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Abstract: Since 2006, staff members within the Faculty of Education at the University of Wollongong have been designing and implementing an electronic portfolio. The ePortfolio has been designed as an online tool for undergraduate students to use for the duration of their coursework and thereafter in order to enhance the learning process whilst assisting students with the transition from university to graduate employment. This paper presents the findings of a recent 2009 evaluation that explored the ePortfolio’s usefulness to students and staff, ascertaining the extent of its current use. Areas were identified for improvement via professional development, technical support, accessibility and improved functionality of the ePortfolio’s features. This paper will not only present the rationale for the web-based ePortfolio, but will discuss the complexities, challenges and successes of implementing a non-commercial ePortfolio product. The varied results of an online student survey and explorative interviews with academic staff will be shared to highlight current practice and future areas for development.
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Introduction

THIS PAPER PRESENTS an evaluation on the implementation and effectiveness of ePortfolios as perceived by students and staff at a New South Wales University. The purpose-built ePortfolio was designed by a number of general and academic staff within the Faculty to construct a purposefully designed ePortfolio system. This in-house, non-commercial product was designed to be used by undergraduate teacher education students demonstrate the New South Wales (NSW) Professional Teaching Standards as devised by the NSW Institute of Teachers (2006) both within subject outlines and via students’ trajectories. In 2009 a survey of students and interviews with five academic staff about the views of the web-based ePortfolio was conducted in order to understand the effectiveness, value and understandings about the ePortfolio. The purpose of this article is to explain the rationale behind designing, building and deploying a non-commercial in-house ePortfolio and relate its current practice and challenges from the viewpoint of both students and academic staff.

Literature Review

An educational portfolio consists of “work that a learner has collected, reflected upon, selected, and presented to show growth and change over time” (Barrett, 2007, p. 436). The introduction of portfolios into teacher education is not a recent development. Reflective journals have been widely used in teacher training programs to support pre-service teachers’ learning
and reflective practices and document and describe their emerging skills and competence as a teacher. Electronic portfolios are the next development in the practice of encouraging pre-service teachers to record, reflect and review their understanding of learning and teaching (Lorenzo & Ittleson, 2005). Research by Young (2008) and Barrett and Knezek (2003) has indicated that pre-service teachers who successfully adopt ePortfolios are more likely to establish links between learning attained at university and skills developed while on teaching practice (Young, 2008). Barrett and Knezek (2003) suggest one of the important assets of an electronic portfolio is the ability for students to demonstrate and give evidence of their achievement of teaching standards, easily linking artefacts that satisfy multiple standards without having to make duplicate copies.

Due to their technological nature, ePortfolios enable pre-service teachers opportunities to develop and improve their computing skills and understanding, throughout the process of developing their portfolio (Abrami & Barrett, 2005; Hartley, Urish & Johnston, 2006; Sherry & Bartlett, 2005). Recent studies indicate that teachers who demonstrate competent technological skills through the development of an ePortfolio are more likely to integrate the use of technology into their own classrooms (Sherry & Bartlett, 2005). Investigations on the use of educational ePortfolios have linked the use of ePortfolio technology to constructivist theory; where the pre-service teacher utilising ePortfolio is actively constructing their understanding of teaching and learning. Wang’s (2007) qualitative case study explored students’ roles in the development of electronic portfolios and suggested those students who actively used ePortfolio were engaged, motivated and independent learners – outcomes that are aligned with constructivist learning theory. The research also indicated that students using ePortfolios developed skills in the areas of planning, creativity, critical thinking and problem solving. The finding of most interest was that through the process of utilising ePortfolios, students’ ability to become reflective thinkers was enhanced, arguably an important aspect of effective teaching.

A study by Lin (2008) explored the effectiveness and value of ePortfolios in pre-service teacher education. This research, like that discussed in this paper, used surveys and interviews to collect data concerning the progression of pre-service teachers’ perspectives and understanding of ePortfolios during the completion of their teacher education and training. Results of the study indicated that while some pre-service teachers found using and creating their ePortfolios challenging, the overall response to the new technology was favourable. Pre-service teachers indicated that ePortfolios helped them to engage in a deeper analysis of their teaching and what it meant for their students’ and their own learning and it enhanced their technology skills. Although this was only a reasonably small study, these results suggest that ePortfolios have the capability to positively impact teacher education. This paper takes the research further in ascertaining the perspectives and understandings of the pre-service teachers and the academics involved in the implementation of a purpose-built ePortfolio product (i.e. built for the needs of the current cohorts).

