

E-portfolio as a Higher Training Professional Tool: a Comparative-Descriptive Study

Soodeh Babae

Kosar University of Bojnord, Department of English Language, North Khorasan, Iran

ABSTRACT: Portfolio had become a popular word by the early 1990 in educational context. Since that time, many definitions and various assessments have emerged (Kelonovskh, 2010). E-portfolio has turn out to be a popular pedagogical device on the higher academic landscape, often called a “high effect practice” that has the capacity to generate transformative knowledge. After reflecting on the academic developments and undergraduate teaching practices with E-portfolio, we recognized regions of resonance with, and misalignment between, research literature and the problems of implementation. In this study, teachers’ experiences with E-portfolios are investigated, and a comparative analysis of these narratives along E-portfolio is presented. In this article, we provide a comprehensive literature review, an outline of the experiences, and a discussion about the inconsistencies springing up from the comparisons. The article finishes by proposing some tips for application and recommendations for further research.

KEY TERMS: *E-portfolio, language classes, teacher education, professional practice, ultimate success.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Reese and Levy (2009) defined E-portfolio as, a valuable tool for assessment and learning. This assessment tool work as a digitized collection of artifacts including: demonstratives, resources, and accomplishments that display an individual, group or institution. E-portfolio has these days emerged on the higher training landscape as a popular device for fostering and assessing student gaining knowledge (Xiang, 2004). In the same line, Schreiner (2016) suggested that “Portfolio is a unique opportunity for students to learn, to monitor their own progress and take responsibility for meeting goals set jointly with the teacher” (as cited in O’Malley & Pierce, 1996, p. 36). A virtual model of the hard-copy portfolio, E-portfolio affords students a possibility to illustrate their skills, competencies, reflective practices, and studying in a proper and flexible manner. With an intention to leverage momentum round E-portfolio use amongst instructors and students, many researchers are studying E-portfolio generation and support. However, in spite of the purported reputation of E-portfolios in language classes and higher education, the researchers’ views have revealed that teachers are hesitant to use them, and adoption of E-portfolio era on our campus has been slow. Puzzled as to the reasons informing this gradual adoption, we’ve got sought opportunities to both facilitate and observe multiple factors of E-portfolio implementation. In addition to investigating the personal consultation practices, these days the researchers have been capable to use E-portfolios as part of a new, interdisciplinary, inquiry-based instrument. Through the act of thinking of the narratives that mirror researchers’ and teachers’ reviews with E-portfolios, many have found that there are areas of both resonance and misalignment between the E-portfolio studies literature and the application of E-portfolio as a part of higher education pedagogical and professional practice. Consequently, this study designs a self-study supposed to examine researchers’ and teachers’ experiences, and then proceeded to compare the emergent narratives with first-class practices indicated within E-portfolio literature. It is this articles’ intention to use personal narratives in assessment to a literature evaluation as a way to better understand some present gaps in E-portfolio studies, and to signify useful suggestions for the ones who are using E-portfolios in their professional teaching practice.

II. E-PORTFOLIO RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

E-portfolio is conceptualized as a multi-faceted tool whereby learners replicate on, synthesize, and present numerous forms of logic and evidence that represent their practice. Scholars have made different typologies in order to signify different aspects of E-portfolio. These classifications include the whole lot from binary categories (consisting of author-centered versus assignment centered) to functionally discrete categories. Totally, E-portfolio versions frequently include ambitions for E-portfolio use, consisting of allowing

instructional advising, facilitating accreditation, fostering reflection, facilitating accreditation, demonstrating mastering or skill development, demonstrating collaborative or efforts, serving as a basis for lifelong knowledge, and acting as a platform for career planning and development, among others (Cambridge, 2010; Reese & Levy, 2009; Strivens, 2015; Taylor, Dunbar-Hall, & Rowley, 2012). Regardless of any specific E-portfolio effort, there is settlement that E-portfolios “have the potential to considerably have an effect on the ways... getting to know is planned, supported and documented” (Christmann & Dahn, 2007, p. 71). This effect is largely represented positively, with challenges in implementation being mitigated by benefits at institutional, departmental, instructor, and pupil levels. Recently hailed as the “eleventh high impact practice” in higher education (Watson et al., 2016, p. 65), the E-portfolio is regularly regarded as a pedagogical and evaluative device which can foster pupil learning and success. According to a new developing frame of research literature that is commonly case-based, there are numerous compelling reasons for imposing E-portfolios in higher education. They are most generally used to offer a repository for professional learning, which in turn serves as a way for teachers or employers to assess the achievement of learning outcomes (Bryant & Chittum, 2013; Challis, 2005; Lamont, 2007; Richards-Schuster et al., 2014).

