

E-Portfolios as Formative Assessment

Nuño Aguirre de Cárcer Girón

SLLM, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; Universidad
Nebrija, Madrid, España

Arturo Mendoza Ramos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México; University of the Witwatersrand,
Johannesburg, South Africa

Abstract This chapter proposes the use of digital portfolios, an innovative formative assessment practice, in the area of the humanities. An initial discussion on the importance of formative assessment practices that integrate digital tools is followed by a detailed description of the methodological principles of portfolios and how to design them, and how to integrate the digital component in its design. We conclude that assessment as reading, as opposed to the traditional summative assessment of reading, is a promising area of innovation in the pedagogy of the Humanities.

Keywords E-learning. Formative assessment. E-portfolios. Digital portfolios. Humanities.

Summary 1 Aim. Context. Rationale. – 2 Formative Assessment. – 3 Defining Portfolios. – 3.1 Present Definitions of Portfolio. – 3.2 Portfolios in the Language Classroom. – 3.3 The Benefit of Portfolios. – 3.4 General Principles for Portfolio Design. – 4 Integrating e-Learning. Reading e-Portfolios. – 5 Our Proposal for e-Portfolios. Assessment of/as Reading. – 6 Shortcomings of e-Portfolios. – 7 Conclusion.

1 Aim. Context. Rationale

This chapter is a theoretical reflection on the importance of introducing formative assessment practices in the present-day humanities classroom.

In an era when increasingly large classes have become the norm, there has been a strong pull towards final summative assessments that were standard-

ised and could be quickly graded. This has reinforced the traditional tendency to grade, in the humanities, with a final summative essay.

We argue for interventions aimed at balancing this tendency in the specific context of Language Learning and in the Literature classroom, by incorporating insights from assessment of language acquisition, specifically reading comprehension and written production. Our proposal is based on innovative practices introduced in our own classroom, specifically the implementation of ePortfolios to create effective and meaningful Formative Assessment practices.

It is important to mention that the disciplines of Language Learning and Literature tend to go together in majors across the Anglophone world.¹ We want to highlight that the topic of assessment in language learning and literary studies continues to be contested, although it seems to involve some or all of the so-called *Four Skills* - in the case of language learning - and those reading and writing skills specifically required for literary studies. What is meant by a proficient command of literary analysis remains a locus of debate and, in this sense, Adsit (2017, 2018) suggests connecting creative writing and literary studies. The latter places special emphasis on the writing process, including literary knowledge *per se*, creative or aesthetic sensibilities and the context from which the text emerges. The defining concepts for assessing literature are by no means clear and unanimous. However, it is common to consider *reading* as a specific skill that is fostered in the literature classroom.

In the case of language learning, although there has been a major shift towards integrated tasks (Cumming 2014), proficiency is often assessed in an atomised fashion (i.e. separate assessments of listening, reading, writing and speaking) and, mostly, for summative purposes. We argue that portfolios constitute an effective measure of integrated skills (the ability to read and write, in the case of literature, and the ability to read and listen for writing and speaking), and provide meaningful gauge of students progress.

Insofar as literature teaching is concerned, Fry, Ketteridge and Marshall note that many lecturers “teach students without having much formal knowledge of how students learn [...] nor do they necessarily have the concepts to understand, explain and articulate the process” (2008, 8). The same can be said about assessment, which often replicates conventional practices based on long essays (in literature) or multiple-choice tests (in language) at the end of the semester.

Firstly, we would suggest that there exists a lack of understanding among lecturers of the impact that assessment practices have on the

1 This is no different at the University of the Witwatersrand, where the e-Portfolios that form the basis of this analysis were implemented as formative assessment, within the framework of Spanish Studies.

student approaches to learning, namely in terms of the concepts of the surface approach or the deep approach (cf. Biggs 1988). Secondly, teacher's beliefs and misconceptions regarding the use of digital media for assessment hinder them from the likelihood of implementing a more comprehensive assessment programme through ePortfolios. We would argue, however, that the incorporation of ePortfolios promotes deep learning and good formative assessment practice.

In this chapter, we explore the advantages of the use of ePortfolios in assessment, particularly for the context of developing countries, where the effective use and command of technology might be a challenge for both scholars and students. In our view, this mode of assessment can be appropriately implemented without advanced technical mastery.