Clearly there are advantages and benefits that can be gained from using ePortfolios in teacher education programs; however there can be numerous challenges and organizational and institutional issues that need to be considered. Batson (2002) suggests that there needs to be thorough preparation of staff and students prior to implementing an ePortfolio system and that the planning stage is crucial in the successful adoption of the technology by staff and students. It seems that electronic portfolios cannot be treated purely as an add-on to already existing courses, as students may not realise their worth and potential. Other issues
involving the implementation of ePortfolios in teacher education programs include the need for education courses and assessments to be redesigned to accommodate the new technology. Tosh et al. (2005) states that key stakeholders who will be using the technology need to be consulted, that key personnel need to reach an agreement about the criteria and the function of the ePortfolio and that time, money and technical issues all need to be taken into account during the important planning stages. Other concerns institutions have encountered with the utilisation of ePortfolio systems include difficulties in storage abilities of systems and students maintaining accessibility after leaving the teacher education institution where they are studying. While an ePortfolio system may have many benefits, implementing the system is often difficult to organize, administer and can be costly and time consuming. Because of these issues it is important that teacher education institutions that are establishing electronic portfolio systems try to validate the expense and effort involved prior to implementation (Adamy & Milman, 2009). As ePortfolios are a relatively new development this paper examines the implementation and usage of an ePortfolio system in five teacher education programs from the perspective of pre-service teachers and teacher educators. The issues encountered by pre service teachers and staff, and the benefits of the ePortfolio for learners and staff have led to the question: “Was the introduction of this purpose built new technology worthwhile?”

Methodology
The interviews with staff were conducted during October 2009. Five academic staff members were interviewed each representing four of the five teacher education programs. The survey was made available to students during October – November 2009 during the latter part of the spring session (semester 2). 75 students completed the student survey via an online survey set up using Survey Monkey. This research was conducted across multiple programs in order to determine the value and limitations of the ePortfolio. Of the 75 students who participated in the study, 72% students were enrolled in the Bachelor of Primary Education, 21.3% were enrolled in the Graduate Diploma of Education, 1.3% were enrolled in the Bachelor of Health and Physical Education and 5.3% were enrolled in the Bachelor of Science/Mathematics Education program. 54.7% (over half) were in their second year of study, whilst 6.7% were in their first, 17.3% in their third and 21.3% were from the Graduate Diploma of Education program (an extended one year course equivalent to 18 months of full-time study).

Limitations
Due to the time constraints on the conduct of the student survey (the Graduate Diploma of Education students were out on professional experience when the survey was advertised to them), the response rate was low. This could also be due in part to the timing of the deployment of the survey as it was only available towards the end of the session when many students were on placement in schools. In addition, some cohorts had not had as much promotion and support of its use compared to the Bachelor of Primary Education students.

What should be pointed out is that commercial products, whether software or hardware or solely web-based, have had extensive testing before they become available for sale. Testing of any product requires much time, money for staff to complete the testing, and extreme attention to detail. Therefore, the ePortfolio in question can be seen to be disadvantaged as it is a non-commercial product, designed in house by IT and teacher educator academics,
but it also can be framed as being an advantage in that specific requirements particular to
the desired users can be included in its design and functionality. This article focuses on
evaluating the ePortfolio as designed at the University of Wollongong in the Faculty of
Education. It is not meant to evaluate ePortfolios in general.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the findings from the student survey explaining the students’ under-
standings, usage and experience with the ePortfolio. The subsequent section details the same
issues from the viewpoint of the five academics interviewed for this project.

Students’ overall use of the ePortfolio

When asked about the purpose of the ePortfolio, the vast majority of students were confident
that the ePortfolio was an online storage space to display work in the form of a resume or
curriculum vitae (CV) and to show that they had met the Professional Teaching Standards
(from the New South Wales Institute of Teachers). One student’s response summarises the
overall result: “To document our learning (through assignments, Professional Experience
[PEX] reports, useful websites) for the future and to show that we are meeting requirements
of the NSW Professional Teaching Standards”.

