

Portfolio Assessment in Second/Foreign Language Pedagogy

Huy V. Phung*

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, USA

Abstract

Portfolio as a collection of artifacts has been employed for a long time in different creative professions as one way to display one's talents, competences, and accomplishments for career advancement and social recognition. In second/foreign language education, portfolio has been enthusiastically received by classroom teachers as an alternative to the traditional testing characterized as formalized, time-restricted, one-shot, and inauthentic. This paper provides a critical review of the literature on portfolio assessment and offers an example of how it can be implemented in practice through a project-based English course for college students in an EFL context.

Introduction

Given the increasing use of portfolios in language education, this paper aims to review the fundamental concepts and concerns of portfolio assessment (PA) in second/foreign language pedagogy. In the first section, a brief introduction about PA is presented. Next, PA will be explored in relation to its theoretical concepts and language assessment, particularly the social constructivist theories of learning and alternative assessment. After that, a review of the advantages and drawbacks of PA will be scrutinized via empirical studies. I will conclude the review with a concise exchange of validity in PA and some recommendations for future research. To illustrate how the principles of PA can be realized in actual classrooms, I will provide an example of how e-portfolio is incorporated into a project-based English course. Thus, the four main questions in this paper are: (1) What is portfolio and portfolio assessment (PA)? (2) What are the current conceptualizations of PA? (3) What are some benefits and drawbacks of PA? (4) How can teachers implement PA in their classrooms?

Portfolio and Portfolio Assessment (PA)

Portfolio as a collection of artifacts has been employed for a long time in different creative professions as one way to display one's talents, competences, and accomplishments for career advancement and social recognition. Over time, professionals in other fields started utilizing



Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs

CC BY-NC-ND

Phung, H. V. (2016). Portfolio Assessment in second/foreign language pedagogy. *Hawaii Pacific University TESOL Working Paper Series 14*, 90-107.

Website: <http://www.hpu.edu>.

*Email: phunghuy@hawaii.edu. Address: Department of Second Language Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Moore Hall 570, 1890 East-West Road Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

portfolios for different purposes, particularly in the realm of education (Brown, 2005). If one looks up “portfolio” in the Merriam-Webster dictionary, a derivative definition can be found as “a selection of a student's work (as papers and tests) compiled over a period of time and used for assessing performance or progress” from its primary meaning as “a set of drawings, paintings, or photographs that are presented together in a folder.” In education, portfolios have been found in collections of evidence/documents for program evaluation and quality assurance at different institutional levels. Many students are required to compile and showcase their best works in a briefcase as a precondition for graduation. Gradually, advocates of educational reform movements associated portfolios with their agenda of opposing large standardized tests (Brown, 2003). Portfolios, along with other instruments including checklists, journals, conferences and so on, have been enthusiastically received by second language teachers (Brown & Hudson, 1998). Barnhardt (1998) and his associates noted in their manual for PA in foreign language classrooms that PA is “the systematic, longitudinal collection of student work created in response to specific, known instructional objectives and evaluated in relation to the same criteria” (p. 3). This conceptualization of PA reflected the popular criterion-referenced approach of testing in mainstream educational measurement. This family of testing focuses on measuring how much students have mastered learning content as stated in “well-defined and fairly specific instructional objectives” (Brown, 2005, p. 2) in various courses and programs. However, it is important to note that PA varies substantially with respect to its contents and purposes. As Fox and Hartwick (2011) point out, students can assemble their best works in a *showcase portfolio* or their work-in-progress in a *working portfolio* (p. 47). Regardless of its formats and procedures, it is illuminating to examine PA from its theorizations.

Current Conceptualizations of PA and Controversies

In reviewing theory and practice of PA in second language pedagogy, most scholars often associate it with a more process-focused approach to education, an alternative assessment paradigm, and social constructivist learning theory. Arguing for the utilization of PA, Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000) described a reform movement in writing pedagogy in the 1970s wherein shifts occurred regarding how compositions were conceived and taught. Epistemologically, the formal and structural approaches to composition pedagogy which stressed analyzing literature and transmitting rhetorical strategies were gradually replaced by more liberal perspectives such as expressivism, collaborative learning, social constructivism, and postmodern theory. The authors elaborated four main transformations in teaching and assessing writing (process-focused, learner-centered, curriculum-integrated, and rubric-scored) and indicated the benefits of PA for different stakeholders (learners, teachers, administrators) to consolidate their arguments.

