

2007-11-01

## Using Portfolio Assessment in Course Evaluation

Pamararat Wiriyakarun

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/pasaa>



Part of the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Wiriyakarun, Pamararat (2007) "Using Portfolio Assessment in Course Evaluation," *PASAA*: Vol. 41, Article 3.

DOI: 10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.41.1.3

Available at: <https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/pasaa/vol41/iss1/3>

This Original Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Chulalongkorn Journal Online (CUJO) at Chula Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in PASAA by an authorized editor of Chula Digital Collections. For more information, please contact [ChulaDC@car.chula.ac.th](mailto:ChulaDC@car.chula.ac.th).

---

## Using Portfolio Assessment in Course Evaluation<sup>1</sup>

---

**Pamararat Wiriyakarun**

King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand

Email: pamararat.wir@kmutt.ac.th

### Abstract

Recently, portfolio assessment has become popular in language education as an alternative in language assessment, since it allows for the possibility of assessing various complex and important constructs in language learning, such as the progress and achievements of individual learners. It can, moreover, evaluate not only the growth of individuals but also the effectiveness of a particular course or program. This paper discusses concept of portfolio assessment, followed by the demonstration of the design, implementation, and assessment of two basic types of portfolios-process and product portfolios. The paper concludes with the application of portfolio assessment in course evaluation.

### Introduction

Objective testing has been a vital component of instructional programs throughout the world for decades. However, recently, in language education particularly, a number of educators have expressed their concerns about the use of this type of assessment as a primary measure of student achievement and other learning

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is a revised version of a paper presented at the Annual 27<sup>th</sup> Thailand TESOL/Pan--Asian Consortium International Conference: 2007 at Bangkok, Thailand.

outcomes. Consequently, countless attempts have been made to develop other types of assessment that can gauge student performance without the use of tests. The most frequently used term to represent such types of assessment is “alternative assessment.” Alternative assessment is far more useful than traditional testing, as it can evaluate the process and/or product of learning and other important learning behaviors, e.g., learning strategies, affective and personality styles, students’ work habits, social behaviors, and reactions to courses. It can also promote autonomous and self-directed learning. However, questions concerning the quality (i.e. validity, reliability, and practicality) and implementation of alternative assessment in the language classroom have always been raised by language testing specialists.

### **Portfolio Assessment: Definitions**

Portfolio assessment is a type of alternative assessment that has been widely used in educational settings as a way to examine and measure the progress and achievement of individual learners by documenting the process of learning or change as it occurs. Documenting progress towards higher order goals, such as the application of skills and the synthesis of experience, portfolio assessment provides deeper and broader information on a learner’s capabilities in many domains of learning than standardized or norm-based tests can. Portfolio assessment is also known as a systematic assessment procedure used to plan, collect, and analyze the multiple sources of data maintained in the portfolio (Moya & O’Malley, 1994). Another definition of portfolio assessment is the systematic use of student self-assessment along with the participation of practicing professionals as a means to ensure appropriate objectives and standards. There are five stages of portfolio development: (1) development of goals and objectives, (2) instrument development, (3) data collection, (4) data analysis, and (5) use of data ( Knight & Gallaro, 1994).

### **Design, Implementation, and Assessment**

The following are the steps in the portfolio assessment process designed by the researcher of this study. They include

three main stages: design, implementation, and assessment, which are further divided into six steps:

Step 1: The teacher and students make a decision about the purpose or goal that the portfolio will serve. After that, they make decisions about the portfolio contents related to the attainment of the goals. The teacher specifies what and how much should be included in the portfolio-both core and options (if any). Then, the teacher develops evaluation procedures for assessing the student portfolios. Clearly-stated criteria for marking a portfolio are also introduced to the students to inform them how they can achieve their goals. Portfolio guidelines that cover all the needed information mentioned earlier are prepared and presented clearly to the students before they start their portfolio tasks.

Step 2: The second step is to develop a product or “best pieces” portfolio that includes items demonstrating attainment of the end goals.

Step 3: At this step, a process portfolio is developed. It documents all facets or phases of the learning process as well as plans for the future. This portfolio also includes students’ reflections on their learning.