34.7% of students surveyed responded that they had never used the ePortfolio. However,
out of those who had used the ePortfolio, many found it non-user friendly, unreliable and
time-consuming, stating that “Originally it wasn’t working properly. As the course progressed
I lacked time to investigate it further, and did not see any pressing need or use for it”. Whilst
many students fell into this category, students who were willing to use the ePortfolio felt
that compared to other compulsory course requirements, the ePortfolio lacked priority and
sufficient training and support was not provided: “It is not mentioned during any of the lec-
tures or tutorials”, “I don’t really know how to use it and when I did try to upload something
it wouldn’t work” and “I don’t understand how to use it or why it is needed”.

Students Understandings and Perceptions of an ePortfolio

It was clear from student responses, they were confident that information within the ePortfolio
would be available to send to future employers and be accessible when undergoing interviews
with the Department of Education and Training (DET). One student stated, “The ePortfolio
provides an online space for students to save their work. Students can assign teaching
standards and create reports for subjects and interviews.” Although some felt that it was
solely available for assessment purposes and “to provide a collection of resources for personal
use”, very few students claimed they were totally unfamiliar with the ePortfolio’s purpose.

In each subject outline within undergraduate and the Graduate Diploma of Education
programs at the Faculty of Education, the elements of the Professional Teaching Standards
are clearly stated and linked to each assessment task to demonstrate how the completion of
an assignment demonstrates how they are meeting aspects of the Professional Teaching
Standards (2006). When students were asked how the Professional Teaching Standards
within the ePortfolio were linked to the assignments however, various responses, levels of
understanding and differing opinions were expressed. Over half the students were under the
impression that teaching standards were tightly linked with each assignment, easy to access and clear to follow, making comments such as, “Each assignment we receive has a list of the standards we are showing through the completion of the assignment. I can now see all assignments we are doing are for a purpose, they are slowly building up to us being able to provide evidence for all standards . . . ePortfolio allows me to explicitly highlight the connection,” whilst many felt that even though the Professional Teaching Standards were mentioned in the subject outlines, very little evidence of standards were directly linked to assignments or the ePortfolio. The ePortfolio has “only been used in one assessment . . . there is little to no drive in most subjects to use the ePortfolio.” 10% of students stated they lacked overall understanding and felt there was no need for the ePortfolio when linking standards to assignments and that personal methods of storing data guaranteed greater reliability.

When asked if students had to use the ePortfolio to complete an assignment, 54.1% of students who participated in the survey stated that they had used the ePortfolio to help them with completing an assignment, whilst the remaining had not. Following on from these results, students were asked what recommendations they would make to improve its overall use. Out of the 64 students who answered this question, 60 expressed some form of frustration with the program stating that it required increased functionality, greater reliability, improved layout and easier format: “It doesn’t even work. I have wasted hours of my time trying to create reports only for them to be lost or to have the ePortfolio close down on me”. It was fair to say that many students felt that the interface was confusing, headings disappeared from their work and students were constantly being logged out which meant they lost work: “Redesign it in a logical way (get somebody who knows something about computers to do it). Allow documents to be attached, allow rtf’s [rich text format documents] to be created, stop randomly signing users out etc”.

A number of students expressed that they wanted a guaranteed future use of the ePortfolio at no charge that would extend beyond university years and well into their careers. I need a “guarantee [that] it will be accessible to students after they graduate . . . also, I understand I need to pay a maintenance fee to keep it once I have left uni. Where is the benefit in that for me? If it was available to us after uni I think I might have used it more.” Whether or not ‘a maintenance fee’ would be applied, students were confused and uncertain of the ePortfolio’s future and demanded to know more.

A majority of students expressed a need to develop a greater understanding of the ePortfolio’s relevance and overall significance to their learning; they wanted sufficient training and support, and “more instruction and guidance for the best way to use it.” One student said, “I think it is potentially a valuable resource but I think students need to have it linked more directly to the course. I think a lot of people didn’t use it because it wasn’t mandatory or there weren’t any clear connections between the ePortfolio and course requirements.” Another student stated, “I would like to actually know why it is there and why we should be using it.” Finally, a few students felt that the ePortfolio was beyond improving and needed to be abolished.

In the student survey, students were asked about how they could be encouraged to use the ePortfolio on a regular basis; many requested that the overall reliability, navigation, layout and functionality needed to be improved. Students stated that, “If errors were fixed and the file size for uploading was extended”, “if there were headings or topics in our subject outline that gave us a better understanding as to where to put assignments when updating the ePortfolio” and, “If it functioned properly I would be more likely to use it because I believe
that it is a very useful resource for my future.” Numerous students felt that it would be beneficial to make the ePortfolio compulsory across all subjects and ensure mandatory completion of assignments in this format. Regular, ongoing use in tutorials with ongoing training and support was a key issue to most students, whilst having time available to use the ePortfolio was a factor for others.