2 Formative Assessment

Formative assessment is an overarching concept that encompasses the design of meaningful and intrinsically motivating tasks, the monitoring of students and the feedback that they receive (from the instructor, peers or through self-assessment) and the setting of future goals based on individual performance (Bennett 2011). According to Sadler (1998), one of the benefits of formative assessment is to accelerate the learning process. Luckett and Sutherland (2000) argue that formative assessment is intrinsically motivating, and its purpose is to fulfil the needs of students and instructors by providing feedback of student progress. By contrast, they also contend that summative assessment is extrinsically motivated because its goal is to serve stakeholders that are not directly involved in the teaching-learning process arguing that summative assessment tend to be "used to provide judgement on students' achievements" (2000, 101).

It is generally assumed that, owing to this intrinsic motivation character, formative assessment practices are better than summative assessment practices (Van Gorp, Deygers 2014). However, current research is unclear, as Bennett (2011) points out, due to the wide variety of implementations and the lack of a proper conceptualisation of formative assessment practices (Fulcher 2010). This chapter contributes to this clarification by dissecting the intertwined relationship between tasks, feedback and goal setting.

Crucially, we do not consider summative and formative assessment as competing practices, but rather as complementary. As Knight (2002) has rightly pointed out, the dichotomy of summative and formative assessment is not satisfactory, resulting in a polarised and extremist approach (443). Following Rea-Dickins and Poehner (2011), we argue that the balance between the two should be struck with formative practices, providing quality feedback and opportunities to engage, and sum-

mative assessment, capping the learning process. We are guided, in this sense, by Biggs' idea of constructive alignment or "aligned systems of instruction" (Biggs 1999, 64), which establish intended outcomes and align these with classroom teaching activities and the assessment practices. In other words, as teachers, we must always bear in mind that student performance and their own Zone of Proximal Development (Holzman 2009) is more important in establishing goals than the actions taken by instructors without any reference to student progress (Biggs 1987; Poehner 2014; Poehner, Lantolf 2010).

In this regard, portfolios are a useful way for monitoring and assessing progress as well as setting goals, and they constitute a useful means of embedding formative assessment into language and literature learning.

3 Defining Portfolios

3.1 Present Definitions of Portfolio

Portfolios are not something new (cf. Barton, Collins 1997; Farr, Tone 1994). In Fine Arts, they have been widely used since the 1990s (Moya, O'Malley 1994), and one of the most comprehensive definitions states that:

a portfolio is a purposeful collection of student work that exhibits the student's efforts, progress, and achievements in one or more areas. The collection must include student participation in selecting contents, the criteria for selection, the criteria for judging merit, and evidence of student self-reflection. (Paulson, Paulson, Meyer 1991, 60)

However, Paulson, Paulson and Meyer continue, the nature of the portfolio changes when it is used for assessment purposes:

a portfolio used for educational assessment must offer more than a showcase for student products; it must be the product of a complete assessment procedure that has been systematically planned, implemented, and evaluated. (60)

3.2 Portfolios in the Language Classroom

The use of portfolios as a means of Formative Assessment strengthens the relationship between teaching, learning and assessment because it provides the instructor with insightful information about the students' development over time (Biggs, Tang 2010; Herman, Winters

1994; Yin 2014). This information is not only useful for assessing but also for informing the direction of future instruction. Assembling a portfolio and collecting relevant pieces of work also requires cognitive effort and the use of learning strategies to assess what is worth including and what is not (Yu 2014). In doing so, the student develops autonomy and self-assessment strategies. However, the task of selecting what to include in the portfolio does not depend only on the student but can be done in collaboration with other classmates and with the reflection and feedback of the instructor.

One of the key difficulties in implementing portfolios is the development of clear criteria for grading. The instructor must be able to pinpoint the different attributes that are important to consider during the assessment, making them tangible, clear and objective (Karpov, Tzurriel 2009). As we will see now, we believe that the literature classroom can benefit from the advancements made in the field of second language learning.

In this sense, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) provides an interesting guide to scaffolding the teaching-learning process while acquiring a modern European language (Council of Europe 2001). The CEFR consists of six levels of proficiency (A1 to C2) that have been grouped into three broad levels: Basic User, Independent User and Proficient User. Although this document was not originally designed to guide assessment processes, it has had a great impact on this matter (Jones, Saville 2009). Since its publication in 2001, the European Council has incorporated a range of documents (e.g. rating scales and self-assessment grids) that are useful for those instructors and institutions that wish to develop their own criteria for assessing language by other alternative formative methods, such as portfolios.

In the field of language learning, portfolios are particularly useful in assessing productive skills (i.e. speaking and writing) although the steady growth of integrated tasks (reading or listening for writing or speaking) has also allowed for more authentic manifestations of oral or written discourse that can be assessed using portfolios (Cumming 2014; Pierce, O'Malley 1992).

