

Voicing the E in WOVE: Improving Reflection in ISUComm Foundation Courses ePortfolios

Barbara J. Blakely
Iowa State University

Using the literatures of student personal epistemology and approaches to learning, this article describes one WPA's deliberate pursuit of a deep approach to her learning about reflection. Other WPAs and instructors who have encountered an unexpected gap in their programs' or classes' work with reflection can revise documents and re-tune pedagogy so that students are encouraged from the beginning of the course to think of their learning in terms of a narrative and not a container, seeing multimodal communication work in first- and second-year foundational courses as a developing network of understanding and ability rather than as an accumulation of discrete bits of skill and knowledge. We can do this by encouraging students to more meaningfully and concretely understand their learning processes as developing and their reflections as representations of those processes. The ePortfolio can provide the space and the occasion for such an understanding when it functions as more than merely a storage space and when accompanying curricula and pedagogy invite students to become self-aware learners through the powerful potential of their reflective work.

“Change merely for the sake of change is inappropriate, but an appreciation of *changing* as a curricular stance creates reflective and revisionist opportunities for teachers and administrators.” (Grabam & Ryan, 2005, p. 91)

Our long-standing multimodal ISUComm Foundation Courses program positions reflection, along with analysis and composition, as one of three essential communication abilities. In our program, students develop these communication abilities in the context of our WOVE curriculum, which attends to four communication modes: Written, Oral, Visual, and Electronic. ISUComm, as a communication-across-the-curriculum program, aims to engage a broad set of communication competencies. Rather than focus solely on written communication, ISUComm develops as well students' oral, visual, and electronic knowledge and practice. ISUComm Foundation Courses—the two-course sequence required of all students—is the critical launching pad for this communication learning. Using written, oral, visual, and electronic texts, students analyze, compose, and reflect as they learn and practice the flexible value of the rhetorical pentad: context, substance, organization, style, and delivery. Reflection therefore is one of the three essential communication activities in which students engage in our program and many like ours. Because we, like other programs, perceive reflection as integral to transfer and general development as a learner, both of the ISUComm Foundation Courses list reflection on communication processes, strengths, goals, and growth as course goals. Thanks largely to the long-awaited introduction of ePortfolios in ISUComm Foundation Courses, we have recently been able to examine more thoroughly what students are learning about and from reflection in our courses.

Using the literatures of personal epistemologies and approaches to learning, as the writing program administrator (WPA) of ISUComm Foundation Courses, my own learning about our programmatic use of reflection has revealed that our curricular and pedagogical attention to reflection will benefit from work that elicits potentially deeper representations of learning. As elaborated in this article's third section, the framework of learning approaches (Entwistle, 1988; Marton & Säljö, 1976), with its distinctions between surface, strategic, and deep approaches to and resulting representations of learning has been critical to our program's changes relative to reflections in ISUComm ePortfolios. By adopting a deep approach to my own learning about how our curricula and pedagogy guide our students' reflective work, I am better able to identify curricular modifications to meet ISUComm Foundation Courses' reflective goals and pursue change that is not just reactive or utilitarian but that provides us the “reflective and revisionist opportunities” characterized by Grabam and Ryan (2005, p. 91).

Operationally, ISUComm Foundation Courses are guided most directly by Dewey (Dewey 1938; Dewey 1944) and Yancey (Yancey, 1998; Yancey, 2004) in the use of the term *reflection*: reflection is conceived of as both process and product, a simultaneous looking forward and backward while meaningfully integrating the learning of the moment. In ISUComm Foundation Courses, students are asked to communicate, clarify, and evaluate their composing and learning processes and resulting products by systematically noticing and thinking about patterns in their learning; connecting their processes and learning to course outcomes and terminology as well as to work in other contexts; and identifying growth—specifically, how that growth occurred and what work students may need to do in the future to continue to develop as learners and effective

multimodal communicators. Students are encouraged, as part of their reflective work, to take into account their own re-thinking of and others' feedback on their work, so that they gain increasing agency over their performance and their learning in general.