Step 4: This step involves portfolio assessment and feedback. Each portfolio piece is assessed in accordance with its specific goal(s). At this stage, self-assessment is used as a tool for formative evaluation. After that, the teacher provides feedback on the students’ portfolios, including strengths and weaknesses as well as a profile of the individual students’ ability. Another option is to arrange student-teacher conferences in which the teacher and students can discuss the students’ progress and future goals.

Step 5: Students revise their portfolios and present them to the class.

Step 6: The students' portfolios are then marked and graded using the designed criteria. The scoring is performed by three raters using two types of rating scales as scoring criteria for assessing students' learning product and process.

### **Application of Portfolio Assessment in Course Evaluation**

Knight and Gallaro (1994) suggested several applications for portfolio assessment in educational contexts, e.g., uses in accreditation and program review, program analysis and improvement, diagnosis of growth, and enhanced employment opportunities. The most interesting suggestion is applying portfolio assessment to program or course evaluation. Not all language programs can employ portfolio assessment in program evaluation. Nevertheless, portfolio assessment is very useful for evaluating programs that have flexible and individualized goals or outcomes, such as training students to self-direct their learning or developing students' autonomy in language learning.

Portfolio assessment is a highly positive and productive combination of process and product. It is a multi-faceted process providing both formative and summative opportunities for monitoring students' progress towards achieving essential outcomes. Therefore, using portfolio assessment in course evaluation would be very effective if the goals of the course being studied were to examine students' language improvement as well as their learning process. However, a major concern about using portfolio assessment in course evaluation is defining standards and criteria for interpretation of portfolio contents. Standards and criteria for student performance are necessary for making educational decisions, such as pass/fail. Its validity and reliability are also concerns. The use of multiple methods and information or data collected from various sources can enhance the validity of portfolio assessment, while the use of multiple judges and proper training of raters can solve the issue of its reliability. The accuracy of portfolio information influences judgments about student performance as well as the course being studied. Therefore, a system for verifying portfolio data is necessary. For examining its validity, a portfolio procedure should be validated. Varied forms of

evidence should be collected and reviewed to ensure that there is an agreement between a portfolio procedure and other types of evidence and that the same instructional decision can be obtained from both. Three methods are recommended by Moya and O'Malley (1994:11):

- (a) a study of the relationship between the findings derived using portfolio information and the findings derived using objective data, such as standardized test scores (a concurrent validity);
- (b) a study of the relationship between the findings derived using portfolio information and teacher judgment (a concurrent validity); and
- (c) a longitudinal study of the relationship between decisions made using portfolio information and subsequent student performance (a predictive validity).

The following is an example of how to employ portfolio assessment in course evaluation. The researcher hopes that this example may, more or less, provide a clear picture of portfolio assessment as a valid, reliable, and practical measurement procedure.

### **The Case Study: An Example**

In applied linguistics, case study research has been used to investigate the language development of first and second language learners (Nunan, 1992). In the field of second language acquisition, case studies have portrayed very detailed accounts of the processes and/or outcomes of language learning for a variety of subjects, ranging from young children in bilingual home environments to adolescent immigrants, adult migrant workers, and university-level foreign language learners (Duff, 1990, as cited in Nunan, 1992). Therefore, the case study seems to be the most suitable research method for examining the processes and products of learning through portfolio tasks.

### **Context**

The case study was carried out at King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT), an autonomous university in suburban Bangkok, Thailand. Its purpose was to evaluate a task-based English course provided by School of Liberal Arts based on a set of criteria and the Integrated Stake-Tyler (IST) model proposed especially for this study.

The evaluated course was *Fundamental English II* (course code: LNG 102), a second course in a four-course series. *LNG 102* is the most appropriate course to be studied. It places a strong emphasis on developing the cognitive skills of the students, which are addressed through a series of English medium tasks including dictionary tasks, resourcing tasks, and portfolio tasks. The goals of this course are to provide strategy training and to enhance autonomous learning skills. Students are also encouraged to learn independently using the Self-Access Learning Center as well as Internet and library resources. Therefore, the task-related materials used in this study consist of teaching materials (e.g. course handouts and other course-related documents); learning materials – authentic materials— such as newspapers, journals, magazines, e-books, and e-magazines); and self-access learning materials available at the Self-Access Learning Center, KMUTT.