It is important to remember that the criteria given to students to self-assess their work must be as clear as possible and this is only feasible when they are linked to a specific task. Let us briefly examine the descriptors offered by the CERF for written production, reports and essays, level C1:

Can write clear, well-structured expositions of complex subjects, underlining the relevant salient issues. Can expand and support points of view at some length with subsidiary points, reasons and relevant examples. (Council of Europe 2001, 62)

The descriptor is useful but too broad. It requires further division into many more understandable descriptors in order to effectively involve students in the assessment process via a portfolio. In the case of reading portfolios, the situation is the same: marking criteria must go hand in hand with the specific task given to the student (Van den Branden 2006). This implies that a general descriptor needs to be detailed according to a specific task or assignment.

Furthermore, we must also keep in mind the lesson from second language learning in relation to authentic assessment. The increasing awareness of the importance of these forms of assessment in that field must serve as a guideline for the implementation of reading portfolios: integrated tasks, with student involvement, can result into more meaningful opportunities for authentic learning which incorporate a social and contextual dimension (McNamara, Rover 2006).

In this regard, Moya and O'Malley (1994, 14-15) provide a set of 5 characteristics that apply to English as Second Language, but which can be easily adapted to the literature classroom. These are: *comprehensive* (the depth and breadth already mentioned), *systematic* ("planned prior to implementation"), *informative* (i.e. meaningful, with adequate feedback), *tailored* and *authentic*.

3.3 The Benefit of Portfolios

There are multiple benefits to using portfolios in the classroom. Firstly, student participation and engagement speaks to the issue of agency: formative assessment should consider the role of student participation in the co-construction of the curriculum (Yorke 2006). Offering choices can bridge the gap between the student-experienced curriculum and the intended curriculum. As Hume and Coll (2010) explain, there is often a "mismatch" between the two, and a portfolio can provide a connection. It is important to note that student agency should not be limited to selecting materials and forms of engagement. As Blake Yancey (2004) explains, portfolios should also invite students to theorise about their own reading practices, not just about the content of the texts selected in the syllabus.

Secondly, the criteria for judging merit implies that students should also participate in the assessment process itself. Rubrics can be co-created with students in order to incorporate their own points of view on the way material is going to be graded. In this way, lecturers can verify that students find the assessment criteria fair and valid. This is particularly important if we consider multiple modalities of engaging with the text, as we suggest in this chapter. If we are going to allow students to respond to a literary text by creating a podcast, the question is: "how are we going to grade the podcast?". If the student is not consulted, the mismatch between student perception and

teacher perception is reproduced: the student might feel that s/he has done a great job, but the grades do not reflect this.

Thirdly, self-reflection practices should be included in the portfolio. Finding adequate criteria to assess reflective practices is challenging and raises questions of the reliability of portfolios. It is essential to understand portfolios as part of the classroom in which they are implemented. As Tierney highlights, there is a certain “spirit of the Portfolio Classroom”, one that is characterised by students’ sense of ownership, “assessment that is responsive to what students are doing and that represents the range of things they are involved in” (1991, 4).

3.4 General Principles for Portfolio Design

We suggest that there are certain general principles that should guide the design of reading portfolios. These include:

- a. Student agency
Students should have an opportunity to decide which texts they are going to study and how they are going to respond to them. In this sense, the idea of curriculum as merely a selection of texts must be rejected to allow students to engage critically.
- b. Modelling and clarity
If we are going to move away from summative assessment to formative assessment, it is essential that we explain to the students what exactly is expected from them. This implies, at least, the development of rubrics that are specific to the tasks and the use of exemplars. This fosters innovation and collaboration because students are directly involved in the whole process of evaluation, instead of being mere recipients or passive users.
- c. Use of multiple intelligences
Summative assessment should not be based on one single skill: writing complex arguments in prose. Other forms of engaging with the text should be conceived. In this sense, we should update the notion of *reading* to include multiple intelligences (Gadner 1983), and implement portfolios that address multiple modalities.