Voicing the E in WOVE

We have required paper portfolios in ISUComm Foundation Courses from the inception of the program, about 2005, but their practical usefulness as an evolving record of student learning, and reflection on that learning, was problematic, both for students and for the program. On occasion over the years, we had quipped that it seemed like the E in WOVE was silent, and certainly in terms of the dualism between consuming and producing electronic content, there was some programmatic frustration about that—a recognition that we were not providing all we could for students' 21st-century communication learning. While our curriculum does include student learning in basic graphic design for programmatic projects such as creating brochures, posters, and slideshows electronically, adopting ePortfolios in ISUComm Foundation Courses brought more technology affordances, including archiving, revising, sharing, and interactivity. Frankly, students also enjoy working in the digital space of ISUComm ePortfolios, and the idea that they exit our two classes with a website they can continue to add to—a benefit the paper portfolio did not provide. As the WPA, I had struggled with the feeling that the paper portfolio seemed less an authentic and genuinely useful project for students and more a simple compilation of one or two semesters of work; the likelihood of students revisiting and adding to a paper portfolio in later classes seemed remote. How could they readily use it another class, for instance, or as part of an employment package? On the other hand, as we know, ePortfolios offer potentially deeper learning, not just about the electronic mode, but about students' awareness of themselves as agentive learners.

Lacking a university communication-across-the-curriculum director to spearhead an institutional ePortfolio initiative, developing and introducing ISUComm ePortfolios in ISUComm Foundation Courses took a great deal of political, technological, and personnel effort. Perseverance and a proof-of-concept presentation to an assistant dean garnered an enthusiastic go-ahead, and some Rhetoric and Professional Communication PhD students with enthusiasm, vision, and programming skills boosted ISUComm ePortfolios in ISUComm Foundation Courses to a three-semester pilot phase in 2013. Without question, launching ISUComm ePortfolios in our program was a significant milestone, and I eagerly anticipated the ways in which all aspects of student

portfolio work, and especially reflections, would reflect this change. After all, we had finally voiced the E in WOVE!

Piloting ISUComm ePortfolios and Taking Stock

With National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) standards and statements guiding us with our course outcomes and best practices from the inception of ISUComm Foundation Courses, we looked also to the Association for Authentic, Experiential, and Evidence-Based Learning (AAEEBL) as we integrated ISUComm ePortfolios, “a meta-high-impact” practice (Kahn, 2014) into our program. We wanted more than better assessment ability and even more than being able to say we had fully implemented the E in WOVE. As Yancey (2004) asserted, ePortfolios allow students to represent themselves and their learning with more complexity than do print portfolios, thus facilitating student navigation in 21st-century communication environments by providing a “new kind of space for student work” (p. 747). Compellingly, this digital composing and metacognitive space “provides for the invention of a different particular kind of student: one who can make multiple connections and who creates *depth* [emphasis added] through multiplicity and elaboration, who can work in visual and verbal and aural modalities” (Yancey, 2004, p. 751). Three semesters of dozens of archived pilot ePortfolios, coupled with a state-mandated assessment report in academic year 2015-2016, allowed us to undertake a combination of informal assessments of ISUComm ePortfolios in conjunction with beginning to scale up to the more than 300 sections, several dozen instructors (predominantly adjuncts and graduate teaching assistants), and 7,100 students in our program. Aside from ease of use of the WordPress platform, provision of technical support and training, and the benefit to students of WOVE work within ISUComm ePortfolios, I was eager to examine ISUComm Foundation Courses students' abilities to reflect on their work in our courses—to demonstrate that they were gaining from the “fundamentally different intellectual and affective opportunities” ePortfolios provide (Yancey, 2004, p. 742).

Certainly, archived ePortfolios provide a window onto our program that paper portfolios never realistically permitted. We have been pleased, though not surprised, that student artifact and design work within ISUComm ePortfolios is easily competent, even good (no doubt due to the visual and graphic design work already integrated into the curriculum). But student reflections—their representations of their learning in our courses—only rarely articulate the depth of learning the students would seem to have engaged in to produce the various artifacts

in the ePortfolio, indeed, to actualize the digital composition itself. Reflections show students (mostly) diligently trying to deliver what they “think we want” in this part of their ISUComm ePortfolio—what they need to do to satisfy this element of the ePortfolio assignment; however, many conflate their reflective purpose with one or more of the forms Riedinger (2006) said are not reflection (e.g., summaries, lists, clichés; pp. 92-93). Indeed, as I have come to understand, a significant part of the shortfall in student reflective work has been precisely that students have tended to conceive of reflection more as a requirement to be satisfied and less as an embedded, systematic practice integral to their learning. Naturally, my concern as a WPA is that students’ insubstantial representations of their learning—the lack of evidence of their standing aside from it (Silver, 2013), abstracting from it, and connecting it to other communication contexts—render that learning less transferable beyond our two courses. Inasmuch as “learning occurs in the process of representing learning” (Moon, 2004, p. 147), more productive ePortfolio representations of learning are not merely desirable, they are essential. Because reflection is integral to “folio thinking” by functioning to “encourage students to integrate discrete learning experiences . . . enhance students’ self-understanding[,] promote students’ taking responsibility for their own learning[,] and] support students in developing an intellectual identity” (Designing Education Lab, 2016), reflections that demonstrate honest self-examination and connection to prior and future learning are more effective than those that O’Neill (2002) characterized as “ritualistic.”