When specifically asked about the effectiveness of the individual functions available to students on the ePortfolio, approximately 50% of students had not attempted using the various functions. However, it was clear from students who had used the ePortfolio system, that functions like creating an entry or report were manageable but classified as just satisfactory. The majority of students found that creating a folder within a folder worked well and was above satisfactory whilst creating a report and attaching files was rated poor.

Overall, when asked how students thought the ePortfolio could support their development as reflective and effective educators, approximately 50% of students indicated that the ePortfolio would allow them to review and reflect on Professional Teaching Standards for further reference and serve predominantly as a curriculum vitae/resume for future employment. Excerpts from three students’ responses included: “It will allow me to reflect upon my assessments and make me think about what could be improved. It also allows me to address the Professional Teaching Standards and therefore help me improve my teaching methods”, “It is a great resource to consolidate all that has been learnt and will continue to be learnt as a lifelong learner,” and, “If it could be kept as an electronic device and updated from now into the future it would be better and more attractive to use.”

Contrary to the above views, the remaining 50% of students felt that the ePortfolio played no part in supporting their development as being reflective and effective educators. The majority of students who supported this view felt that they felt no need for any future use of the ePortfolio and that prospective employers would not have the time to view their work or be familiar with the ePortfolio and its functions. One student stated, “I don’t think I will use it at all - it is cumbersome and I do not believe prospective employers will take the time to look at it”. Another student claimed, “At this stage, I honestly have no interest in using the ePortfolio because, although I am certain that it will assist me in the future, for the moment I do not want to put in the extra effort and time needed.”

Out of 45.9% students who envisaged ongoing use of the ePortfolio after graduation, half felt that it served as an on-going CV that could be added to whilst the other half thought of it as a storage space for uploading vital information and data such as lesson plans, units of work, websites etc. “The ePortfolio can be used to prove I have achieved the Professional Teaching Standards using undergraduate information. It can be added to after graduation (if possible) and be a helpful tool. However, in its present form it is not a beneficial tool after I graduate.” Finally, over half the students (54.1%) who participated in the research did not envisage using the ePortfolio after graduation.

The Academics’ Experiences of the ePortfolio

A compilation of five lecturers and professors from the University of Wollongong familiar with the ePortfolio were involved in the collection of data to gain a better understanding of the ePortfolio and its use across subjects in the Faculty of Education. An email requesting participation in the interviews was sent out to all academic staff, and the five academic staff
who responded and were interviewed were Dr Plum, Dr Peach, Mr Blue, Dr Orange and Dr Green (pseudonyms are used to promote confidentiality).

When asked how the ePortfolio was being used in their teaching, all academics acknowledged that even though the implementation of the ePortfolio was specifically mentioned in their subject outlines, meeting these guidelines was not always possible. Dr Plum, responsible for designing the ePortfolio and who was coordinating the 1st year undergraduate Information Technology (IT) in Education subject in 2009, required students to make entries on the ePortfolio relating to their assignments. “At the end of the session we run one of the tutorials where we get the students to make some entries in the ePortfolio using the material from the assignments that they have done for that particular subject. Really it’s to introduce them to the idea”. She commented that the students hear about the ePortfolio earlier in the semester but felt that with greater exposure, the better informed students would be. Dr Plum was also adamant that the ePortfolio needed to be seen relevant across all learning areas and not considered an IT incentive only.

Both Dr Orange and Dr Plum set assignments to be submitted on the ePortfolio which directly linked to the Professional Teaching Standards (PTS). Dr Orange said, “Basically, the subjects I teach are Professional Studies which links with the professional experiences and reports are all based on the Professional Teaching Standards,” “the reports that they collect from their supervising teachers shows how they have met the Professional Teaching Standards.” Dr Plum added “everything that they do in my IT subject, we always link them to the PTS, the information is actually there for every tutorial that they do so every tutorial indicates to them how what they are doing links to the PTS. So in our case it is all very explicit for every aspect of the subject.”

Furthermore, lecturers Dr Peach and Mr Blue, had planned to use the ePortfolio as “a place to present assignments, lesson plans and other evidence to chart their progress towards the Professional Teaching Standards” although due to on-going difficulties such as broken links and file upload errors on the ePortfolio, these plans were unable to go ahead and students did not complete the set tasks. “They weren’t able to put documents on there and they weren’t able to open particular pages; they weren’t able to use it so they weren’t able to get the value of it,” said Dr Peach.