This is a controversial point because (a) there is a strong tendency in Literary Studies to privilege the written word over the visual, the auditory or others; and (b) because, although there are indeed different learning styles, current research is not univocal on the benefits of implementing different learning strategies depending on the learning styles (Biggs 2001; Massa, Mayer 2006). However, we believe that the general point about portfolios being multimodal is still

valid. As Pierce and O'Malley remark: "the purpose of portfolio contents is to expand understanding of a student's growth based on multiple measures" (1992, 3). These multiple measures, from our perspective, should be connected to multiple modalities of engaging with the literary texts, to *read* them in multiple ways.

d. Systematic feedback

There should be a feedback loop structure that allows for effective re-writing of the pieces. The student should be at the centre of the feedback process, with the ultimate goal of equipping "students to learn prospectively" (Hounsell 2007). Boud and Molloy (2013) remark that good feedback practice acknowledges the active role of learners. They identify four characteristics of sustainable feedback:

1. Involving students in dialogues about learning, which raise their awareness of quality performance;
2. Facilitating feedback processes through which students are stimulated to develop capacities in monitoring and evaluating their own learning;
3. Enhancing student capacities for ongoing lifelong learning by supporting student development of skills for goal setting and planning their learning;
4. Designing assessment tasks to facilitate student engagement over time in which feedback from varied sources is generated, processed and used to enhance performance on multiple stages of assignments. (703)

Portfolios should be designed to match these criteria to promote a formative development with a strong emphasis on dialogical experiences of working and reworking the material. Students learn how to plan their portfolio and evaluate and monitor their own learning over the course of a semester. They also learn to engage with different forms of feedback coming from peers and the instructor.

e. Self-reflection

Ultimately, portfolios are instruments that should serve to verify whether the student has achieved a certain level, and also to allow him/her to understand how this happened. In past decades "portfolios were seen mostly as records of achievement or evidence of attainment of specific outcomes, and seldom as reflective learning experiences. The content of portfolios was often dominated by input by 'others' in control, rather than those who 'owned' the portfolio" (Woodward 2000, 330). However, only when the student is at the centre of the portfolio it can achieve the formative character that we aim for.

This, in turn, requires a certain degree of self-reflection from the student that should be embedded in the portfolio. Woodward (1998) also argues in favour of reflective journals alongside portfolios, because this fosters a better tracking of the student's growth. In the case of Literary Studies and reading portfolios, for example, students should have the opportunity to reflect upon their own work and upon their own understanding of texts and literary periods, as the course moves forward.

How would these 5 core principles be applied in different classrooms is a matter that must remain open. It should, however, establish a community of practice (Wegner 2011). This idea of "community" has also been suggested by Lam (2018), who calls for a "collegial portfolio culture which supports teaching and learning of writing" (109).

In summary, we believe that the most relevant benefits of portfolios are:

- Increase of metacognitive skills by including in the drafting organisational and research activities, which also translates into self-reflection and self-assessment.
- Fostering of critical thinking and time to investigate.
- Improvement of written expression, linguistic accuracy and the ability to generate ideas.
- Better planning strategies and editing skills.
- Development of autonomy whilst reflecting, analysing and selecting the best pieces of work.
- Identification of strengths and weaknesses.
- Increased interaction and feedback between students and instructor due to the constructivist nature associated with portfolios for assessing.
- Assessment for learning, meaning that the assessment becomes part of the teaching and learning process.

4 Integrating e-Learning. Reading e-Portfolios

We cannot present a complete picture of the role of portfolios without taking into consideration the changes that are taking place in the classroom in the digital age, especially nowadays, with the growing need of shifting face-to-face courses to either online or blended modes. As Merriam and Bierema point out: "our ability to access information has facilitated learning in a way that is particularly meaningful to adults: it is just-in-time, relevant, and self-directed" (2013, 191).

E-learning takes on multiple forms, from auto-instructional to instructor-led experiences. Deivam and Devaki remark that this can include many formats:

text, image, graphic, animation, video and audio, or streaming video. E-learning provides very rich learning experiences and is be-

yond comparison with conventional setting of education and is a very effective medium in the teaching-learning process. (2016, 12)

However, the focus is often placed on the production of didactic materials, without a parallel reflection on the assessment process. Yet, it is important to consider that, if the learning process has changed due to the presence of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), assessment practices cannot remain the same. It makes sense, therefore, to expand our horizons with other meaningful ways of assessment, such as digital portfolios.

According to Lorenzo and Itterton

an e-Portfolio is a collection of artefacts, including demonstrations, resources and accomplishments of an individual, group, community, organisation, or institution. This collection can be comprised of text-based, graphic, or multimedia elements. (2005, 2)

e-Portfolios have several advantages, connected to what has been explained before. Fundamentally, they expand the range of the multiple modalities of engagement with the literary text that normal portfolios already have. This, in turn, expands the concept of *reading* way beyond traditionally reading practices, a fact that may be a challenge for lecturers, but likely a motivation for younger students. A non-exhaustive list of digital reading practices could be this: a podcast; an Instagram post and/or an Instagram story; a storyboard; a conceptual map; a spin-off; and any other format that can be negotiated.