To address the difficulty with meaningful reflection that voicing the E in WOVE in our program laid bare for us (elaborated below), I turned to scholarship about personal epistemologies evinced specifically in the first year of post-secondary education (Brownlee, Walker, Lennox, Exley, & Pearce, 2009; Hofer, 2004; Schommer-Aikens & Easter, 2006), as well as the scholarship of student approaches to learning (Biggs & Collis, 1982; Entwistle, 1988; Marton & Säljö, 1976; Moon, 2004; Rossum & Schenk, 1984). These scholars showed that students’ personal epistemological assumptions affect their approaches to learning, and first-year students in particular will naturally rely on the approaches to learning with which they have experienced the most reinforcement: what has been sufficient in their schooling to date (Hofer, 2004; Rossum & Schenk, 1984). However, since students’ approaches to learning are connected perforce to their concepts of learning and to transfer potential, it is problematic that many first-year students’ representations of their learning suggest a view of knowledge as “an accumulation of discrete, concrete, knowable facts [rather than] an interrelated network of concepts that

are relative, contingent, and contextual” (Hofer, 2004, p. 143). Representations that fail to show knowledge as a developing network suggest that students tend to isolate and atomize skills and practices they perceive as specific to success in individual classes, but whose later benefit and role in their learning trajectory is unarticulated and perhaps not even recognized.

Hofer (2004) and others (e.g., Brownlee et al., 2009) highlighted an important consideration about the first year of post-secondary school, one that applies directly to WPAs’ and instructors’ efforts in foundational ePortfolio reflections. Encouraging representations of learning like Hofer’s networks of interrelated concepts is especially beneficial for first-year students, whose personal epistemologies may be at variance with those more optimal for effective learning during their university experience. Nelson et al. (2008) said of students’ pre-existing, “ill-informed preconceptions about . . . what it is to be an independent learner” that “it is the duty of universities to deal honestly with these expectations” (p. 9). Rossum and Schenk (1984) agreed, having noticed that beginning students’ views about learning need to be deliberately and purposefully addressed in curricula and pedagogy. Hofer (2004) added that, although restrictive and less adaptive student preconceptions are likely to appear in first-year and introductory courses, it is precisely because these courses “play a powerful part in students’ socialization to college study” (p. 161) that we need to ask students explicitly to recognize and articulate the meta-processes and meta-meanings of their learning, as well as the fact that their preconceptions about learning are amenable to change and not immutable personal characteristics. Certainly, Yancey’s (1998) assertion that “curricula are exercises in identity making” (p. 43) reminds us that intentional, scaffolded curricula and focused instructor development can help students rethink their preconceptions about learning as they revise the narratives of their learning.

A “Strategic” Approach Falls Short for a WPA

The framework of different approaches to learning (Entwistle, 1988; Marton and Säljö, 1976) was described by Moon (2004) as

probably a more helpful construct than any other in the realm of student learning . . . the background of much study of student or higher level learning, even though it is not sufficiently known by teachers or learners themselves. (p. 120)

I suggest that the framework of learning approaches—deep, surface, and strategic—is extremely helpful in teasing out a program’s understanding of reflection and how WPAs and instructors might take

steps to improve this important part of the curriculum.

Briefly, the framework shows that students taking a deep approach to learning engage with assignments and course goals holistically, acknowledging their complexity and interrelatedness with other material; this approach allows students to construct meaning rather than file away separate facts, thereby effecting significant and increasingly transformative revisions of their learning representations. These students recognize their learning as a journey, a narrative, rather than a destination point or a conclusion, and they see ongoing growth as foundational to this journey, rather than believing their learning is dictated by fixed personal characteristics.