Mr Blue stated that even though he was not specifically setting an assignment for students to complete, each subject outline states the Professional Teaching Standards to be achieved by students and in tutorials it is suggested how they can use the ePortfolio to help gather data. Dr Green felt that the ePortfolio was a good way for “students to understand the NSW Institute of Teachers’ requirements and understand what they need to develop in terms of meeting standards”.

When discussing each of the staff members’ understanding of the ePortfolio, each felt that its main purpose was for students to have an electronic (online) space to place ongoing data in support of their studies and in relation to the Professional Teaching Standards, throughout their undergraduate degrees and to have one place to go in order to reflect on the work carried out during this time. However, Mr Blue added “I’ve always had a little bit of a blur in regard to its purpose - certainly when it was implemented last year my question was “Why do we need this?” Whilst he could see the benefits of keeping a record of data and using it as an electronic portfolio for future access, he felt that pedagogically it was of little relevance, time consuming and it was not a requirement. He added if students were to
ask “does the institute require us to use it?” and we say ‘No’, then they may not use it and we cannot force them to do so.”

In support of this view, Dr Orange added that the ePortfolio would be “useful for them as alumni and working towards professional competence stage.” Again, this notion was yet to be fully utilized as was obtaining direct support and making links with the Department of Education and Training (DET) for the Graduate Diploma of Education students.

**Operational Problems and Barriers to the Use of ePortfolio**

All members of staff who participated in the research agreed that the ePortfolio needed many improvements for the students to have trouble free access. Mr Blue stated, “There was great difficulty in uploading the documents to ePortfolio, which was due to the mechanic and logistics of the program which ended up taking away a lot of the students’ time.” Collectively, all other participants agreed that the system had a number of flaws and bugs that needed rectifying.

Dr Peach and Dr Green felt there was greater need for staff development and training before an improvement could be made. Both stated that the program lacked coherency and appeared complex in its overall layout. Dr Peach felt that “The navigation tools could be better”., adding, “Simplify it somehow - as it is quite complex at the moment and students take a while to work their way through it and to work out where to put what and how it all works - the whole process and structure needs to be simplified.” In addition, Dr Green and Dr Peach both felt that an online tutorial where somebody was demonstrating its use would be beneficial. In accordance with all other participants, Dr Green confirmed, “For it to be successful it has got to be integrated into subjects, not just as a one off, but continually through the thirteen weeks of the first semester and then again throughout the second semester - but in a really meaningful way.” The comments and suggestions by staff supports previous research findings (Batson, 2002; Tosh et al. 2005) that for ePortfolio successful implementation and uptake it is critical that extensive consultation and in servicing is undertaken with all key personnel.

Mr Blue felt that the main barriers were the functionality, physical space and the overall effectiveness of student learning. “If it gets them to understand the Professional Teaching Standards better then that may be good and that’s then designing tasks that fit in.” But he raised the question “Is it worth taking up the extra time, is the ePortfolio going to enhance that learning and will it make the learning any better? I always look at things as to how they are going to enhance the learning; did the ePortfolio allow the students to really do the task better or is it just another tool in which they can present, why does it make the quality of their work any better apart from some presentation?” Overall, he believed these were the real barriers that needed clarifying.

**A Way Forward for the ePortfolio**

In order to reduce some of the barriers mentioned, the majority of staff noted that it would be useful to have on-going training and support provided to both students and staff. Dr Peach, Dr Green and Mr Blue all suggested that it would be helpful to view the work of others and attend workshops showing how the ePortfolio could be fully utilised through examples of
existing and functioning ePortfolios. “It would be good to see how other people use it so that you can get some sort of idea how you can build it in,” said Mr Blue.

The members of staff were later asked how they planned to use the ePortfolio in their future subjects. Even though all staff answered this question positively, their responses relied on the system being up and running with the completion of all improvements previously mentioned. It was of concern that those few members of staff willing to integrate the ePortfolio into the teaching and learning were deterred to use the program due to its lack of functionality and the overall time wasted on trying to rectify ‘technical issues’ and deal with endless student complaints, which, were beyond their means and ability to address.