As remarked by Barret, for an e-Portfolio to become a truly formative practice, as we advocate, it is essential that the focus is on the learner: “to be effectively used to support assessment *for* learning, electronic portfolios need to support the learner’s ongoing learning” (2004, 443).

5 Our Proposal for e-Portfolios. Assessment of/as Reading

Due to the extensive use portfolios could have in language learning and literature, in what follows we will set out an example of how formative assessment could be implemented in Literary Studies for assessing reading.

Reading should include much more than writing a commentary on a text. In other words, literature scholars should widen the scope of what can be done in their classroom and what can be considered ‘reading’, to include other forms of engagement with literary text. These forms should encompass other forms of expression besides the written word and should take into consideration the use of technology. In this sense, the creation of a podcast, a conceptual map or an Instagram story are potential candidates for an e-Portfolio.

From our point of view, the first defining attribute of the contemporary reading portfolio is this: reading should be about *doing something with the text*. Doing something with the text means that the student is encouraged to go beyond simple commentary or the text analysis. Reading portfolios should be designed to unleash the creativity of students in potentially unforeseen ways. The teacher should be ready to accommodate this, to adapt to it, to accompany the student in his/her journey with the texts.

There is a key reason for this creative element of reading portfolios: creativity is the highest form of production across disciplines. In the most recent version of Bloom's taxonomy, it is placed at the top of the educational objectives (cf. e.g. Krathwohl, Anderson 2009), whereas in the Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) taxonomy proposed by Biggs and Collis (1982), the level of "extended abstract" is associated with creating new ideas or engaging with material in an original, new (creative) way.

In our view, this is one of the strengths of portfolios over other methods of assessment: they truly integrate creativity as a core principle. The use of online platforms also allows the integration of multiple media formats that the student can use to engage with the text in different ways. This also allows students to engage in a practical and effective way with multiple intelligences and multimodalities. In terms of literary texts, a portfolio allows students to move beyond the vertical exegesis of the text, based on interpretation of meaning, into a rhizomatic openness to the text that provides an *interaction with multiple meanings*.

This takes us to the second defining attribute of a reading portfolio: it is not a final piece but rather a work-in-progress. It shows accomplishment in a fluid way, and it incorporates the student's reflection about this process. This requires a sustainable feedback system that separates "comments from grades because grades distract from engaging with feedback" (Boud, Falchikov 2007, 408). Portfolios can be resubmitted (particularly favourable in the case of e-Portfolios) and graded at the end, an assessment strategy that acknowledges the non-linear nature of developing understanding about literature.

The first objection to this assessment practice is the issue of large classes. Many lecturers claim that portfolios cannot be implemented in such conditions. However, e-Portfolios are also akin to other means of assessment (i.e. self and peer-assessment and reflection on progress; cf. LeMahieu, Gitomer, Eresh 1995). With the use of technology, a portfolio can be easily stored and accessed by different peers for reviewing and feedback, so students can be paired up with different classmates, and provide insightful feedback without the need of printing and photocopying material. In fact, e-Portfolios easily allow the use of writing in larger classes. We echo Hornsby, Osman and De Matos-Ala (2013) who consider intensive writing courses

an inclusive pedagogy that promotes the practice of writing as learning and thinking within disciplines. Rather than viewing writing as simply a tool for recording and testing, it employs writing to learn techniques; writing for real communication; writing for different audiences and for different purposes; and *writing as revising, so as to think further*. (97; emphasis added)

In summary, reading portfolios could be implemented in the following way:

- a. Text selection
The lecturer provides a series of (open) tasks to students that are aligned with the content of the curriculum of the course. Reading and formative assessment practices must be constructively aligned, which necessarily implies clarity of the intended learning outcomes.
- b. Agency
Students should have the opportunity to negotiate the task, they should be allowed to engage with the texts using multi-modalities, and they should also participate in the design of the rubric for the assessment of their performance.
- c. Submission and feedback structure
Tasks are submitted (online, preferably, to promote ICTs) but are not graded in the first submission. The lecturer provides constructive feedback upon this submission and then gives a reasonable amount of time for the student to resubmit.
- d. Grading
There is an explicit criterion in the marking rubric (with a % of the marks) allocated to how well the student has engaged with the feedback (i.e. a poorly written first version may still earn 70% if the student engages appropriately with the feedback provided).

We believe that this model can help to effectively assess the student's capacity to read literary texts critically with sustainable formative assessment practices that can promote motivation and engagement by using multiple modalities.