A surface approach to learning, on the other hand, treats course content discontinuously, as discrete pieces of information to be memorized for later recall, independent of course learning goals and potential future use. The framework describes a surface approach to learning as the filing away of atomized bits of knowledge often embodied in rules and procedures. Surface student reflections show what Jarratt, Mack, Sartor, and Watson (2009) described as an understanding of learning as a container in which pieces of information are gathered in a process of accretion, rather than as “a narrative constantly under construction within changing contexts” (p. 49). As a result of taking a surface approach, students can have “difficulty in making sense of new ideas presented” (Moon, 2004, p. 122).

A third approach to learning is the “strategic,” in which the learner determines the amount and kind of effort required to produce a desired result (for students, this may be “what the teacher wants” or “what I have to do to get a good grade”). The strategic approach is motivated by pragmatism and single-minded focus on a utilitarian outcome, without specific attention to its connection to a larger network of understanding. Because the strategic learner’s goal is to accomplish immediate goals efficiently, it is not reliably conducive to student representations of learning that achieve a “meta” level of understanding about that learning.

Sampling reflections from the pilot semesters and an additional small-scale assessment, we used the framework of approaches to learning to sort and analyze what is and is not satisfying about students’ ISUComm ePortfolio reflections. These examinations showed me that, as the WPA in a large program, I have focused pragmatically on a result; I have wanted student reflections to be produced regularly throughout the course so that students have a record from which to write an overarching reflection for their ePortfolios at the end of the semester. The curriculum has attempted, pragmatically, to elicit these products with routinized reflection prompts after each assignment, intending to make reflection habitual for our students. While our students have indeed been producing representations of

their learning, these have not been systematically reflective of deeper learning; in other words, we have work to do to offer consistently optimal conditions for creating Yancey’s (2004) “different particular kind of student” (p. 751) in the many sections we teach. This student is one who not only has insights into present learning challenges and connections but is also prepared for future learning, ready to flexibly adapt their learning to new settings.

Reflections in ISUComm ePortfolios: Student Representations of their Learning

In addition to our perusal of archived pilot ISUComm ePortfolios, we took advantage of another opportunity to examine our most recently produced ISUComm ePortfolios. Three years ago, the state of Iowa mandated a process called Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP), requiring program directors at the state universities to conduct simple assessments based on our program outcomes (Rosacker, 2013). The mandate is unfunded so while I am more than willing to collect data that will tell me something useful about the program (I can choose what ISUComm Foundation Courses outcome to evaluate, for instance, and how we will determine levels of achievement), I do not have resources to make this into a major programmatic assessment project. This academic year, my CIP for ISUComm Foundation Courses examined how students were meeting the outcome of reflection in each of the two courses.

Looking at a random sample of 15% (about 200) of ISUComm ePortfolios for Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 (remember that we have not yet achieved full implementation of ISUComm ePortfolios in every section of ISUComm Foundation Courses), we used criteria suggested in the literature (e.g., Rickards et al., 2008) about successful student reflections: the degree to which students (a) make and support claims about their processes and work; (b) make connections between their learning in ISUComm Foundation Courses and other projects, classes, contexts; (c) articulate the use of peer and instructor feedback; (d) analyze their process and work, not merely recount it or refer to its completion as evidence of meta-understanding; and (e) use transferable rhetorical terminology and concepts from the course materials in their reflections (e.g., audience, delivery, cohesion). A simple sorting of students’ reflections was carried out using a scale of 1-3 (1 = *low* and corresponded roughly to a surface representation of learning; 3 = *high* and suggested a deeper approach to learning).

The CIP assessment showed approximately 25% of reflections scoring at a Level 1 and another 25% scoring at Level 3. This obviously left half of our students in Level 2, where they were not consistently

making connections or articulating agency but rather writing reflections that, by their strategic and utilitarian characteristics, would be less useful to students than would building the networks of understanding via deeper approaches to learning and its representation. Level 1 reflections can be exemplified by statements like the following: “I did a power point, so now I know how to use visuals” and “I was very satisfied with my presentation to the class.” Level 2 might include statements like these: “I knew I needed at least five sources and I needed to cite them correctly. So I found five and looked in the handbook to see how to cite them” and “My peer responder said I needed transitions, so I put some in my paper.” Level 3 statements indicate metacognitive awareness of real growth as well as how that growth came about and how it might be applied in future settings. For example,

By doing my presentation for this class and watching others’ presentations, I learned that less text and more well-chosen graphics can convey a message better to an audience of a visual argument. This will help me with the poster session I will have to do for my major.