### **Background**

The task-based EFL curriculum at KMUTT has been developed and used for more than seven years. Based on a learner-centered approach, it has its own unique characteristics. For example, it includes three types of analytic syllabus: task-based, project-based, and content-based. The task-based syllabuses focus on the process of learning and students' need to analyze the language input to understand specific language points. Each course is organized around goal-directed activities, and the language to be learned emerges from such activities (Watson Todd, 2001). The evaluations initially performed in 2001 using action research (Kongchan, 2001; Wiriyakarun, 2001) as well as the teacher and students' informal reactions indicates that the first two finished

courses, LNG 101 and LNG 102, and teaching materials seemed beneficial but not yet perfect.

Watson Todd (2006) conducted a study to investigate how and why changes in innovations at KMUTT occurred continually in a situation of immanent innovation where the implementers felt in control of and free to change the innovation. The data came from two sources: documentation concerning the course under investigation, LNG 102, and interviews with instructors who teach the course regularly. The findings from the interviews revealed the reasons for changes, for instance, teachers' concerns about the lack of reliability of assessment and evaluation procedures, the incompatibility of students' needs with the course objectives, both linguistic and non-linguistic, and the impracticality of the learning and teaching methodology. As a result, attempts to increase explicit teaching of linguistic objectives and assessment through exams have been made to alter the original version of the task-based curriculum at KMUTT to the 'modified' one. The course used to have no pre-specified linguistic objectives and an emphasis on continuous assessment, but this is no longer the case. These changes are still being questioned by the stakeholders and all others involved regarding whether they could 'improve' or 'fail' the curriculum. So long as no more concrete and reliable evidence of the curriculum's effectiveness has been formally reported, i.e., no one can prove how effective it is, the curriculum is continuously changed. Unfortunately, no single current evaluation model would fit the learner-centered, task-based learning context. As this type of curriculum has its own characteristics and concepts different from any other kind of curriculum, it requires a specific evaluation model that fits its ideology and context.

The IST model designed by the researcher of this study is a combined formative-summative approach, combining also the positivistic perspective with a more natural one. The model is based on Robert Stake's responsive approach integrated with Ralph Tyler's objectives-based approach. For formative evaluation, naturalistic inquiry is utilized to uncover in-depth information about context, e.g., individuals, groups, or institutions as well as implementations as they naturally occur. For summative evaluation, the experimental approach is used to examine the student outcomes,



such as student achievement and learning process. The data were gathered using qualitative and quantitative measures. A case study was carried out to investigate naturalistic qualitative data. A quasi-experimental, one-group pretest-posttest design was the measure used to collect quantitative data. The data —both ‘process’ and ‘product’— were, then, analyzed descriptively and statistically.

In this study, the effectiveness of the curriculum can be determined based on three main features: context, implementation, and student outcomes. Portfolio assessment is a research instrument used for assessing student performance and competence in triangulation with other methods in high-stakes assessment because it can reveal student outcomes in terms of the underlying thought process as well as the final product. In this paper, only the results from portfolio assessment are discussed to show how this assessment method can be utilized as a measure for course evaluation (for more detail concerning findings from other research instruments, see Wiriyakarun, 2007).

### ***Research question***

Can portfolio assessment be used as a means of determining the effectiveness of a task-based English course?

### ***Method***

A portfolio task is an adjunct of the LNG 102 course that all students taking it are required to do to learn how to self-direct their learning. In this study, two types of portfolios, process (see Appendix A) and product portfolios (see Appendix B), were developed by revising the existing materials on the portfolio task. Product portfolios deal with summary writing. Students are required to write a short paragraph describing what they have learned from reading or listening to texts. Process portfolios contain ten questions that cover six attributes: awareness of portfolio goals and objectives, explanation of choice made, student progress, self/peer assessment, awareness of independent learning, and association of portfolio task with real-life tasks.

