experiences of the "curricular" actors. Therefore, it is believed that the work with collaborative feedback of the curriculum is relevant to educational contexts, since it offers the possibility of promoting training in line with the demands, not only of the institution but also of the experiences of curricular actors, qualifying training and contextualizing curricula.

Regarding the curriculum components of the two universities investigated, it was identified that although there is some freedom and autonomy of professors to propose a curriculum that will consider resonances of the students, the eva-

luation is still difficult to conduct, because there is a quantitative system that requires expressing the result of the formative experience in numbers, leaving little room for more qualitative proposals; however, if a formative evaluation is used (Morales, 2010) it can be applied.

Throughout the research, it was evident that the horizontality between the curricular actors and the intercritical dialogue provided the conditions for collaborative feedback. In this way, environments can be generated where experiences are shared and proposals are refined from consensus, transforming the resonances of students into curriculum acts that can be incorporated into the proposals of the curricular components. In this sense, it was found that contradictions and differences are opportunities to review pedagogical practice, to think "out of the box," and to create alterities that strengthen formative processes, so they cannot leave aside the reflection on training and curriculum.

With regard to resonances, they are not always clear, coherent, or objective; even so, it should not be a problem or seen as a mistake, since the main objective is to identify all those curriculum acts that are ambiguous, i.e., not recognized either explicitly or tacitly. Therefore, collaborative activities implemented in the focus groups encouraged the creativity and autonomy of the participants, so that in this way they could express their experiences more freely, which, as seen in many cases, were alike or contrary to the demands. Hence, resonances imply the desire and the experiences of the students, hence the revealing power they have to reflect on the curriculum through the recognition of these acts, but they are almost always excluded, discarded or treated as epiphenomena of the formative process. In this work we consider their value and ability to modify the curricular proposals by improving the quality of teaching, learning, formative experience, pedagogical practice and by qualifying the curriculum.

Finally, we can affirm that the pre-established curriculum is a fiction, because the curriculum is itinerant and socially constructed, where the narrative of "curricular" actors has the ability to modify, transform, transgress or deny the knowledge chosen as formative, which through an intercritical and sensitive dialogue can be customized in accordance with the curriculum acts of the actors involved in the training process, generating a broad experience and meaningful learning. Collaborative feedback of the curriculum is one of the ways to achieve this goal.

Acknowledgment: authors thank CAPES, Universidad Federal de Bahía, and the research group FOMRACCE.

References

Barkley, E., Cross, P., & Major, C. (2007). *Técnicas de aprendizaje colaborativo. Manual para el profesorado universitario.* Ediciones Morata.

Bia, A., Carrasco, M., Jiménez, M., Montes, A., & Moreno, M. (2005). *Aplicación del portfolio discente. Una experiencia interdisciplinar.* Universidad de Alicante, Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación. https://bit.ly/3oqyACF

Brell, M. (2006). Juegos de rol. Educación social: *Revista de intervención socioeducativa.* Dedicado a: El juego, herramienta educativa (33), 104-113. https://bit.ly/3wiGl1Y

Brown, J., & Isaacs, D. (2007). *O word café: dando forma ao nosso futuro por meio de conversações significativa e estratégicas.* Editora pensamento Cultrix Ltda. https://bit.ly/3yncaIx

Buzan, T., & Buzan, B. (1996). *El libro de los mapas mentales.* Como utilizar al máximo las capacidades de la mente. Ediciones Urano.

Coulon, A. (2005). *Etnometodología.* Traducción de Teodora Estaban. Tercera edición. Colección: Teorema.

Freire, P. (1980). *Conscientização. Teoria e pratica da libertação. Uma introdução ao pensamento de Paulo Freire.* Editora Moraes.

Freire, P. (2010). *Cartas a quien pretende enseñar.* Segunda edición. Editorial Siglo XXI.

Furnham, A. (2001). El mito del brianstorming. *Revista Harvard Deusto Business Review* (105), 32-41.

Gadotti, M. (2008). *MOVA, por um Brasil Alfabetizado.* Instituto Paulo Freire. https://bit.ly/3pqNbz8

Garfinkel, H. (2006). *Estudios de etnometodología.* Editorial Anthropos.