Another Level 3 example is, “I read my paper aloud and realized that without stronger transitions, my paper made sense to me, but an audience would have some trouble seeing how my ideas relate to each other and to my main point.” Note that both surface and strategic reflections suggest students believe they have reached a destination point, tending to show an “I-followed-the-directions-and-rules” representation of learning.

The reflections examined in the three previous (pilot) semesters showed similar characteristics, although we were not yet using the approaches to learning framework to help us fully understand what we were seeing. Ours were admittedly small samples somewhat cursorily analyzed, but as the WPA, I am not satisfied that roughly one-fourth of the students, even in this small sample, meet the course and program outcome for reflection at only a surface level (clichéd, ritualistic, atomistic). In this sample, three-fourths of the students represented their learning at less than a Level 3, falling short of representations that suggest a deep approach to their learning. Although disappointing, our students’ reflections do resonate with what the literature says about students’ personal epistemologies and their emergence in the first year or so of post-secondary school—as a mismatch of assumptions about learning that, as Nelson et al. (2008) argued, can and needs to be addressed. Understanding the likely approaches to learning taken by many of our students has become central to my deeper reflection on—my standing-aside from and evaluating—the curricular tasks we have

been asking students to complete, so that ISUComm Foundation Courses are better able to work effectively with the problematic fit between first-year students’ sometimes surface or strategic approaches to learning and the deeper ones that lead more reliably to transfer and successful future learning.

In the remainder of this section I share some examples of how our program’s work with reflection, coupled with characteristic student approaches to learning in the first year, may have tended to produce surface or strategic representations of learning; other programs and instructors may recognize some of their practices here. For instance, we have been asking students to respond to a fairly generic reflection prompt after every major communication assignment. This prompt is presented as a list of unvarying questions: (a) “Has your essay/project fulfilled the purpose of the assignment?” (b) “How did you come up with your thesis and develop support for it?” (c) “What do you think are the strengths of this essay/project?” (d) “What problems did you face while preparing this essay/project?” (e) “What solutions did you find for those problems?” While not misguided or ineffective questions, without an overarching understanding of how the reflection relates to their learning in the course, unvarying questions like these can turn reflection into a rote exercise after the first couple of assignments. As we know, students respond to our cues about what is valued in the coursework and how it relates to the other learning in the course. If instructors are inconsistent about providing feedback on student reflections or about devoting class time to a wider range of reflective work, we cannot necessarily expect students to represent their learning in ways other surface or strategic. Moreover, we have seen that some students and instructors have tended to view the ePortfolio as an end-of-semester project, as evidenced by the number of requests for course sites that our English Online Learning Team receives relatively late in each semester (sometimes within the last 3-4 weeks). This tendency risks making the ePortfolio seem like just one more assignment, and a rushed one at that, if it is introduced or worked on in earnest primarily near the end of the semester.

Practice that occurs in ways or for reasons other than those intended by the program, and too much of it based on assumptions not explicitly consonant with knowledge about student epistemology and approaches to learning, means that reflection ostensibly can be part of curricula yet not function effectively to encourage “students to participate with us . . . as agents of their own learning” (Yancey, 1998, p. 5). We all recognize that the potential of ePortfolios

is better realized when they are neither “one last assignment” nor just storage.

Curricular Changes

While on the one hand, I am able to interpret our need for refocus on reflection as the manifestation of well-documented issues attendant upon adopting and scaling up classroom technology, on the other hand, as a WPA who has waited long and worked hard to implement ePortfolios in our multimodal communication program, I return to a bluntly stated reality: “Without reflection, the ePortfolio is merely storage” (Riedinger, 2006, p. 91). Making an integrational leap I suspect is not unique to ISUComm Foundation Courses, we may have been idealistic about how students at the start of their academic communication trajectory are realistically prepared to represent their learning in the coherent and long-range way we want, especially in light of the literatures on first-year students’ common personal epistemologies and learning approaches. Like students elsewhere, in their first two years of college ours have taken few other university courses to which to connect their ISUComm Foundation Courses’ learning, and these other courses offer few communication projects and few of a (WOVE) multimodal nature. For all these reasons, reflection must be foregrounded if ePortfolios are to provide not only the electronic space but the cognitive developmental opportunity for representations of students’ deep learning—“the evidence of the identity and learning that are transferred across situations” (Yancey, 1998, p. 35). In the spirit of Graban and Ryan’s (2005) encouragement to move from “What is” to “What is possible,” in post-secondary communication programs, we are working to achieve a critical mass of sections that not only incorporate ISUComm ePortfolios but use finer-tuned pedagogy to accord more closely with most promising practices for meaningful reflection. Such programmatic goals are essential to making ISUComm ePortfolios both effective and sustainable for student learning. To move more deliberately toward what is possible, we are incorporating at least four changes into ISUComm Foundation Courses, changes that necessarily occur incrementally as we revise materials and continue to extend professional development to the various groups of instructors in our program.