### ***Sample and Data Collection***

The participants were 20 KMUTT undergraduate students randomly selected from different clusters consisting of three faculties: the Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Science, and Faculty of Industrial Education. Each student was assigned to complete four portfolio pieces: two product portfolio pieces and two process portfolio pieces. The student portfolios (80 pieces) were, then, marked by three raters using two rating scales: the analytic scale for assessing product portfolios (see Appendix C) and the holistic scale for assessing process portfolios (see Appendix D). Analytic scoring is applied to assess the product portfolio. With this method, three features of the students' written work, format, accuracy, and communicative ability, are scored to determine its strengths and weaknesses. Holistic scoring is used to examine the students' overall impression of the course, students' self-study skills, and their reflections on the portfolio task. To ensure some consistency in assessment, every portfolio piece was assessed by three raters, and agreement between raters or inter-rater reliability was calculated.

### ***Data Analysis***

To assure the reliability of the rating scales for portfolio tasks, generalizability coefficients (G-theory) were applied to investigate the source(s) of error in the measure. GENOVA, a computer program for generalizability theory, designed by Robert Brennan, director of the Center for Advanced Studies in Measurement and Assessment at the University of Iowa, was employed to calculate generalizability coefficients.

To investigate the inter-rater reliability of the rating scales for portfolio tasks, the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients were computed using SPSS/PC. The Pearson Product-Moment correlation was also utilized to examine the relationships between portfolio scores and scores obtained from other measures: the scores on ratings of product portfolios were correlated with scores on the curriculum-based achievement tests to measure the convergent or concurrent validity of the two measures. Scores on process portfolios

were also correlated with those from the self-assessment checklist to examine the students' learning process.

### ***Findings***

The findings from the portfolio tasks can be summarized as follows:

*Student performance and competence.* Most of the students' portfolio assignments (66.3%) —both product and process portfolios—were rated *average*. The second and third ranks were *high* and *low*, respectively. Results from portfolio assessment confirmed that the students acquired learner autonomy to some degree while they were taking the LNG 102. In addition, the students' performance on the two product portfolio pieces rated by three raters (mean = 39.40,  $k = 60$ ) was markedly better than their performance on the two process portfolio pieces rated by three raters (mean = 32.30,  $k = 60$ ). Results also showed a significant relationship between the two types of portfolios. The two mean scores obtained from both types of portfolios were significantly correlated at the significance level of 0.05. The relationship between the two scores, however, was moderate ( $r = 0.57$ ). These findings indicate that the students who had positive perceptions towards self-directed learning and learner autonomy were likely to work well on their assigned portfolio tasks. In other words, developing learner autonomy may enable students to increase their language abilities.

*Reliability.* To estimate the reliability of the designed scales for assessing both portfolio types, generalizability coefficients were calculated. The results showed that the generalizability coefficient of the analytic scale for product portfolios was 0.89, which is higher than the criterion set ( $r > .75$ ). The generalizability coefficient of the holistic scale for process portfolios was 0.73, which is slightly lower than the criterion set ( $r > .75$ ). However, the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, which is comparable to G-theory, can be used to estimate changes in several facets (e.g. test items or raters) to increase the generalizability coefficient (Bachman, 1990, p. 197). Henning (1987, as cited in Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991, pp. 536-537) suggested the Spearman formula for determining the optimal number of items or raters to reach the reliability that has been set. The results indicate that, in order to obtain data with a .75

reliability estimate, one more rater should be added. In other words, the process portfolio scores will be more reliable if there are four raters marking the same portfolio pieces. However, three raters are sufficient for rating product portfolios. Moreover, additional training in rating procedures should be provided to raters to improve reliability.

Inter-rater reliability was also examined using the Pearson-Product Moment correlation to investigate the relationship between the scores rated by the three raters, English teachers in the Department of Language studies at KMUTT. Raters 1 and 3 have more teaching experience than rater 2 does. Rater 1 is the researcher who designs the rating scales for assessing portfolio tasks. Rater 3 is the subjects' teacher. The results show a significant agreement in scoring of the product portfolios rated by raters 1 and 2 ( $r = .53$ ), indicating that there was a moderate relationship between the scores rated by the two raters. They might follow the same marking criteria. The correlation coefficient for raters 1 and 3 was very low ( $r = .26$ ). The scores assigned by rater 3 did not correlate significantly with those of the other raters, indicating that rater 3 interpreted the marking scheme differently than the others did.