However, recent research has also indicated the potentials of E-portfolios to be used as pedagogical practice, reflective tool, and a means for identity development rather than straightforward artifacts of gaining knowledge (Nguyen, 2013; Parkes, Dredger, & Hicks, 2013; Pitts & Ruggirello, 2012). This marks a shift, where, in a few cases, E-portfolio implementation in higher education has become greater strategies than concrete object. In different words, E-portfolios might also enable students to discover and create narratives regarding their identities, view their stories in evaluation with others, situate themselves within specific communities, and consider future actions or possibilities (Nguyen, 2013). E-portfolio has also been located as a narrative tool that eclipses conventional, linear representations of mastering (Schreiner, 2016); it is far from reality to facilitate the holistic integration of engaged mastering, instructional determination, and social connectedness. As such, E-portfolios end up as pedagogically and meta-cognitively-oriented tool, allowing learners to direct, synthesize, assess, interrogate, and observe their own studying. Accounts of imposing E-portfolios in ways that move beyond situating them as content material repositories or assessment gear are rare. However, no matter the reason for the use of E-portfolios, present-day literature dictates that it is the communication purpose that is most crucial to make sure the successful implementation. Scholars maintain that it is crucial to talk about the nature, structure, and intended effects of E-portfolio procedure with clarity and concision (Johnson, 2005; Lamont, 2007; Parkes et al., 2013; Ring & Foti, 2003). Students must recognize the learning and/or developmental benefits which can be associated with compiling E-portfolios, in order to make sure their engagement within the method. Clarity can be ensured by: (a) offering students with structural expectations, sequences, and guidelines early inside the process of using E-portfolios, inclusive of an assessment rubric; (b) developing a technique for identifying acceptable evidence for inclusion in E-portfolios; and (c) establishing a schedule for follow-up with college students about their development with E-portfolio assignments (Richards-Schuster et al., 2014). Social media is a 21st century term, which is often interchangeable with the terms web 2.0 and social software. It is used to define a variety of technologies that emphasis social aspects of the internet as a channel for communication, collaboration, and creative expression (Dabbagh & Reo, 2011). It includes resource-sharing tools such as Twitter, blogs, wiki software, Facebook and YouTube that enable social networking (Kistantas & Dabbagh, 2010). Through the use of social media the opportunity for Personal Learning Environments (PLEs) as an effective platform for students, learning raised. As a result of having PLEs, learners enable to take charge of their own learning as they are required to select tools and resources to create, organize and package learning content to learn effectively (McGloughlin & Lee, 2010).

Some researchers also recommend four extensive steps for developing E-portfolios (Parkes et al., 2013; Richards-Schuster et al., 2014):

1. Collect – collecting, saving, and organizing information from programs, courses, and personal knowledge or experiences;
2. Select – the use of a critical thinking to pick the information that serve as proof of studying and professional development;
3. Reflect – reflecting, in an established way, on how the evidence that has been selected demonstrates an evolution in moving to professionalism;
4. Connect – identifying points of connection throughout the information and reflections for the reason of creating an educational profile.

In addition to this process, there are some elements of E-portfolio implementation that are continuously recommended, some of them are specifically salient in our query: (a) that there may be a stability between structure and flexibility in E-portfolio assignments that permits college students to “create their own methods of shooting their experiences” (Richards-Schuster et al., 2014, p. 136), and (b) that reflection is obvious and ties the elements of the portfolio collectively right into a coherent whole (Lamont, 2007). Reflection, or demonstrating intentional thoughtfulness, is widely considered an important thing of E-portfolio creation

(Parkes et al., 2013). Consequently, the substances included within any E-portfolio should be substantiated by way of learners' dependent reflections.

III. E-PORTFOLIO DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

In the process of creating E-portfolios, the learners' development, critical thinking, decision-making and problem-solving skills, as well as negotiation with educators about the contents of portfolios, all facilitate learning. Barrett (2001) claims that designing an E-portfolio can be daunting, but it becomes less difficult when viewed as a series of stages that accommodate different goals and activities. Taking the process of E-portfolio development into consideration, Lee (2006) suggests two main stages. The first stage is data collection and organizing it into E-portfolios. This stage includes designing, arranging, and presenting the content of E-portfolios, and they are the most time-consuming and challenging tasks for learners. The next one is designing the tabulation for navigation. Tabulation of E-portfolios refers to arranging the content in a way, which allows easy access to information by its. Kuo (2004) suggests several types of tabulation of data according to learners' fields of study, content items, student's work, or chronological order.