Moreover, portfolios are often documented in various review articles of assessment literature, illustrating the shift in testing and assessment commonly known as alternative assessment (Anderson, 1998; Burner, 2014; Fox, 2008; Yin, 2013). Fox (2008), in her contributive chapter to the Encyclopedia of Language and Education, provided a comprehensive overview of alternative assessment including its main debates and issues. Portfolios, along with other alternative types of assessment, are mostly referred to in contrast with traditional testing, which is

characterized as formalized, time-restricted, one-shot, and inauthentic. It also refers to the common activity of collecting learning evidence. In this sense, portfolios are information-eliciting tools employed for assessment purposes which often occur in the classroom. To this end, Brown and Hudson (1998) in their influential article, contend that PA, along with other supplementary forms of assessment, are what teachers have practiced for a long time and that “these new procedures are just new developments in that long tradition.” (p. 657). With this argument, they proposed the use of the terminology “alternatives in assessment” instead of “alternative assessment” because the latter term may appear to refer to something completely new or revolutionary rather than a matter of changing interest and focus. However, this conceptualization of portfolio and alternative assessment has been challenged by other scholars (Lynch, 2001; Shohamy, 2001) who oppose this conceptualization on ontological and epistemological grounds.

Yin (2013) adduced that the popularity of PA aligned with several educational trends, particularly sociocultural or social constructivist theories of learning, which view learning as a constant development (co)constructed by learners and the people with whom they interact. In fact, Anderson (1998) compared the philosophical beliefs and theoretical assumptions underpinning traditional assessment with those of alternative assessment in mainstream education. He quoted Michaels and Karnes (1950, p. 2) to clarify the underlying principles of traditional testing, which holds that “anything that exists at all exists in some quantity, and anything that exists in some quantity is capable of being measured” (as cited in Anderson, 1998, p. 6). This is a typical reflection of “Cartesian,” or “positivist” stances, believing that there is an objective “truth” about the real world. As a consequence, “the goals of the curriculum are to teach students the “truth” by employing a transmission model of instruction and in turn assessing whether students have learned it (Anderson, 1998, p. 6). However, synthesizing works by prominent scholars in the late 20th century such as Piaget, Bruner, and Vygotsky, a different school of thought [constructivism] defines “knowledge as temporary, developmental, socially and culturally mediated, and thus, non-objective...” (Anderson, 1998, p. 6). In second language pedagogy, Lynch (2001) and others from their critical positions argue that “different validity requirements for different approaches to assessment” (p. 306) should be recognized. Lynch expands the concept of assessment and promotes an assessment ‘culture’ that surpasses the tradition of testing and the post-positivist paradigm of reliability and validity that is constrained by traditional psychometric characteristics such as inter-rater reliability, objectivity, and construct generalizability. He puts forward the following propositions to expound the construct of alternative assessment: (1) intertwinement of teaching and assessing; (2) student-participated development of assessment; (3) evaluation of both process and product; (4) qualitative over quantitative assessment report/results.

Aside from the controversies surrounding these viewpoints, the main issue, pragmatically, lies in the interpretations and uses of the information received from testing and assessment. What matters is the clarity of the ‘ends/goals’ in the minds of teachers and decision makers from which a given type of test or assessment can be employed, developed, and implemented. As Brown and Hudson (1998, p. 672) confirmed, “Tests are neither good nor evil in and of themselves. They are simple tools”. This view is corroborated by Fox who claimed that it is (2008, p. 99), “how portfolios are used that determines whether they are truly alternative assessment

tools. It is more than a matter of form or format.” Therefore, it is more meaningful to explore PA in practice by examining its benefits and drawbacks at different levels of implementation.

Benefits and Drawbacks: Portfolio Assessment in Practice

A number of scholars have reviewed related literature and surveyed the benefits and drawbacks of PA (Brown & Hudson, 1998; Fox, 2008; Hung & Huang, 2012; Yin, 2013). For instance, Brown and Hudson (1998) identified the advantages of PA and assembled them into three main categories including: (a) enhancing student learning; (b) informing teachers; and (c) facilitating the assessment process. They also discerned five common disadvantages of PA in terms of design decision, logistics, interpretation, reliability and validity. Yin (2013), drawing on the recent empirical studies, validates the benefits of PA with the claim they do the following: (a) antagonize traditional tests and correspond to curriculum goals; (b) enhance language abilities, particularly writing skills; (c) augment students' self-reflection, autonomy, metacognition, and motivation. She points out the challenges of PA and characterizes the reality of PA implementation by elaborating the macro and micro level decisions for teachers and stakeholders. Additionally, Hung and Huang (2012) add that the most cited benefits of PA are its tendencies to cultivate a sense of authorship or ownership and a sense of community. In terms of PA weaknesses, their main concerns are still with logistical, reliability, and validity issues.

Brown (2003) dedicated a single chapter in his book to discuss the principles of language assessment. Five central issues in language measurement literature were included as fundamental for his discussion, including authenticity, washback, practicality, reliability and validity (chapter 2, pp. 19-41). Speaking on alternatives in assessment (chapter 10, pp. 251-280), he presented the dilemma which teaching professionals often encounter when they, on the one hand, desire to increase the positive washback and authenticity of more open-ended, contextualized, criterion-referenced assessment, while, on the other hand, want to ensure reliability and practicality. Correspondingly, the dilemma manifests both the benefits and drawbacks of PA.