Findings also indicate statistically significant agreement in the scoring of the process portfolios by raters 1, 2, and 3. The correlation coefficient for raters 1 and 2 was moderately high ( $r = .75$ ), the correlation coefficient for raters 2 and 3 was quite high ( $r = .67$ ), and the correlation coefficient for raters 3 and 1 was moderate ( $r = .57$ ). Further, to investigate any differences in the mean scores of each pair, a one-way ANOVA was employed. Since the scores obtained from product portfolios could not assume equal variances ( $p > .05$ ), the Games-Howell test was applied to determine which pairs were different. The results revealed that two pairs of means were significantly different at an alpha level of 0.05. They are as follows: (1) rater 1 scored higher than did rater 2, and (2) rater 3 scored higher than did rater 2. It can be concluded that the results from the post-hoc analysis reveal that rater 1 scored the highest followed by rater 3 and rater 2, respectively. This may be because rater 1 was the designer of the portfolio tasks, so she knew how to use the rating scales far better than did the other raters.

The scores obtained from the process portfolios did not violate the basic assumption of the ANOVA, and as a result, the Scheffe test was applied to discover which pairs were different. The results revealed that none of the means were significantly different at an alpha level of 0.05. However, rater 1 scored higher than did the others, and rater 3 scored higher than did rater 2. As mentioned earlier, rater 1 scored the highest because she knew the rating scales very well as she herself developed them.

*Validity.* The content validity of the scoring rubrics for assessing the product and process portfolios was approved by three experts using the Index of Item-Objective Congruence. The index of the product portfolios was 0.78 (moderately high), and that of the process portfolios was 0.77 (moderately high).

The concurrent validity of portfolio assessment was also examined. Pearson Product-Moment correlations were calculated to examine the relationship between portfolio scores with those obtained from other test tasks: (1) the achievement test and (2) the self-assessment checklist. The results showed no significant relationship between product portfolios and achievement tests ( $r=.29$ ,  $p>.05$ ). This may be because they are different types of tests. The achievement test is an objective test, whereas the product portfolio involves essay writing. Surprisingly, there was also no significant relationship between the process portfolio and self-assessment checklist scores ( $r=.22$ ,  $p>.05$ ), even though these two measures test the same construct: autonomous learning. The process portfolio illustrates the students' behaviour when performing portfolio tasks. The self-assessment checklist reflects their perceptions toward self-directed learning and learner autonomy. It can be interpreted that what the students think about their autonomy in language learning is not consistent with what they actually do.

## ***Discussion***

The results from portfolio assessment revealed that the scores on product portfolios assigned by the three raters were remarkably different, even though one pair was significantly correlated. It seems that rater 1 and rater 3, who have more

teaching experience, scored product portfolios higher than did rater 2, who has less experience. The product portfolio aims at assessing students' writing abilities through a summary-writing task. The rating scale consists of three attributes: format, accuracy and communicative ability. Rater 2 showed her concern about the accuracy attribute. She explained that it was very difficult to differentiate between copied writing and writing in phrases and chunks. The analytic scoring rubric for assessing product portfolios should, therefore, be revised by providing more information about each attribute. Among the three attributes, accuracy seems to be the most problematic one that needs to be redefined. As grammatical accuracy is the most important index for writing quality, more detailed grammatical features, namely verb tenses and moods, subject-verb agreement, and active/passive voice, should be identified. However, the holistic scale for process portfolios appears to be reliable and suitable for measuring students' learning process. The three raters' scoring of the process portfolios was not significantly different. Their relationship ranged from moderate to moderately high.

Additional training in the scoring should be conducted to increase the reliability of measures and the fairness of the assessment procedures as well as the tasks. Formal rater training should be provided to teachers no matter who they are: experienced or inexperienced raters. In a rater training workshop, raters try out a holistic rubric on a set of process portfolios, and an analytic rubric on a set of product portfolios. After that, they compare their answers in small groups and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each rubric. This will help raters learn to apply similar standards.

As no single rating scale for portfolio assessment can suit all kinds of learning contexts, to develop fair and valid instruments for assessing students' portfolios, teachers should bear in mind that any rating scales they will choose must be congruent with the objectives of a particular course, such as determining the students' learning process or improving their learning outcome (product).

It is worth noting here that the results from the case study conducted with a small sample size may not be sufficient to prove that portfolio assessment can be used as a high-stake assessment.