6 Shortcomings of e-Portfolios

e-Portfolios require a great deal of organisation on the part of the instructor. Students and instructors need institutional support for implementing new assessment methods as well as user friendly online platforms. Following Stefani, Mason, Pegler (2007), the implementation of ePortfolios requires full commitment at all levels if we want to benefit in the classroom.

There are other potential drawbacks in deciding to implement portfolios as a means of assessment in the classroom, but they will depend largely on instructor beliefs and conceptions of the intertwined relationship between teaching, learning and assessment. The first limitation is the teaching perspective. A student-centred approach facilitates the development of autonomy in the classroom and the detachment of the instructor as the only authority involved in the assessment process (Carless 2015). An instructor who believes in learning autonomy will give high priority to the reflective potential of assessment through a portfolio. Student's beliefs, however, must also be in alignment with this type of assessment. Depending on the students' background, some might be more prone to underestimate their capacity to effectively assess the quality of their own work or they might find it more difficult to provide feedback to a classmate because they might question their authority to do so.

The second limitation refers to the lack of tools available to assess a portfolio. Detractors quite often argue that the assessment becomes a subjective process that jeopardises summative assessments at the end of a course. It is true that without proper guidelines, students may find it quite challenging to identify the different attributes and characteristics that demonstrate the quality of a piece of work. Therefore, it is important to develop checklists and rating scales that guide students to identify the criteria that instructors also observe while assessing a piece of work. Instructors will have to invest a considerable amount of time in developing the tasks and in collecting or designing all the assessment instruments students will be required to use to evaluate the quality of the work. In addition, the instructor must explicitly teach the students how to use the checklists or rating scales and what each attribute means and how they can identify its quality in their own work. This is the reason why the implementation of portfolios cannot be left to instructors alone; in fact, the institution and stakeholders, namely heads of department and heads of schools, should promote their implementation in the classroom as part of the teaching-learning-assessment process. Hence, the effectiveness of portfolios will depend on how they are perceived by the institution, how they are implemented by the instructors and other stakeholders, and how instructors train students to work with them. It is important to highlight that most online learning platforms used

by institutions, and even some commercial apps, facilitate the creation of portfolios and the storage of multiple types of resources (i.e. written, audio and video) which can be easily used as part of the formative assessment.

Another potential shortcoming is the access of students to digital platforms. Not all students, particularly in developing contexts such as South Africa, have access to digital platforms² either because they live in rural areas, or they do not have a computer or Internet at home even in the city. We also observed that not all students nor scholars possessed the same literacy in relation to technology and, if they were going to be graded on the basis of their digital production, this resulted in situations of discrimination and exclusion. Thus, when we use ePortfolios we must ensure that we are also providing access and training to these practices and that we are not falling into the pitfalls of “the decontextualised learner” (Boughy, McKenna 2016).

Finally, we must consider the issue of large classes. For such contexts, a self and peer assessment might be a more logical approach. The quality and quantity of the feedback is by no means restricted to the lecturer (Hornsby, Osman, De Matos-Ala 2013). Even if our final mark is given by means of a final summative task, that does not necessarily imply that students cannot have reflected upon their own performance and learned from what their classmates did via quality feedback from peers. Some suggestions to overcome the difficulties of implementing portfolios would be:

- Providing training through reading portfolio evaluation.
- Using exemplars, available on the online platform of the course, so students can compare their work against a model.
- Feedback from peers and peer-evaluation.

7 Conclusion

Changing the content of the curriculum in the teaching and learning of languages was a difficult endeavour in the last 20-30 years, arguably and mostly because of the focus on Postcolonial studies and other Area Studies. However, the growing and sometimes abrupt necessity to accommodate most or all university courses online³ will likely result in an unforeseen proliferation of assessment methods, such as the implementation of ePortfolios. The assessment practices described in this chapter are part of a larger project aimed at revising the way Literature is taught in Higher Education, one that moves

² Something that has been brought into relief by the 2020 lockdown.

³ For reasons such as global emergencies of the likes of the 2020 pandemic.

away from vertical conceptions of curriculum dictated by institutions. The objective is to foster a more comprehensive and inclusive horizontal and rhizomatic way of teaching that engages students' agency and participation. We believe that this swift in epistemological approach leads to a (more) meaningful production and transformation of knowledge.