Two main benefits of PA are authenticity and positive washback. Authenticity refers to the natural, contextualized, meaningful, and real-world qualities of language assessment (Brown, 2003). Authenticity can be seen as both the ends and the means of PA. In fact, Fox (2008) notes that some scholars even “equate authenticity in alternative assessment with both reliability and validity” (p. 101). Burner (2014) in his systematic review of the potential benefits of PA on ESL/EFL writing devotes an entire section to authenticity. PA, according to Burner, (a) creates opportunities for authentic and sophisticated language use; (b) responds to the multifaceted nature of language/ multi-domain learning; (c) generates anxiety-free effects from time-constrained tests and exams; (d) increases students' motivation and time-on-task; (e) promotes interaction in and out classroom; and (f) facilitates communication and sharing of texts online, enhancing ecological validity. Similarly, PA has been reported to have positive effects on both teaching and learning. Nunes (2004) employed portfolios as one way to dialogue with her students and to encourage her student reflection. She asserted that the information synthesized from students' reflections provides a window into their learning process such as styles, needs, and obstacles. As a result, she could modify the instructional strategies to accommodate her students' needs. Ziegler and Moeller (2012) measured the impact of *LinguaFolio*, a portfolio-based

formative assessment, on student motivation, learning, and achievement among 168 first-year French and Spanish classes. They found that *LinguaFolio* promoted intrinsic motivation, increased task-value, and catalyzed more accurate self-assessment of learning.

However, there are also many challenges in PA implementation, particularly its practicality and reliability. Regarding practicality, which can be anatomized into time, cost, effort and administration, PA is often criticized for drawbacks in each of these dimensions. It is reported that the implementation of PA is time-consuming and demanding for teachers and challenging for students. Lo (2010) writes in her action research article that she had to give feedback and responses to students' work and to meet overloaded expectations from the administration:

The reading and grading load was enormous, as was that of answering students' questions. For questions I could not answer, I had to spend time locating answers as well. (p. 86)

Despite the greatly reduced number of questions, the reading and grading load was still very heavy. To meet the administration's deadline for submitting final grades, I was forced to write short comments and had no time to correct grammatical errors. The six entries I had insisted on to establish the habit of reading newspapers had become a massive burden for me. (p. 87)

Moreover, the artifacts students compiled for the portfolio were varied and difficult to grade consistently. Like reliability, validity is one of the most important and controversial issues in language assessment and portfolio assessment. Reliability is "precondition for validity" (Brown, 2005, p. 220), that is, the assessment must be reliable to be valid. Nevertheless, meeting reliability demands for PA is not impossible. In one empirical study, the reliability of PA was confirmed, as Song and August (2002) concluded: "when carefully conducted with clear evaluation standards, PA can be relied upon as a basis for making judgments about the writing proficiency of ESL students" (p. 63). Additionally, Barootchi and Keshavarz (2002) probed the correlation of PA and teacher-generated tests among 60 Iranian 16-year-old female high-school sophomores and found that "the portfolio assessment scores correlate, to a reasonable degree, with those of the achievement test" (p. 284). Despite the questionability of the instruments (the fact that they were teacher-made tests and the manners in which portfolios were assessed) in this report, consistency in PA can be reached with carefully planned implementation. The issue of PA validity has been gradually addressed. Mai, Nguyen, and Griffin (2011) are among the first researchers to study and affirm the validity for portfolio writing assessment in a long-term project. They worked with a group of teachers and students from a research-based institution in Vietnam to develop the assessment criteria for PA. Strictly following the instrument development procedures (drafting, panelling, piloting, trialling, and finalizing), the researchers reviewed the literature in second language writing and portfolio assessment, and then incorporated the local teachers' expertise to validate the construct. As a result of the first two stages, a portfolio writing assessment instrument of two domains, six capabilities, 36 indicators, and 138 criteria was designed which was both theory-driven and context-relevant. The authors concluded that "designing an empirical instrument for a formal assessment of portfolios is a feasible task for concerned researchers and teachers" (p. 175).

Discussion

The central issue of any testing and assessment activity is validity. Traditionally, validity was treated as a composite of different types, including criterion, content, and construct (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). However, this treatment could be misleading if one believed that one type of validity can compensate for the others. Messick (1989) proposed a unitary view of validity by taking it out of tests and focusing more on test interpretations and uses. He elucidated that “validity is an integrated evaluative judgment of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the *adequacy* and *appropriateness* of *inferences* and *actions* based on test scores or other modes of assessment” (p. 5) (author emphasis). According to this view, the concept of inherently valid assessment is fictitious and myopic (cf. Brown & Hudson, 1998). PA as well as other types in the family of alternative assessment should be treated equally with other testing and assessing protocols in terms of validity. PA is more beneficial for process-based, longitudinal, and pro-learning assessment when compared to its use for high-stakes purposes where decision makers have to pick out a limited number of people among many. This is not to argue for the traditional forms of testing (standardized, one-time ones). Rather, this is to say that the issue of validity should be taken seriously when implementing PA. Whenever possible, a combination of multiple sources of evidence drawn from a variety of testing and assessment sources is the best option to assure fairness.