The use of multiple research methods can provide valuable information to improve the validity of interpretations and fairness of decisions based on portfolio scores. In future research, more valid, reliable and practical rating scales for the evaluation of portfolios of learners at various L2 proficiency levels must be produced to construct an accurate and efficient instrument for performance assessment.

### **Conclusion**

Portfolio assessment is still a promising alternative assessment procedure that can examine individual students' growth and performance. In other words, it can evaluate the process as well as the product of learning and promote autonomous and self-directed learning (Tsagari, 2004, p. 119). It is an extremely valid form of assessment, as it accurately measures the complex variables that contribute to the students' real abilities. In addition, it is systematic documentation of student language growth that can be used as supporting evidence in program or course evaluation. Portfolio assessment of a course or student progress provides a means of conducting assessments throughout the life of the course. It focuses on the outcomes of the course and the steps necessary to meet them. It also shows visual or descriptive evidence of the successes of individuals and courses. Since portfolio assessment is considered less reliable than more quantitative measures, such as standardized testing, it has been mostly used as supplement to standardized testing. Major problems in portfolio assessment are the lack of validation of portfolio assessment procedures and inadequately defined criteria against which performance is to be judged. If these two problems can be solved, at some time in the future, portfolio assessment will probably be accepted and acknowledged as a reliable tool for assessing students' progress, both formatively and summatively, and it may eventually replace objective tests in monitoring student language development.

### **The Author**

Pamararat Wiriyakarun is a lecturer at the Department of Language Studies, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. Also, she is currently a doctoral student of the English as an International Language Program of Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. Her research interests include task-based language teaching, program evaluation and learner autonomy.

### **References**

- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Knight, M. E., & Gallaro, D. (1994). Introduction. In M.E. Knight and D. Gallaro (Eds.), *Portfolio assessment: Applications of portfolio analysis*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Kongchan, C. (2001). The practicalities of designing courses. In R. Watson Todd (Ed.), *Task-Based learning and curriculum innovation* (pp. 108-111). Bangkok: King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi.
- Moya, S. S., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). A portfolio assessment model [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 13, 13-36.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsagari, C. (2004). Alternative assessment: Some considerations. *Language Testing Update*, 36, 116-124.
- Watson Todd, R. (2001). Designing a task-based curriculum. In R. Watson Todd (Ed.), *Task-Based learning and curriculum innovation* (pp. 3-9). Bangkok: King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi.
- Watson Todd, R. (2006). Continuing change after the innovation. *System*, 34, 1-14.
- Wiriyakarun, P. (2001). The practicalities of implementing courses. In R. Watson Todd (Ed.) *Task-Based Learning and Curriculum Innovation* (pp. 112-115). Bangkok: King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi.



Wiriyakarun, P. (2007). An application of the integrated Stake-Tyler model to an evaluation of a task-based English course at King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.

**APPENDIX A***Product Portfolio*

Name:..... Date: .....

Topic/Unit: ..... Level: .....

Source: ..... ☐ Inside SALC ☐ Outside SALC

Write a summary of the text you have studied. Your summarized paragraph must include

- the title /topic of the text,
- the resource where you found it, and
- a summary of the text.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Teacher's comment:

☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Needs more work

## APPENDIX B

### *Process Portfolio*

Name:..... Date: .....

Topic/Unit: ..... Level: .....

Source: ..... ☐ Inside SALC ☐ Outside SALC

---

Instructions: Reflect on how you feel toward your portfolio task. Answer the following questions:

1. What did you learn from the text (e.g. content, vocabulary, grammar, expression, or idiom)?

.....  
.....  
.....

2. What skills did you improve in doing this task? How did you monitor your improvement? Did you develop your own techniques to practice such skills?

.....  
.....  
.....

3. Why did you choose this item/text? Specify the reason(s), including your interests, needs, and so on.

.....  
.....  
.....

4. How did you plan your portfolio task? Did you set your own learning goals and objectives before doing this task? Did you check whether you accomplished your learning goals and objectives?

.....  
.....  
.....

5. What do you want to improve in the item/text (e.g. content, idea, task type, or exercises)? If not, give reason(s).

.....  
.....  
.....