Kaplún, M. (1998). *Una pedagogía de la comunicación.* Ediciones De La Torre. https://bit.ly/2KWx5hW

Larrosa, J. (2002). Notas sobre la experiencia y el conocimiento de la experiencia. *Revista Brasileña de Educación*, (19), 20-28 http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782002000100003

Lima, T., Consorti, F., Cândido, E., Gomes, C., & Ceolim, M. (2014). Estágio curricular supervisionado: análise da experiência discente. *Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem.* 67(1),133-140, Jan-fev. https://bit.ly/3t4QJt6

Macedo, R. (2007). *Currículo. Campo, concepto e investigación.* 5ª Edición. Editorial Vozes.

Macedo, R. (2010). *Etnopesquisa critica. Etnopesquisa-formação* (segunda edição ed.). Liber livro editoria Ltda.

Macedo, R. (2015). *Investigar la experiencia. Comprender / mediar saberes experienciales.* Editora Crv.

Macedo, R. (2018). *Investigación contrastiva: Acerca de los estudios multicaso multiexperienciales.* Editora: UFBA.

Morales, P. (2010). *La evaluación formativa.* Universidad Pontificia Comillas, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales. https://bit.ly/3oCge3s

Navarro, C., Botella, P., Jarque, M., Gil, D., & González, C. (2011). *Implicación del alumno en el desarrollo de proyectos como estrategia didáctica en la búsqueda del proceso de aprendizaje y aprendizaje. Una experiencia de estudiante.* https://bit.ly/2Zo39zW

Oliveira, F. (2014). *A perspectiva discente sobre a formação profissional em letras/UFJF.* (Tese de doutorado, programa de pós-graduação em linguística, da faculdade de letras da Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora). https://bit.ly/3pqlcQn

Oliveira, K. (2016). *Docente ou discente? somos todos (in) formadores de opiniões.* IV semana de matemática. Universidade do Estado da Bahia-campus X. Departamento de Educação-DEDC. Texeira de Fretas. https://bit.ly/3qVtQ9N

Paula, A., & Ortiz, R. (2015). *Proyecto escolar: alternativa para ampliar el saber docente y discente.* Primer congreso de educación de los grandes dorados. Escuela, familia y sociedad: construyendo nuevos caminos. https://bit.ly/3cQeqNu

Rodrigues, P., & Knupp, J. (2012). *A relação docente e discente no ensino superior: os processos ensino e aprendizagem.* XVI Encontro Latino Americano de Iniciação Científica e XII Encontro Latino Americano de Pós-Graduação-Universidade do Vale do Paraíba. https://bit.ly/2M8SHrW

Silva, E., & Arruda, S. (2013). *Descrição das relações tridimensionais do saber discente na orientação da prática no ensino superior.* II Jornada de didática e I seminário de pesquisa do CEMAD. Docência na educação superior: caminhos para uma práxis transformadora https://bit.ly/3r9YjkL

Spendolini, M. (1994). *Benchmaking.* Grupo Editorial Norma.

Souza, S. (1999). *Método Paulo Freire: princípios e práticas de uma concepção popular de educação.* https://bit.ly/3ooOXj1

Tardif, M. (2005). *Docencia de conocimientos y formación profesional.* 5ª edición, Editora Vozes.

Teixeira, A. (1978). A Pedagogia de Dewey. In Dewey, John, *Vida e educação.* 10. ed. Melhoramentos.

Thees, A. (2011). *Algumas implicações das atitudes docentes pelo saber matemático discente.* XIII Conferência Interamericana de Educação Matemática-XIII CIAEM-XIII CIAEM-IACME. https://bit.ly/3qVs4oZ

Torres, P., & Irala, E. (2014). *Aprendizagem colaborativa: teoria e prática. Complexidade: redes e conexões na produção do conhecimento.* Senar. https://bit.ly/3qPaAL8

Vargas, A., De Souza, M., & Dias, S. (2007). *A Satisfação do Discente em Instituições de Ensino Superior: um estudo de caso.* V Simpósio de Gestão e Estratégia em Negócios Seropédica. https://bit.ly/39k9h0O

Vázquez, F. (1994). *Análisis de contenido categorial: el análisis temático.* Unitat de Psicología Social. Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona. https://bit.ly/36aH5eT

Woitowicz, E., Szumilo, M., & Lindino, T. (2014). *Desafios da Interação docente-conteúdo-discente no Ensino de Geografia de uma Escola Pública do Município de Marechal Cândido Rondon-PR.* Congresso Brasileiro de Geógrafos. Anais do VII CBG. https://bit.ly/3iTNd0b