3.1. Using E-portfolio to assess student in an inquiry-based system

Researchers have currently offered a brand-new undergraduate inquiry-based getting to know route. It is designed to have interaction interdisciplinary groups of first-year undergraduate students in the process of exploring a complex world task by way of immersive inquiry processes. This course represents an inversion of conventional learning in higher education, situating students as the sellers of their personal knowledge. Students direct their achievements by using iterative inquiry; furthermore, they're also responsible for choosing and providing proof of their mastering instead of being "tested" through typical assessment codecs like essays. The new inquiry-primarily based knowledge of route has in reality no formal disciplinary content and was instead established around studying outcomes related to skill-building in practices. As such, a requirement for college kids to select, justify, and present proof—in alignment with E-portfolio nice-practices—seemed like a wonderful fit for this route. Professional platform is provided for learners' E-portfolio construction; this platform is a Word-Press website online tailored specifically for the students. The required additives for inclusion in the students' E-portfolios had been: (a) a portfolio introduction; (b) add of assignments that have been completed by using the scholar in the course of the term; (c) a self-evaluation of the pupil's own participation; (d) at least three pieces of self-selected proof of studying, accompanied with the aid of a descriptive justification of the evidence; and (e) a narrative to attach the factors of the E-portfolio, offer a reflective assessment, and suggest what the scholar could do because of his/her learning.

3.2. E-portfolio Assessment

Portfolio assessment (PA) is popular because it has various uses at classroom level. Aligning teaching and assessment in order to facilitate productive learning is one of them (Klenowski, 2002). Through using portfolio assessment, learners are able to make choices that will be beneficial by selecting the best piece of work and reflect on why it is the best evidence. Portfolio has some benefits such as facilitating teacher- student collaboration, promoting active learning, self-reflection and self-assessment, and encouraging learners to take responsibility for their learning. In Oskay, Schallies and Morgil's (2008) view, portfolio assessment is considered as a powerful, valid and trustworthy approach. With regard to assessment, there are two types of portfolio as described by Cooper and Love (2007). Firstly, formative portfolio include samples of students, work collected throughout the term to show changes over a period of time. Formative assessment focuses on judgments about the quality of students, work, and emphasis how successfully something has been done or is being done. Furthermore, formative assessment focuses on feedback in order to promote learners, competence (Royce, 1982). Formative portfolios can show the process of learning for a special learner, for example, and it may be used as a report to parents or guardians. Secondly, E-portfolios include proof of students, skills. The range and depth of their skills are called summative E-portfolios. Summative portfolios have learning outcomes, and they do not focus solely on the process of learning. There is an agreement on the advantages of alternative assessment. However, it is difficult to implement them. This difficulty is caused by educators. In fact, their uncertainty about how to combine quality assessment with daily practice makes this issue. In order to combine assessment with daily practice it is crucial to adopt innovative teaching method that integrates their IT literacy into assessment. With regard to modern learners in the changing world, technology in learning plays a significant role in achieving this goal. Internet and web- based technologies have a big impact on modifying traditional methods of assessment by including new ways of measuring students, ability and knowledge (Phillips, 1995).

3.3. Foundations for reflection on narratives

As educational improvement professionals who have consulted on, and utilized, E-portfolios in higher education, researchers are consistently engaged in verbal exchange and reflective exercise to make experience of the experiences and to guide the future efforts. For the researchers, reflective exercise has been expressed individually through various varieties of private writing, and as collaborative, retrospective-targeted talk in which worked together to pick out and analyze shared experiences (Coia & Taylor, 2009). Researchers view these reflections as a point of departure; they permit to discover the narratives emerging from “naturally occurring accounts” of the stories (Sandelowski, 1991, p. 161), allowing the important evaluation of ideals concerning the use of E-portfolios in evaluation with their very own utility in a localized higher education context.