Like most WPAs, I agree with Qualley (2002) that instructor preparation “turns out to be the occasion that ensures [a] program remains dynamic” (p. 279). Accordingly, our initial and most rapidly visible changes are to continue work with ISUComm ePortfolios in our pro-seminar for new ISUComm Foundation Courses TAs, as well as to write ISUComm ePortfolio work into the standard, required syllabus for

new TAs and new adjunct instructors. Secondly, for advanced graduate students and established adjuncts, we will continue to offer workshops and “expos” at which TAs and adjuncts already successfully teaching with ISUComm ePortfolios share their experiences, particularly with respect to reflective work. We have found that such events, at which those already practicing successfully are the expert presenters, highlight the community needed to sustain change. As the WPA, I encourage adjuncts to include their participation at these workshops on their annual reviews as evidence of professional development.

Thirdly, course materials in addition to the syllabus are under revision to include reflective activities beginning early in the semester. For instance, using the guidance of Brownlee et al. (2009), this academic year we are encouraging instructors to ask students at the beginning of the course to write about their usual process when approaching a communication project. Where did they learn that process? What about it has and has not worked in various situations? What kinds of projects have they done? This thinking about past experience can then be explicitly connected to written, oral, visual, and electronic course outcomes as students progress through the semester and see what is or is not changing about their processes and knowledge. We have also revised the reflection prompts themselves for the first of our two courses and will implement these in the coming academic year, as we revise the prompts for our second course. A notable refinement is that each prompt not only refers to specifics of each successive assignment, it also asks students in what ways their learning “story” is changing (going back to their initial responses to the process questions above) and to articulate changes and challenges explicitly using course terminology and concepts. The revised prompts ask students to specify what knowledge and/or practice was carried over from a previous learning experience or assignment (in this course or another), as well as to project what of their communication learning experience on a current assignment can be carried over to a future assignment or setting. Through these more nuanced prompts we expect to see students developing their own abstractions from their current learning and forging (even speculative) connections to their future learning. Coupled with asking students which of the activities and materials (assignment sheet, rubric, textbooks, peers) gave them the most guidance, we anticipate that this work will help students gain not only a sense of control over their learning but also a more concretized understanding that their approaches to learning need not be static.

Finally, we are experimenting with a simplified version of the reflection “sorting” continuum for student reflections we used for our CIP data analysis. We have prepared a version of this for instructors and

students, so that instructors can more readily provide useful feedback on reflections and students can better target their efforts in their reflections. We will use instructor feedback to determine the effectiveness of this response method, both in terms of instructor time and student benefit.

By deliberately pursuing a deep approach to learning about reflection (connecting to student personal epistemology and learning theory), WPAs who have encountered an unexpected gap in their program's work with reflection can revise documents and re-tune pedagogy so that students are encouraged from the beginning of the course to think in terms of a narrative and not a container, seeing their work in these first-year and introductory courses as a developing network of understanding and ability rather than as discrete bits of skill and knowledge. We can do this by encouraging students, in a number of ways, to look at "the trajectory of [their] development over time and across contexts" (Slomp, 2012, p. 82), an examination that ideally will also allow them to begin the shift to deep approaches to learning. The ePortfolio can provide the space and the occasion for such an examination when it functions as more than mere storage and when accompanying curricula and pedagogy invite students to become self-aware learners through the power of their meaningful reflections.