6. How did you feel about your performance? Did you work well on your task? Why or why not ?

.....  
.....  
.....

7. Evaluate your own performance. Indicate your rating by putting a circle on the scale.

|           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |           |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Very poor |   |   |   |   |   | Excellent |

8. What were the problem areas you encountered (e.g. content, vocabulary, grammar, expression, or idiom)? How did you solve your problems?

.....  
.....  
.....

9. How did you correct your mistakes? Did you correct your own mistakes? Did you ask people to help you? If so, who are they?

.....  
.....  
.....

10. How can you apply the knowledge you have gained from this task to real-life situations?

.....  
.....  
.....

**APPENDIX C**

## Analytic Scale for Rating Product Portfolio

| Format   | Marks |
|--|-------|
| Incorrect format<br>Includes only some required items  | 1     |
| Correct format<br>Includes all the required items  | 2     |
| Accuracy   | Marks |
| Copies<br>Writes name<br>Writes isolated letters or words only   | 1     |
| Writes in phrases and chunks only<br>Incorrect use of basic structure<br>Poor spelling                         | 2     |
| Limited use of basic language structures<br>Basic spelling and punctuation mistakes                            | 3     |
| Mostly correct use of basic language structures  | 4     |
| Communicative ability  | Marks |
| Irrelevant information<br>Reader cannot follow the message<br>Vocabulary inadequate                            | 1     |
| Some of the information relevant<br>Reader can follow the message easily<br>Vocabulary quite adequate          | 2     |
| Most of the information relevant<br>Reader can follow the message very easily<br>Vocabulary generally adequate | 3     |
| Information is relevant<br>Message is clear and well-organized<br>Adequate vocabulary                          | 4     |

**APPENDIX D**

## Holistic Scale for Rating Process Portfolio

| Grade | Description   |
|-------|---|
| 1-3   | <p>Shows limited awareness of portfolio goals and objectives (e.g. strategies training, skill development, creative thinking, and critical thinking)</p> <p>Limited explanation of choices made</p> <p>Demonstrates little evidence of student progress, i.e., how students plan, perform, and evaluate the portfolio task</p> <p>Has difficulty relating to self/peer assessment</p> <p>Shows limited awareness of independent learning (e.g. self-management, self-monitoring, relative independence from teacher, and self-evaluation)</p> <p>Has difficulty associating the portfolio task with real-life tasks</p> |
| 4-7   | <p>Reflects awareness of some portfolio goals and objectives (e.g. strategies training, skill development, creative thinking, and critical thinking)</p> <p>Explains choices made in a relevant way</p> <p>Demonstrates some evidence of progress, i.e., how students plan, perform, and evaluate the portfolio task</p> <p>Relates to self/peer assessment</p> <p>Reflects some awareness of independent learning (e.g. self-management, self-monitoring, relative independence from teacher, and self-evaluation)</p> <p>Associates the portfolio task to real-life tasks</p>   |

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 8-10 | <p>Reflects awareness of portfolio goals and objectives (e.g. strategies training, skill development, creative thinking, and critical thinking)</p> <p>Fully explains choices made</p> <p>Demonstrates evidence of progress, i.e., how students plan, perform, and evaluate the portfolio task</p> <p>Reaches high level of reliability in self/peer assessment</p> <p>Reflects awareness of independent learning (e.g. self-management, self-monitoring, relative independence from teacher, and self-evaluation)</p> <p>Indicates a clear association between the portfolio task and real-life tasks</p> |
|------|--|

### Marking Scheme

To mark process portfolios, each of the following attributes must be carefully studied:

1. Awareness of portfolio goals and objectives (see items 1, 2, 5, and 8)
  - Items 1 and 2 report students' skill development and creative thinking
  - Items 5 and 8 reveal students' critical thinking
2. Explanation of choice made (see item 3)
3. Student progress (see item 4)
4. Self/peer assessment (see item 9)
5. Awareness of independent learning (see items 6, 7, 8, and 9)
  - Items 6 and 7 indicate students' self-monitoring and self evaluation
  - Item 8 reveals students' self-management
  - Item 9 illustrates students' relative independence from the teacher
6. Association of portfolio task with real-life tasks (see item 10)