IV. METHOD AND RESULTS

In this study, we used self-study as a mechanism to critically study the practices and experiences of other teachers while experiencing with E-portfolios, which then served as a basis for the analytical project. Self-study entails the consideration and interrogation of one’s very own practice, including an exploration of what is happening and what may be changed in future practice (Koster & van den Berg, 2014; Loughran, 2007). There are not any prescribed methodological standards for engaging in self-study (Ritter, 2017). We align with Challis’s (2005) hints for generating an exceptional self-observe: (a) the self-study is characterized with the aid of a genuine voice and enables connection; (b) it permits interpretation that provides insight into academic practice; (c) the self-study researcher have to be forthright and honest; (d) the self-study focuses on an undertaking or issue within the context of education, with the goal of continuous improvement for the researcher and others; (e) the self-study researcher is careful to consider context; and (f) the self-examine provides a unique angle on hooked up conventions or processes. Researchers performed this alignment with the aid of undertaking iterative, reflexive cycles of sharing the narratives in a dozen face to face conversations, followed by way of writing the narratives individually, and then comparing the narratives the usage of a collocation method (Mello, 2002). Collocation evaluation honors the integrity of narratives by means of considering them as a whole rather than breaking them into analytical pieces. Researchers centered on identifying textual and transactional similarities between the narratives, which mean that searched for resonance with, appreciate to patterns of behaviour and interpretation, non-public significance, and context (Mello, 2002). This self-study technique changed into initiated through guidelines, changed into centered on the stories, and did not contain any other human subjects.

While this study refers to groups of humans as a part of our reflections (for example, well-known categories of people such as “students” or “instructors”), researchers do so most effective in a generalized manner. Furthermore, these companies were no longer the cognizance of our query; our analytical undertaking changed into targeted round the perceptions—as educational builders and instructors—of the E-portfolio as a pedagogical tool. As such, ethics approval at our organization changed into no longer required for professional practice. Ultimately, our cognizance become no longer on the narratives rising from the self-observe themselves; rather, researchers used the narratives and our analyses of the narratives as a basis for a comparative critique. The studies researchers generated as a part of our reflective exercise enabled us to listen deeply and empathize with one another (Lamont, 2007), and, of their telling, researchers uncovered inconsistencies among what the research literature tells us about the use of E-portfolios in higher training and what we’ve witnessed as part of their real implementation. Researchers closely tested our tales of experience, in both verbal and written format; however, it’s far the contrast of our memories with the literature evaluation regarding E-portfolios that has constituted the bulk of our effort. At the Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning, one in every of our useful priorities is to interact in evidence-based practice. Thus, an evaluation of E-portfolio literature has served as a baseline for our efforts since the inception of our E-portfolio session practice and scholarly consideration. As our session and teaching practices with E-portfolios spread out over time, researchers used reflective writing, coaching exercise notes, and face-to-face conversations to find the narratives of our studies with E-portfolios.

V. E-PORTFOLIOS IN EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Many teachers are interested in the possibility of changing a traditional mission with something new. This “something new” sparks engagement within teachers because an E-portfolio has the capability to (figuratively) maintain getting to know in digital media. Imagine a space that can preserve a thought, where it grows and can be collected while it has ripened to percentage with others; then, planting new seeds of knowing to begin again. This cyclical process, this area, this idea of authentic mastering, need to provide a holistic way for college students to specify their studying and display evidence in their growth. Students “need to” be able to do this and this belief is frequently laced with an assumption that college students can think metacognitively to self-direct even as the path proceeds. Researchers like the idea of E-portfolio as a “mover and a shaker,” romanticizing the capability for E-portfolio as a transformative mastering tool. Institutions showcase student-evolved E-portfolios on their coaching and gaining knowledge of websites, take part in annual E-portfolio competitions, and promote