Throughout the PA literature in second language pedagogy, more attention has been paid to writing than other language skills. This is explicable, as I presented earlier in this paper, in terms of the widespread employment of PA deriving from composition studies and writing pedagogy and in terms of the shift to a more process-based approach. With technological advancement, an array of user-generated content platforms including blogging and social media is available for PA enthusiasts to incorporate into their writing programs. E-portfolios have been on the increase in PA literature. However, there is scant discourse on PA in reading, listening, and speaking. It could be more illuminating to see more studies exploring how other language skills can be ‘portfolioed,’ particularly with the availability of many handy technologies such as Voicethread, Google hangout, Skype and Youtube. Further studies could also focus on how digital portfolio assessment relates to students’ identities and multi-competences and how different language skills are integrated in PA. Balancing both the benefits and drawbacks of PA, classroom teachers can utilize portfolios as a regular instructional activity to promote the intertwinement of teaching, learning, and assessing, as Lynch (2001) puts forward. By employing PA, teachers can juggle the fundamental concerns and priorities of PA, namely differing times, contexts, and students.

Practical Application

In this section, I will describe how E-Portfolio is incorporated into a project-based English learning course at a public university in Vietnam. Project-based learning (PBL) as a method of instruction is often attributed to the American educational philosopher John Dewey (1859-1952), who reported and promoted “the benefits of experiential, hands-on, student-directed learning” (Markham, Larmer, & Ravitz, 2003, p. 1). Webb (2007) elucidated: “projects require *a goal* where students must *search for a method*, acquire skills and knowledge, *accept* failure and *bounce back* from it,

and keep trying until the goal is achieved. They *learn* through experiences, and more importantly, they learn how to *research and apply* knowledge. Success is measured by the *complexity* of the project and the ability to *finish* it.” (emphasis added). PBL has been an innovative practice for foreign language education at the aforementioned institution, which also requires alternative modes of assessment which focus on both process and product to capture students’ learning. Therefore, portfolio was identified as an optimal choice for the course.

What	When/How	Who		Why
Brochure/Website (30%)	Monthly drafts/pages (40%) RUBRIC A	Teacher	50%	process-focused
		Peer	30%	formative-focused
		Self	20%	
	Final website/brochure (60%) RUBRIC A	Teacher	50%	
		Peer	30%	product-focused
		Self	20%	summative-focused
A Virtual Tour (30%)	Oral reports/Rehearsals (40%) RUBRIC B	Teacher	50%	
		Peer	30%	process-focused
		Self	20%	formative-focused
	Final Virtual Tour (60%) RUBRIC B	Teacher	50%	
		Peer	30%	product-focused
		Self	20%	summative-focused
Project Reflection (20%)	Monthly personal reflection (30%) RUBRIC C	Self	30%	Self-assessment
	Final personal reflection (40%) RUBRIC C	Self	(40%)	
	Final group reflection (30%) RUBRIC C	Peer	(30%)	
	Website/Portfolio (40%) RUBRIC D	Teacher	(40%)	
E-Portfolio & Collaboration (20%)	Collaboration evaluation (30%) RUBRIC E	Teacher	(30%)	Whole process
	Collaboration evaluation (30%) RUBRIC E	Peer	(30%)	

Figure 1. The Matrix of The Project-Based Language Learning Assessment

During a one-semester, hands-on project-based course, students were expected to demonstrate four skills in the target language by preparing a travel brochure to describe a favorite destination. Students were instructed to perform a mini-research in groups on a place of interest by collecting, processing, and organizing information about the place. At the end of the semester, students were required to deliver a brochure (written skills) and to produce a virtual tour (oral skills) through a multimedia presentation in which students would work as a tour guide to provide assistance, information, and interpretations on cultural, historical, and contemporary heritage to English-speaking visitors. The assessment of students’ learning was based on the products they

produced (*a travel brochure, a virtual tour, and monthly drafts/rehearsals*), accounting for 60% of the total scores, and on the process of implementing the project, accounting for 40% of the final grade. To facilitate the assessment procedures, the students were instructed to create a blog/website to *record* and *showcase* all their works in one place (platforms used: wordpress.com, wix.com, weebly.com, google sites, blogspot). In other words, the students were instructed to 'portfolio' their learning progress. By doing so, they would receive ongoing feedback from their peers and instructor while having an opportunity to reflect on their own progress. Examples of students' project websites can be found at goo.gl/0lJ6zs, goo.gl/5epKGGK, goo.gl/LNVAX1, and goo.gl/YG1wA2.