References

- Biggs, J. B., & Collis, K. F. (1982). *Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO taxonomy (Structure of the observed learning outcome)*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Brownlee, J., Walker, S., Lennox, S., Exley, B., & Pearce, S. (2009). The first year university experience: using personal epistemology to understand effective learning and teaching in higher education. *Higher Education*, 58(5), 599-618. doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9212-2
- Designing Education Lab. (2016). *Reflective learning*. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/group/design_education/cgi-bin/mediawiki/index.php/Reflective_Learning
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Collier Books.
- Dewey, J. (1944). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Entwistle, N. J. (1988). *Styles of learning and teaching: An integrated outline of educational psychology for students, teachers, and lecturers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Graban, T. S., & Ryan, K. J. (2005). From "What is" to "What is possible": Theorizing curricular document revision as in(ter)vention and reform. *WPA: Writing Program Administration-Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators*, 28(3), 89-112.
- Hofer, B. K. (2004). Exploring the dimensions of personal epistemology in differing classroom contexts: Student interpretations during the first year of college. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 29(2), 129-163. DOI:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2004.01.002
- Jarratt, S. C., Mack, K., Sartor, A., & Watson, S. E. (2009). Pedagogical memory: Writing, mapping, translating. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 33(1-2), 46-73.
- Kahn, S. (2014). E-portfolios: A look at where we've been, where we are now, and where we're (possibly) going. *Peer Review*, 16(1), 4.
- Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning—ii: Outcome as a function of the learner's conception of the task. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 46(2), 115-127. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8279.1976.tb02304.x
- Moon, J. A. (2004). *Reflection in learning and professional development: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Nelson, K. J., Kift, S. M., & Clarke, J. A. (2008). Expectations and realities for first year students at an Australian university. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00004557>
- O'Neill, P. (2002). Reflection and self-assessment: Resisting ritualistic discourse. *The Writing Instructor*, 2. Retrieved from <http://www.writinginstructor.org/oneill-2002-04>
- Qualley, D. (2002). Learning to evaluate and grade student writing: An ongoing conversation. In B. Pyllyk & S. Liggett (Eds.), *Preparing college teachers of writing: Histories, theories, programs, practices* (pp. 278-291). New York, NY: Oxford UP.
- Rickards, W. H., Diez, M. E., Ehley, L., Guilbault, L. F., Loacker, G., Hart, J. R., & Smith, P. C. (2008). Learning, reflection, and electronic portfolios: Stepping toward an assessment practice. *Journal of General Education*, 57(1), 31-50. doi:10.1353/jge.0.0008.
- Riedinger, B. (2006). Mining for meaning: Teaching students how to reflect. In A. Jafari & C. Kaufman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on ePortfolios* (pp. 90-101). Hershey, PA: IDEA Group Reference.
- Rosacker, E. (2013, June 27). Iowa law adds improvement plan requirement to large courses. *Inside Iowa State*. Retrieved from <http://www.inside.iastate.edu/article/2013/06/27/plan>
- Rossum, E. V., & Schenk, S. M. (1984). The relationship between learning conception, study strategy, and learning outcome. *British Journal*

- of Educational Psychology*, 54(1), 73-83. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8279.1984.tb00846.x
- Schommer Aikins, M., & Easter, M. (2006). Ways of knowing and epistemological beliefs: Combined effect on academic performance. *Educational Psychology*, 26(3), 411-423. doi:10.1080/01443410500341304
- Silver, N. (2013). Reflective pedagogies and the metacognitive turn in college teaching. In M. Kaplan, N. Silver, D. LaVaque-Manty, & D. Meizlish (Eds.), *Using reflection and metacognition to improve student learning: Across the disciplines, across the academy* (pp. 1-17). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Slomp, D. H. (2012). Challenges in assessing the development of writing ability: Theories, constructs, and methods. *Assessing Writing*, 17(2), 81-91. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2012.02.001
- Yancey, K. B. (1998). *Reflection in the writing classroom*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Yancey, K. B. (2004). Postmodernism, palimpsest, and portfolios: Theoretical issues in the representation of student work. *College Composition and Communication*, 55(4), 738-761. doi:10.2307/4140669

BARBARA J. BLAKELY is on the faculty of the Rhetoric and Professional Communication Program and is the director of ISUComm Foundation Communication Courses Program at Iowa State University in Ames, IA. She teaches courses in pedagogy, research methods, and writing program administration and publishes on curriculum, pedagogy, and technology use in multimodal foundational programs.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the work of Kathleen Rose, PhD student and research assistant during 2015-2016, in collaborating on the creation and revision of materials for the standard English 150 course. Acknowledgement also is due Dr. Eric York, who assisted Rose and the author with CIP data analysis. Finally, the ideas and implementation work of the Online Learning Team, supported by Engineering and Liberal Arts and Sciences Online at Iowa State University, were and are critical to our ability to “voice the E in WOVE.”