E-portfolios as a way for college kids to “promote themselves” to capability employers. In the classroom, however, the thrill is a bit quieter and really awkward. E-portfolio has the tendency to unravel the ideas researchers know potentially. It can be an arduous procedure—for each teacher and student—that takes a couple of expert to navigate. As a learning and academic designer, researchers actually have asserted that an E-portfolio project can complement the alignment of a course (Strivens, 2015), especially if the concepts and thoughts are carefully scaffolded, and provided that teachers allow suitable time, area, and feedback for college students to create a connection with the technique as a way to see themselves in their learning. Based on follow-up consultations about how teachers have used E-portfolio, this is an area that is frequently overlooked. As a result, authentic representations of learning can from time to time be disguised as expertise and talent retrieval, or an examination in brilliant new clothes. Researchers frequently reflect on consideration on how Middendorf and Pace’s (2004) scheme on decoding the disciplines acts as a roadmap for instructors to start considering how to manipulate obstacles in student learning by searching at the ones limitations through an expert lens. Their model is a chain of steps that starts with a trainer identifying a bottleneck or obstacle to pupil learning during the course (Middendorf & Pace, 2004). When researchers think about bottlenecks that instructors have shared with me approximately student studying around E-portfolio, a lot of them are just like the ones expressed by college students themselves: writing insightful reflections, choosing suitable artifacts, connecting assignments across a course, starting their E-portfolio early, troubleshooting technology, etc. These bottlenecks are inhibitors of scholar gaining knowledge of, but Middendorf and Pace’s (2004) research well-known shows that, while it comes time for instructors to consider boundaries from their expert lens, the E-portfolios blurs the traces between the expertise of the trainer and scholar.

Researchers have all started to appearance beyond the disciplines and to start interpreting how the development of an E-portfolio may be an area of continuity in which students and instructors can learn alongside each other, enticing with the complexity and uncertainty of their very own thinking. In E-portfolio development, who’s the expert, and what happens while both the teacher and the student experience bottlenecks to their getting to know at some point of the system. This line of questioning leads researchers to suppose that both the teacher and the student are co-creating an emergent academic revel. Therefore, even though instructors have specific strategies at their disposal and can use methods to solve the problems from an expert lens, cultivating a narrative identification in E-portfolio improvement is a way of thinking that is complex, multifaceted and “...rarely provided to students explicitly, that students generally lack possibility to practice and receive feedback on...” (Middendorf & Pace, 2004, p. 3). When specialists in their area focus much less on E-portfolio as a tool and more on E-portfolio as a studying environment, E-portfolio implementation becomes more about integrating and scaffolding the system of studying at some stage in the course.

VI. Some Features of E-portfolios

6.1. Formative Feedback

Feedback has greater role than simply correcting errors. It is a major aspect in writing process. This is supported by Burstein (2004) who views feedback as the best way to improve writing. Also, feedback is a crucial component of the formative assessment process. Students and teachers have the opportunity to gain information about how students are working based on the goals of classroom (Brookhart, 2008). Taken together, E-portfolios are recommended as a means of a formative feedback. It includes samples of a student’s work collected throughout the term to show changes over a period of time.

6.2. Monitoring

Monitoring is a way of reviewing writing (Charles, 1990). It is noted that students can take control over the feedback they receive by monitoring. Also, monitoring enables students to improve the organization of their writing (Xiang, 2004). Another advantages of monitoring in writing classroom which is stated by Cresswell (2000), is increasing autonomy. Accordingly, monitoring has a positive role in improving writing skill. Therefore, there is a need to choose an approach which establishes monitoring. As William and Black (1996) stated, it is possible to have monitoring during PBL E-portfolios. He further stated, E-portfolios are considered as simple tool for monitoring learning and also performance. This idea is supported by Blackburn and Hake (2006) who emphasized the use of E-portfolios to enhance monitoring strategies.

6.3. Prior Knowledge

Prior knowledge refers to students’ characteristics, their previous experiences, and their new knowledge (Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983). It could help students to develop their writing skills. This claim is supported by Strangman and Hall (2004) who believed that students’ writing skill improves by activating their background knowledge. Also, the effectiveness of prior knowledge on learning is supported by a number of researchers who stated there is a strong link among prior knowledge and learning. Further emphasis is given by Cupta (2006) who stated having prior knowledge affects the way student realize writing.

6.4. Student-Focused

In students-focused classroom, students involved in planning, implementation, and assessment (McCarthy, 2015). In this environment students become independent learners who take responsibility for their own learning. This environment is beneficial for learning. In particular, writing classrooms which are student-centered can improve students' writing. Such an environment caused students work together, brainstorm their ideas as well as their thoughts, and make notes (Jones, 2007). Accordingly, Problem-based learning as a student-centered pedagogy is suggested.