Finally, it was also noted that staff felt that without specific purpose or need, students were reluctant to use the ePortfolio. Furthermore, Dr Orange agreed that if the students had a purpose or goal and could see the value of using the ePortfolio, then this would enhance the overall significance. “They need a real purpose to be using it, therefore we need a carrot for them and they need a reward and the only way to do that is to make them complete assignments using the ePortfolio. Now if the faculty doesn’t want to go that way, then we can’t really make them use it any other way.” In conclusion, staff had mixed feelings about the overall use and success of the ePortfolio.

**Conclusion**

This paper evaluated the viability and usage of a customised ePortfolio system. Staff and students agreed in principle on the value of an ePortfolio tool for pre-service teacher education, however the overall acceptance and use was mixed. While staff interviewed agreed that the ePortfolio had excellent potential as a tool for students to collate, reflect and store data in a secured electronic (online) space and also to support students’ studies and understanding of the Professional Teaching Standards (2006), concerns with technical issues was identified as a major barrier. To support greater meaningful use of the customised ePortfolio, training and on-going support was acknowledged as critical to future acceptance at the main campus as well as the three satellite campuses. Video conferencing and online tutorials were suggested to minimize on-going concerns in these areas. Aside from the technical and training aspects of the ePortfolio, it was also mentioned that a ‘positive culture’ amongst all staff was required in order to better promote the ePortfolio. Through greater awareness and staff training, those interviewed felt this may be possible. Moreover, with greater staff awareness and familiarity with the system, it was envisaged that better integration of the ePortfolio system into teacher education programs could follow leading to students receiving deeper scaffolding and guidance in creating quality reports that incorporated and linked with the NSW Institute of Teachers Professional Teaching Standards. Also identified was the need for the ePortfolio to be available throughout the students’ undergraduate degrees but also available to students upon graduating. It remains to be seen whether the technical issues of functionality and IT support will be addressed; if not this customised ePortfolio will not be utilised as it was originally intended by staff or students.

This article does question the value of a customised ePortfolio. There are many commercial ePortfolio platforms that have become available in recent times, which may be more reliable and straightforward to use. Overall, the reaction of both students and academics to ePortfolios was mixed, so it is clear that a greater emotional and cognitive consensus is required before this can move forward. It also is apparent that the goals and outcomes of the overall
programs need to dovetail into the integration of ePortfolios, hence all stakeholders need
to see the value of the process and product and buy into the concept of ePortfolios.
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Appendix 1

Questions asked in Staff Interview

- How have you been using the ePortfolio in your teaching?
- What is your understanding of the ePortfolio’s purposes?
- What links have you made with the Professional Teaching Standards in the ePortfolio and the assignments you have designed for your undergraduate subjects?
- What improvements would you like to see embedded within the ePortfolio?
- What barriers have you encountered in your use of the ePortfolio? (List in priority order)
- How do you plan to use the ePortfolio in your future subjects?
- What further training and initiatives do you think would assist:
  - Your understanding and use of the ePortfolio
  - Student understanding and use of the ePortfolio

Appendix 2

Information regarding student questionnaire available online at Education courses elearning space. Survey was anonymous and available through SurveyMonkey program.

1. Program which you are currently enrolled?
2. Bachelor of Primary Education, Graduate Diploma of Education, Bachelor of Health and Physical Education, Bachelor of Education (Early Years), Bachelor of Science/Mathematics Education (Loftus)
3. What year are you?
4. 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, GDE
5. How often have you used the ePortfolio in the last 6 months?
6. Never, 1-2 times, 3-4 times, 5 or more times
7. If you ticked ‘Never’ for question 1, what has caused you not to use the ePortfolio?
8. What is your understanding of the ePortfolio’s purposes?
9. How has the ePortfolio supported your professional development?
10. How has the Professional Teaching Standards within the ePortfolio been linked to the assignments you have had to complete?
11. Have you had to use the ePortfolio to complete an assignment?
12. Yes, No
13. What improvements would you like made to the ePortfolio?
14. What would make you use the ePortfolio more regularly?
15. Rate the effectiveness of the following functions on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).
16. Entries tutorial, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Haven’t used
17. Report tutorial, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Haven’t used
18. Creating an entry, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Haven’t used
19. Creating a folder within a folder, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Haven’t used
20. Creating a report, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Haven’t used
21. Attaching a file, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Haven’t used
22. How do you think an ePortfolio may support your development as a reflective and effective educator?
23. Do you think you will use the ePortfolio after you complete your degree?
24. Yes/ No
25. If Yes- how do you envisage using the ePortfolio tool after you graduate?
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