The assessment was an integral part of the course, serving both formative and summative purposes. This was realized through four main components (brochure/website, the virtual tour, project reflection, and portfolio & collaboration) assessed at the end of the semester. It is important to note that the students were instructed to record/video-tape their oral reports/rehearsals and to save their writing drafts by uploading them on their websites, which were later used to facilitate their personal and group reflections. Specifically, the students submitted their writing drafts or part of their working brochures and gave a short oral report of their project progress or a section of their tours every month. They were encouraged to work in groups to provide feedback on member's drafts or rehearsals before class. Then, the teacher and the students across groups would give additional feedback and assess each group's performance using the given rubrics as described in the Figure 1 (see Appendix for more details).

Conclusion

Balancing both the benefits and drawbacks of PA, classroom teachers can employ portfolios a regular instructional activity to promote the intertwinement of teaching, learning, and assessing as Lynch (2001) puts forward. By employing PA, teachers can juggle the fundamental concerns and priorities of PA, namely differing times, contexts, and students.

References

- Anderson, R. S. (1998). Why talk about different ways to grade? The shift from traditional assessment to alternative assessment. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 1998(74), 5-16. doi: 10.1002/tl.7401
- Barnhardt, S. (1998). *Portfolio assessment in the foreign language classroom*. Washington, D.C.: National Capital Language Resource Center, Washington D. C.
- Barootchi, N., & Keshavarz, M. H. (2002). Assessment of achievement through portfolios and teacher-made tests. *Educational Research*, 44(3), 279-288. doi: 10.1080/00131880210135313
- Brown, H. D. (2003). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. White Plain, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Brown, J. D. (2005). *Testing in language programs: A comprehensive guide to English language assessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 653-675. doi: 10.2307/3587999
- Burner, T. (2014). The potential formative benefits of portfolio assessment in second and foreign language writing contexts: A review of the literature. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 43, 139-149. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2014.03.002>
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281-302. doi: 10.1037/h0040957
- Fox, J. (2008). Alternative assessment. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 2240-2250). PLACE: Springer US.
- Fox, J., & Hartwick, P. (2011). Taking a diagnostic turn: Reinventing the portfolio in EAP classrooms. In D. Tsagari & L. Csépes (Eds.), *Classroom-based language assessment* (Vol. 25, pp. 47-61). Frankfurt: Peterlang
- Hamp-Lyons, L., & Condon, W. (2000). *Assessing the portfolio: Principles for practice, theory, and research*. New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Hung, S.-T. A., & Huang, H.-T. D. (2012). Portfolio assessment. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. PLACE: Blackwell John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Lo, Y.-F. (2010). Implementing reflective portfolios for promoting autonomous learning among EFL college students in Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(1), 77-95. doi: 10.1177/1362168809346509
- Lynch, B. K. (2001). Rethinking assessment from a critical perspective. *Language Testing*, 18(4), 351-372. doi: 10.1177/026553220101800403
- Mai, T. D., Nguyen, T. K. C., & Griffin, P. (2011). Developing a framework to measure process-oriented writing competence: A case of Vietnamese EFL students' formal portfolio assessment. *RELC Journal*, 42(2), 167-185. doi: 10.1177/0033688211402179
- Markham, T., Larmer, J., & Ravitz, J. (2003). *Project based learning handbook* (2nd ed.). California: Buck Institute for Education.
- Messick, S. (1989). Meaning and values in test validation: The science and ethics of assessment. *Educational Researcher*, 18(2), 5-11. doi: 10.3102/0013189x018002005
- Nunes, A. (2004). Portfolios in the EFL classroom: disclosing an informed practice. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 327-335. doi: 10.1093/elt/58.4.327
- Shohamy, E. (2001). Democratic assessment as an alternative. *Language Testing*, 18(4), 373-391. doi: 10.1177/026553220101800404
- Song, B., & August, B. (2002). Using portfolios to assess the writing of ESL students: a powerful alternative? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(1), 49-72. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00053-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00053-X)
- Webb, R. L. (2007). Power of projects. Retrieved August 12, 2013, from http://www.motivation-tools.com/downloads/power_of_projects.pdf
- Yin, M. (2013). Portfolio assessment in the classroom. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The companion to language assessment*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ziegler, N. A., & Moeller, A. J. (2012). Increasing self-regulated learning through the LinguaFolio. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(3), 330-348. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01205.x

Appendix
RUBRIC A - Travel Brochure Rubric
 Created with <http://rubistar.4teachers.org>