Bibliography

- Adsit, J. (2017). "The Writer and Meta-knowledge About Writing. Threshold Concepts in Creative Writing". *New Writing*, 14(3), 304-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2017.1299764>.
- Adsit, J. (2018). "Creative Writing and the Limits of Naming What We Know. Threshold Concepts from Aesthetic Theory and Creativity Studies in the Literary Writing Curriculum". *New Writing*, 15(2), 131-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2017.1324881>.
- Barrett, H.C. (2007). "Researching Electronic Portfolios and Learner Engagement: the Reflect Initiative". *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(6), 436-49.
- Barton, J.; Collins, A. (eds) (1997). *Portfolio Assessment. A Handbook for Educators. Assessment Bookshelf Series*. New York: Dale Seymour Publications.
- Bennett, R.E. (2011). "Formative Assessment. A Critical Review". *Assessment in Education. Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.513678>.
- Biggs, J. (1987). *Student Approaches to Learning and Studying. Research Monograph*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Biggs, J. (1988). "Approaches to Learning and to Essay Writing". Schmeck, R.R. (ed.), *Learning Strategies and Learning Styles. Perspectives on Individual Differences*. Boston: Springer, 185-228.
- Biggs, J. (1999). "What the Student Does. Teaching for Enhanced Learning". *Higher Education Research and Development*, 18(1), 57-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436990180105>.
- Biggs, J. (2001). "Enhancing Learning. A Matter of Style or Approach?". Sternberg, R.J.; Zhang, L. (eds), *Perspectives on Thinking, Learning, and Cognitive Style*. Mahwah (NJ): Erlbaum, 73-102. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605986-4>.
- Biggs, J.; Collis, K. (1982). *Evaluating the Quality of Learning. The SOLO Taxonomy (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome)*. New York: Academic Press.
- Biggs, J.; Tang, C. (2010). "Applying Constructive Alignment to Outcomes-Based Teaching and Learning". *Training Material for "Quality Teaching for Learning in Higher Education" Workshop for Master Trainers*. Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Higher Education, 23-5.
- Blake Yancey, K. (2004). *Teaching Literature as Reflective Practice*. Urban (IL): The National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bloom, B.S. (1994). "Reflections on the Development and Use of the Taxonomy". Rehage, K.J.; Anderson, L.W.; Sosniak, L.A. (eds), *Bloom's Taxonomy: A Forty-Year Retrospective*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1-8. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education 93.

- Boud, D.; Falchikov, N. (2007). *Rethinking Assessment in Higher Education. Learning for the Longer Term*. London: Routledge.
- Boud, D.; Molloy, E. (2013). "Rethinking Models of Feedback for Learning. The Challenge of Design". *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 698-712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462>.
- Boughey, C.; McKenna, S. (2016). "Academic Literacy and the Decontextualised Learner". *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning*, 4(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.14426/cristal.v4i2.80>.
- Carless, D. (2015). "Exploring Learning-Oriented Assessment Processes". *Higher Education*, 69(6), 963-76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9816-z>.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cumming, A. (2014). "Assessing Integrated Skills". Kunnan 2014, 216-27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla131>.
- Deivam, M.; Devaki N. (2016). "The Role of e-Learning in Empowering the Digital Generation". *National Journal of Advanced Research*, 2(3), 12-15.
- Farr, R.; Tone, B. (1994). *Portfolio and Performance Assessment. Helping Students Evaluate Their Progress as Readers and Writers*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Fry, H.; Ketteridge, S.; Marshall, S. (2008). *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Enhancing Academic Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical Language Testing*. London: Hodder Education/Routledge.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. London: Heinemann.
- Herman, J.L.; Winters, L. (1994). "Portfolio Research. A Slim Collection". *Educational Leadership*, 52(2), 48-55.
- Holzman, L. (2009). *Vygotsky at Work and Play*. London: Routledge.
- Hornsby, D.J.; Osman, R.; De Matos-Ala, J. (2013). *Large-Class Pedagogy. Interdisciplinary Perspectives for Quality Higher Education*. Stellenbosch: African Sun Media.
- Hounsell, D. (2007). "Towards more Sustainable Feedback to Students". Boud, D.; Falchikov, N. (eds), *Rethinking Assessment in Higher Education*. London: Routledge, 101-13.
- Hume, A.; Coll, R. (2010). "Authentic Student Inquiry. The Mismatch between the Intended Curriculum and the Student-Experienced Curriculum". *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 28(1), 43-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02635140903513565>.
- Jones, N.; Saville, N. (2009). "European Language Policy. Assessment, Learning, and the CEFR". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 51-63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190509090059>.
- Karpov, Y.V.; Tzuriel, D. (2009). "Dynamic Assessment. Progress, Problems, and Prospects". *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, 8(3), 228-37. <https://doi.org/10.1891/1945-8959.8.3.228>.
- Knight, P.T. (2002). "Summative Assessment in Higher Education. Practices in Disarray". *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(3), 275-86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070220000662>.
- Kunnan, A.J. (ed.) (2014). *The Companion to Language Assessment*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