6.5. Self-Assessment

Self-assessment is considered as revision within the writing process. It became popular in the late 1970s. Its popularity begun when Flower and Hayes (1981) introduced a model composing a process for composition. According to this model, revision as a kind of writing strategy is a way of evaluating and reevaluating of the text. After many searches about it, the use of portfolio in EFL writing classroom was suggested. They believed that students participate in self-evaluation activity during portfolio program. Similarly, a number of researchers agree on the effectiveness of portfolio in terms of self-assessment in writing classroom. In the same line, Frank and Brazilia (2004) stated the e- portfolio is identified as an important tool to develop self-assessment. Since learners have the opportunity to think of their own process. Also, these scholars believe that E-portfolios are able to facilitate self-assessment. Therefore, students in PBL E-portfolios have this chance to develop self-assessment to enhance their writing ability.

6.6. Reflection

It is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as a process which is required thinking deeply about a certain subject that is influenced by students' experiences. Reflection has the significant role on writing. Its benefit includes providing a way in which students can make the best use of an experience that leads to deep learning, recording students' progress throughout their study, improving students' performance by using the outcome of reflection to inform future practice, making link among theory and practice. In order to enhance reflection in writing classrooms PBL E-portfolio is suggested.

According to Barette (2011), reflection is a critical component of an educational portfolio. Also, through using E-portfolio learners may select the best choice among their writing assignments and reflect on why it is the best (Allan, 2003). Reflection is considered to be a critical component of PBL as well as E-portfolios. According to Springer, reflection on the relationship between problem solving and learning is an important part of PBL. Consequently, it is hoped that reflection is gained through PBL E-portfolios which affects writing performance positively.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the basis of the disjuncture between E-portfolio literature and teachers' experiences, researchers accept that the usage of E-portfolios has come to run parallel to what is regularly found approximately teaching exercise in better training: that it is characterized by using a lack of community dialogue and encased in a type of "pedagogical solitude". In different words, there is a lot that is not being said. Researchers do no longer see many publicly accessible representations of E-portfolio voices, or the in progress experiences of educational developers, instructors, or students; these narratives are often relegated to satisfaction-type post-scripts. It seems that researchers also turn away from collegial conversations about E-portfolios on our very personal campuses, perhaps due to a pervasive dissonance between satisfactory exercise claims and the difficulties of our very own experiences. So, do researchers romanticize the E-portfolio, or the ability that E-portfolio should reach in terms of improving student getting to know? Given the observations we've mentioned here, how may want to talk about E-portfolio in methods that higher align with the realities of implementation? How might teachers and students embark on E-portfolio trips with clearer expectations, while still leveraging the freedom that E-portfolio work must theoretically enable? These are complex questions that require further inquiry. However, based on our experiences over the past several years, and the observations researchers have made as a part of this comparative exercise, researchers do have some suggestions. First, researchers trust that teachers should engage in a close investigation of the alignment between purposes, expectations, and capacity consequences when considering use of E-portfolio. This action beyond presenting an express and unique description of the E-portfolios' purpose within a course or program, as per conventional nice exercise recommendations. It is critical to emphasize that researchers are not suggesting that there are better or worse functions from which to choose; for example, the usage of E-portfolio for evaluation is no better or worse than the usage of E-portfolio as a reflexive learning space. However, those purposes are different, and require different contexts, strategies, and approaches. In order to mitigate the opportunity of misinterpretation, teachers have to interrogate the functions they've articulated. Is the reason for the usage of E-portfolio reasonable, given the path or program context, aims, and constraints? In addition to structural barriers, what kinds of conceptual misunderstandings would

possibly impact student engagement with the E-portfolio, and how would possibly these be avoided? What varieties of dangers would both teachers and college students want to take that allows you to use E-portfolios effectively? When researchers generate the solutions to those difficult questions researchers obtain a more realistic sense of how the implementation of E-portfolio would possibly go, for that reason helping with decision-making approximately the process.

In phrases of consultation practices, researchers advocate that regarding E-portfolio customers as consultants might be a productive approach. In this case, the instructional developer or instructional fashion designer could come to be a lever for the initiation of a collaborative dialogue between modern-day E-portfolio customers and those who are interested in imposing them. These conversations will be facilitated with the intention of generating sincere reflection about successes and challenges, and enabling a collaborative evaluation about if/how E-portfolios may paintings whilst transposed to one of kind situations on the same campus. Given the right conditions, this sort of consultation might also even grow to end up a community of practice guide for teachers, where businesses of colleagues maintain consistent connection in light of their not unusual interests around E-portfolio use in better education. In the context of coaching exercise, researchers advocate for some simultaneous design and pedagogical shifts when the usage of E-portfolios.