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Writing - Organization	Each section in the brochure has a clear beginning, middle, and end.	Almost all sections of the brochure have a clear beginning, middle and end.	Most sections of the brochure have a clear beginning, middle and end.	Less than half of the sections of the brochure have a clear beginning, middle and end.
Writing - Grammar	There are no grammatical mistakes in the brochure.	There are no grammatical mistakes in the brochure after feedback from an adult.	There are 1-2 grammatical mistakes in the brochure even after feedback from an adult.	There are several grammatical mistakes in the brochure even after feedback from an adult.
Spelling & Proofreading	No spelling errors remain after one person other than the typist reads and corrects the brochure.	No more than 1 spelling error remains after one person other than the typist reads and corrects the brochure.	No more than 3 spelling errors remain after one person other than the typist reads and corrects the brochure.	Several spelling errors in the brochure.
Writing - Vocabulary	The authors correctly use several new words and define words unfamiliar to the reader.	The authors correctly use a few new words and define words unfamiliar to the reader.	The authors try to use some new vocabulary, but may use 1-2 words incorrectly.	The authors do not incorporate new vocabulary.
Writing - Mechanics	Capitalization and punctuation are correct throughout the brochure.	Capitalization and punctuation are correct throughout the brochure after feedback from an adult.	There are 1-2 capitalization and/or punctuation errors in the brochure even after feedback from an adult.	There are several capitalization or punctuation errors in the brochure even after feedback from an adult.

Content - Accuracy	All facts in the brochure are accurate.	99-90% of the facts in the brochure are accurate.	89-80% of the facts in the brochure are accurate.	Fewer than 80% of the facts in the brochure are accurate.
Attractiveness & Organization	The brochure has exceptionally attractive formatting and well-organized information.	The brochure has attractive formatting and well-organized information.	The brochure has well-organized information.	The brochure's formatting and organization of material are confusing to the reader.
Sources	Careful and accurate records are kept to document the source of 95-100% of the facts and graphics in the brochure.	Careful and accurate records are kept to document the source of 94-85% of the facts and graphics in the brochure.	Careful and accurate records are kept to document the source of 84-75% of the facts and graphics in the brochure.	Sources are not documented accurately or are not kept on many facts and graphics.
Knowledge Gained	All students in the group can accurately answer all questions related to facts in the brochure and to technical processes used to create the brochure.	All students in the group can accurately answer most questions related to facts in the brochure and to technical processes used to create the brochure.	Most students in the group can accurately answer most questions related to facts in the brochure and to technical processes used to create the brochure.	Several students in the group appear to have little knowledge about the facts or technical processes used in the brochure.
Graphics/ Pictures	Graphics go well with the text and there is a good mix of text and graphics.	Graphics go well with the text, but there are so many that they distract from the text.	Graphics go well with the text, but there are too few and the brochure seems "text-heavy".	Graphics do not go with the accompanying text or appear to be randomly chosen.

RUBRIC B - Virtual Tour Rubric
 Created with <http://rubistar.4teachers.org>

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Presentation	Well-rehearsed with smooth delivery that holds audience attention.	Rehearsed with fairly smooth delivery that holds audience attention most of the time.	Delivery not smooth, but able to maintain interest of the audience most of the time.	Delivery not smooth and audience attention often lost.
Sources	Source information collected for all graphics, facts and quotes. All documented in desired format.	Source information collected for all graphics, facts and quotes. Most documented in desired format.	Source information collected for graphics, facts and quotes, but not documented in desired format.	Very little or no source information was collected.
Attractiveness	Makes excellent use of font, color, graphics, effects, etc. to enhance the presentation.	Makes good use of font, color, graphics, effects, etc. to enhance to presentation.	Makes use of font, color, graphics, effects, etc. but occasionally these detract from the presentation content.	Use of font, color, graphics, effects etc. but these often distract from the presentation content.
Content	Covers topic in-depth with details and examples. Subject knowledge is excellent.	Includes essential knowledge about the topic. Subject knowledge appears to be good.	Includes essential information about the topic but there are 1-2 factual errors.	Content is minimal OR there are several factual errors.
Organization	Content is well organized using headings or bulleted lists to group related material.	Uses headings or bulleted lists to organize, but the overall organization of topics appears flawed.	Content is logically organized for the most part.	There was no clear or logical organizational structure, just lots of facts.
Originality	Product shows a large amount of original thought. Ideas are creative and inventive.	Product shows some original thought. Work shows new ideas and insights.	Uses other people's ideas (giving them credit), but there is little evidence of original thinking.	Uses other people's ideas, but does not give them credit.
Workload	The workload is divided and shared equally by all team members.	The workload is divided and shared fairly by all team members, though workloads may vary from person to person.	The workload was divided, but one person in the group is viewed as not doing his/her fair share of the work.	The workload was not divided OR several people in the group are viewed as not doing their fair share of the work.