- Krathwohl, D.R.; Anderson, L.W. (2009). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing. A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. London: Longman.
- Lam, R. (2018). "Issues in Portfolio-Based Research and Future Directions". Lam, R. (ed.), *Portfolio Assessment for the Teaching and Learning of Writing*. Singapore: Springer, 109-21.
- LeMahieu, P.G.; Gitomer, D.H.; Eresh, J. (1995). "Portfolios in Large-Scale Assessment. Difficult but not Impossible". *Educational Measurement. Issues and Practice*, 14(3), 11-28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.1995.tb00863.x>.
- Lorenzo, G.; Itterton, J. (2005). *An Overview of E-Portfolios*. ELI Educase Learning Initiative. <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2005/1/an-overview-of-e-portfolios>.
- Luckett, K.; Sutherland, L. (2000). *Assessment Practices that Improve Teaching and Learning. Improving Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: A Handbook for Southern Africa*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Massa, L.; Mayer, R. (2006). "Testing the ATI Hypothesis. Should Multimedia Instruction Accommodate Verbalizer-Visualizer Cognitive Style?" *Learning and Individual Differences*, 16, 321-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2006.10.001>.
- McNamara, T.; Roever, C. (2006). *Language Testing. The Social Dimension*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Merriam, S.B.; Bierema L.L. (2013). *Adult Learning. Linking Theory and Practice*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moya, S.S.; O'Malley, J.M. (1994). "A Portfolio Assessment Model for ESL". *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 13(1), 13-36. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n7p164>.
- Paulson, F.L.; Paulson, P.R.; Meyer, C.A. (1991). "What Makes a Portfolio a Portfolio". *Educational Leadership*, 48(5), 60-3.
- Pierce, L.V.; O'Malley, J.M. (1992). *Performance and Portfolio Assessment for Language Minority Students*, 9. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Poehner, M.E. (2014). "Dynamic Assessment in the Classroom". Kunnan 2014, 677-92. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla033>.
- Poehner, M.E.; Lantolf, J.P. (2010). "Vygotsky's Teaching-Assessment Dialectic and L2 Education. The Case for Dynamic Assessment". *Mind, Culture, and Activity. An International Journal*, 17(4), 312-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10749030903338509>.
- Rea-Dickins, P.; Poehner, M.E. (2011). "Addressing Issues of Access and Fairness in Education through Dynamic Assessment". *Assessment in Education. Principles, Policy and Practice*, 18(2), 95-7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2011.567076>.
- Sadler, D.R. (1998). "Formative Assessment. Revisiting the Territory". *Assessment in Education. Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 77-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050104>.
- Stefani, L.; Mason, R.; Pegler, C. (2007). *The Educational Potential of ePortfolios. Supporting Personal Development and Reflective Learning*. London: Routledge.
- Tierney, R.J. (1991). *Portfolio Assessment in the Reading-Writing Classroom*. Washington, DC: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

- Van den Branden, K. (2006). "Introduction. Task-Based Language Teaching in a Nutshell". Van den Branden, K. (ed.), *Task-Based Language Education. From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-16.
- Van Gorp, K.; Deygers, B. (2014). "Task-Based Language Assessment". Kunnan 2014, 578-93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla058>.
- Wenger, E. (2011). "Communities of Practice: a Brief Introduction". *STEP Leadership Workshop*. University of Oregon. <http://hdl.handle.net/1794/11736>.
- Woodward, H. (1998). "Reflective Journals and Portfolios. Learning through Assessment". *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23(4), 415-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293980230408>.
- Woodward, H. (2000). "Portfolios. Narratives for Learning". *Journal of In-Service Education*, 26(2), 329-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1367458000200123>.
- Yin M. (2014). "Portfolio Assessment in the Classroom". Kunnan 2014, 659-76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla042>.
- Yorke, M. (2006). "Student Engagement. Deep, Surface or Strategic". *Keynote Address to the 9th Pacific Rim Conference on the First Year in Higher Education* (Brisbane, Griffith University, 12-14 July 2006). 1-18. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mantz_Yorke/publication/252918591_Student_engagement_deep_surface_or_strategic/links/5437e4280cf2027cbb20553f.pdf.
- Yu G. (2014). "Performance Assessment in the Classroom". Kunnan 2014, 617-30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla133>.