RUBRIC C – Project Reflection

Adapted from <http://earlycollegeconference.org>

Criteria	4	3	2	1
Reflective Thinking	The reflection explains the student's own thinking and learning processes, as well as implications for future learning.	The reflection explains the student's thinking about his/her own learning processes.	The reflection attempts to demonstrate thinking about learning but is vague and/or unclear about the personal learning process..	The reflection does not address the student's thinking and/or learning.
Analysis	The reflection is an in-depth analysis of the learning experience, the value of the derived learning to self or others, and the enhancement of the student's appreciation for the discipline.	The reflection is an analysis of the learning experience and the value of the derived learning to self or others.	The reflection attempts to analyze the learning experience but the value of the learning to the student or others is vague and/or unclear.	The reflection does not move beyond a description of the learning experience.
Learning	All reflections clearly explain how the artifact demonstrates your growth, competencies, accomplishments, and include goals for continued learning (long and short term).	Most of the reflections explain growth and include goals for continued learning.	A few of the reflections explain growth and include goals for continued learning.	The reflections do not explain growth or include goals for continued learning.

RUBRIC D – E-Portfolio (Website) Rubric

Adapted from: <https://www2.uwstout.edu/content/profdev/rubrics/eportfoliorubric.html>

Criteria	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Proficient	Exemplary
Selection of Artifacts	The artifacts and work samples do not relate to the purpose of the e-portfolio.	Some of the artifacts and work samples are related to the purpose of the e-portfolio.	Most artifacts and work samples are related to the purpose of the e-portfolio.	All artifacts and work samples are clearly and directly related to the purpose of the e-portfolio. A wide variety of artifacts is included.
Descriptive Text	No artifacts are accompanied by a caption that clearly explains the importance of the item including title, author, and date.	Some of the artifacts are accompanied by a caption that clearly explains the importance of the item including title, author, and date.	Most of the artifacts are accompanied by a caption that clearly explains the importance of the item work including title, author, and date.	All artifacts are accompanied by a caption that clearly explains the importance of the item including title, author, and date.
Citations	No images, media or text created by others are cited with accurate, properly formatted citations.	Some of the images, media or text created by others are not cited with accurate, properly formatted citations.	Most images, media or text created by others are cited with accurate, properly formatted citations.	All images, media or text created by others are cited with accurate, properly formatted citations.
Navigation	The navigation links are confusing, and it is difficult to locate artifacts and move to related pages or a different section. There are significant problems with pages connecting to preceding pages or the navigation menu. Many of the external links do not connect to the appropriate website or file.	The navigation links are somewhat confusing, and it is often unclear how to locate an artifact or move to related pages or a different section. Some of the pages connect to the navigation menu, but in other places the links do not connect to preceding pages or to the navigation menu. Some of the external links do not connect to the appropriate website or file.	The navigation links generally function well, but it is not always clear how to locate an artifact or move to related pages or different section. Most of the pages connect to the navigation menu. Most of the external links connect to the appropriate website or file.	The navigation links are intuitive. The various parts of the portfolio are labeled, clearly organized and allow the reader to easily locate an artifact and move to related pages or a different section. All pages connect to the navigation menu, and all external links connect to the appropriate website or file.

Usability and Accessibility	The e-portfolio is difficult to read due to inappropriate use of fonts, type size for headings, sub-headings and text and font styles (italic, bold, underline).	The portfolio is often difficult to read due to inappropriate use of fonts and type size for headings, sub-headings, text or long paragraphs.	The e-portfolio is generally easy to read. Fonts and type size vary appropriately for headings, sub-headings and text.	The e-portfolio is easy to read. Fonts and type size vary appropriately for headings, sub-headings and text.
	Lack of paragraphing impedes scanning	Inconsistent use of font styles (italic, bold, underline) distracts the reader.	In general, use of headings, sub-headings and paragraphs promotes easy scanning.	Use of headings, sub-headings and paragraphs promotes easy scanning.
	Many formatting tools are under or over-utilized and decrease the reader accessibility to the content.	Some formatting tools are under or over-utilized and decrease the readers' accessibility to the content.	Use of font styles (italic, bold, underline) is generally consistent.	Use of font styles (italic, bold, underline) is consistent and improves readability.
	Horizontal and vertical white space alignment are used inappropriately, and the content appears disorganized and cluttered.	Horizontal and vertical white space alignment are sometimes used inappropriately to organize content.	Horizontal and vertical white space alignment are generally used appropriately to organize content.	Horizontal and vertical white space alignment are used appropriately to organize content.
	Color of background, fonts, and links decrease the readability of the text, are distracting and used inconsistently throughout the e-portfolio.	Color of background, fonts, and links generally enhance the readability of the text, and are generally used consistently throughout the e-portfolio.	Color of background, fonts, and links generally enhance the readability of the text, and are generally used consistently throughout the e-portfolio.	Color of background, fonts, and links enhance the readability and aesthetic quality, and are used consistently throughout the e-portfolio.
Writing Conventions	There are more than six errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling requiring major editing and revision.	There are four or more errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling requiring editing and revision.	There are a few errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. These require minor editing and revision.	There are no errors in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.

Multimedia Elements (Optional)	The graphic elements or multimedia do not contribute to understanding concepts, ideas and relationships. The inappropriate use of multimedia detracts from the content.	Some of the graphic elements and multimedia do not contribute to understanding concepts, ideas and relationships.	Most of the graphic elements and multimedia contribute to understanding concepts, ideas and relationships, enhance the written material and create interest.	All of the photographs, concept maps, spreadsheets, graphics, audio and/or video files effectively enhance understanding of concepts, ideas and relationships, create interest, and are appropriate for the chosen purpose.
	The graphics do not include alternate text in web-based portfolios.	Some of the graphics include alternate text in web-based portfolios.	Most of the graphics include alternate text in web-based portfolios.	Accessibility requirements using alternate text for graphics are included in web-based portfolios.
	Audio and/or video artifacts are not edited or exhibit inconsistent clarity or sound (too loud/too soft/garbled).	A few of the audio and/or video artifacts are edited with inconsistent clarity or sound (too loud/too soft/garbled).	Most of the audio and/or video artifacts are edited with proper voice projection, appropriate language, and clear delivery.	All audio and/or video artifacts are edited with proper voice projection, appropriate language, and clear delivery.

RUBRIC E- Collaborative Work Skills: Project Process Assessment

Created with <http://rubistar.4teachers.org>

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Contributions	Routinely provides useful ideas when participating in the group and in classroom discussion. A definite leader who contributes a lot of effort.	Usually provides useful ideas when participating in the group and in classroom discussion. A strong group member who tries hard!	Sometimes provides useful ideas when participating in the group and in classroom discussion. A satisfactory group member who does what is required.	Rarely provides useful ideas when participating in the group and in classroom discussion. May refuse to participate.
Quality of Work	Provides work of the highest quality.	Provides high quality work.	Provides work that occasionally needs to be checked/redone by other group members to ensure quality.	Provides work that usually needs to be checked/redone by others to ensure quality.
Time-management	Routinely uses time well throughout the project to ensure things get done on time. Group does not have to adjust deadlines or work responsibilities because of this person's procrastination.	Usually uses time well throughout the project, but may have procrastinated on one thing. Group does not have to adjust deadlines or work responsibilities because of this person's procrastination.	Tends to procrastinate, but always gets things done by the deadlines. Group does not have to adjust deadlines or work responsibilities because of this person's procrastination.	Rarely gets things done by the deadlines AND group has to adjust deadlines or work responsibilities because of this person's inadequate time management.
Problem-solving	Actively looks for and suggests solutions to problems.	Refines solutions suggested by others.	Does not suggest or refine solutions, but is willing to try out solutions suggested by others.	Does not try to solve problems or help others solve problems. Lets others do the work.
Attitude	Never is publicly critical of the project or the work of others. Always has a positive attitude about the task(s).	Rarely is publicly critical of the project or the work of others. Often has a positive attitude about the task(s).	Occasionally is publicly critical of the project or the work of other members of the group. Usually has a positive attitude about the task(s).	Often is publicly critical of the project or the work of other members of the group. Often has a negative attitude about the task(s).

Focus on the task	Consistently stays focused on the task and what needs to be done. Very self-directed.	Focuses on the task and what needs to be done most of the time. Other group members can count on this person.	Focuses on the task and what needs to be done some of the time. Other group members must sometimes nag, prod, and remind to keep this person on-task.	Rarely focuses on the task and what needs to be done. Lets others do the work.
Preparedness	Brings needed materials to class and is always ready to work.	Almost always brings needed materials to class and is ready to work.	Almost always brings needed materials but sometimes needs to settle down and get to work	Often forgets needed materials or is rarely ready to get to work.
Pride	Work reflects this student's best efforts.	Work reflects a strong effort from this student.	Work reflects some effort from this student.	Work reflects very little effort from this student.
Monitors Group Effectiveness	Routinely monitors the effectiveness of the group, and makes suggestions to make it more effective.	Routinely monitors the effectiveness of the group and works to make the group more effective.	Occasionally monitors the effectiveness of the group and works to make the group more effective.	Rarely monitors the effectiveness of the group and does not work to make it more effective.
Working with Others	Almost always listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others. Tries to keep people working well together.	Usually listens to, shares, with, and supports the efforts of others. Does not cause "waves" in the group.	Often listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others, but sometimes is not a good team member.	Rarely listens to, shares with, and supports the efforts of others. Often is not a good team player.

About the author:

Huy V. Phung received his MA degree in Second Language Studies from the University of Hawai'i, Manoa and was sponsored by the Fulbright program. He specializes in Language Assessment, Measurement, and Program Evaluation (LAMPE) and is interested in Task-Based-Language-Teaching and language assessment.