Pedagogically, it would be exceptionally straightforward for teachers to increase in-magnificence practices that higher aid students' use of E-portfolio, which includes collaborative exam of E-portfolio evidence for the duration of elegance time, book-marking lessons to work on E-portfolio engagement in "real-time," and facilitating reflective conversations that build on student responses to reflective templates via modeling the identification of connections between evidence and meaningful reflective narrative. Perhaps the teacher could even be a part of in on the procedure, building his or her personal E-portfolio in tandem with the scholars in the course, and making that method publicly visible. Intrinsically linked to this, researchers suggest that instructors re-remember the grading practices related to students' E-portfolio submissions. How this could appearance might be dependent on context, however it could encompass shifting E-portfolio assignments to a pass/fail grading system, developing scaffold low-stakes assessment round E-portfolios, or transferring the E-portfolio assessment to a largely formative assessment of method rather than a summative assessment of outcomes. Shifts along with these with recognize to grading practice would possibly create a safer environment for students to interact in a number of the riskier practices associated with E-portfolio, which includes reflective identity development. In the end, our self-have a look at and comparative evaluation have generated more questions than answers. However, and possibly interestingly, our enthusiasm for using E-portfolio in better schooling has no longer been diminished.

Despite the demanding situations and barriers that researchers experienced, they have witnessed many generative moments that centre on E-portfolio use. In session, we've visible instructors who're willing to control ambiguity and pain with E-portfolio practices; they have got made themselves vulnerable in the manner of trusting that the studying profits for their college students could be significant. These equal teachers have responded with flexibility and grace, making their own studying approximately E-portfolios visible; we've advanced long-standing consultation relationships with those teachers who're invested in making high quality alternate to their teaching exercise through E-portfolio implementation. Researchers additionally have students who have taken up the task of engaging with their E-portfolio assignments in contemplative, innovative, and deeply personal ways. These students have not only established mastery of course getting to know results by using manner in their E-portfolio assignments, but have prolonged their paintings with E-portfolio to end up a private improvement opportunity. So, no matter our personal misalignment when undertaking E-portfolio implementation, those college students took the initiative to make the assignment their personal. These examples are exemplars of the capacity and opportunity within E-portfolio, and researchers are devoted to preserve exploring E-portfolio implementation in each session and educational practice.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Allan, G. (2003). A critique of using grounded theory as a research method. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 2(1), 1-10.
- [2]. Barrett, H. (2001). Electronic portfolios= multimedia development + portfolio development. The electronic portfolio development process. Retrieved October 29, 2002, from <http://transition.alaska.edu/www/portfolios/EPDevProcess.html#eval>.
- [3]. Barrett, H. (2011). Electronic portfolios. org. Retrieved from <http://helenbarrett.com/>.
- [4]. Blackburn, J. L., & Hakel, M. D. (2006). An examination of source of peer review bias. *Psychological Science*, 17, 378-382.
- [5]. Brookhart, S. M. (2008). How to give effective feedback to your students. ASCD: Alexandria, VA.
- [6]. Bryant, L. H., & Chittum, J. R. (2013). E-portfolio effectiveness: A(n ill fated) search for empirical support. *International Journal of ePortfolio*, 3(2), 189-198.

- [7]. Burstein, J. (2004). Automated essay evaluation: The criterion online writing service. *Ai Magazine*, 25 (3), 27.
- [8]. Cambridge, D. (2010). *E-portfolios for lifelong learning and assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- [9]. Challis, D. (2005). Towards the mature ePortfolio: Some implications for higher education. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 31(3).
- [10]. Charles, M. (1990). Responding to problems in written English using a student self-monitoring technique. *ELT Journal*, 44, 286-293.
- [11]. Christmann, A., & Dahn, I. (2007). The e-portfolio city. Conference proceedings, International ePortfolio Conference, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- [12]. Coia, L., & Taylor, M. (2009). Co/autoethnography: Exploring our teaching selves collaboratively. In D. L. Tidwell, M. L. Heston, & L. M. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Research methods for the self-study of practice* (pp. 3-16). Cham: Springer.
- [13]. Cooper, T., & Love, T. (2007). Electronic portfolios in e-learning. In N. Buzzetto-More (Ed.). *Advanced principles of effective e-learning*. Santa Rosa: CA. Informing Science Press. Australian Association for Research in Education Conference papers, Retrieved January 12, 2010, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/coo01346.htm>.
- [14]. Creswell, A. (2000). Self-monitoring in student writing: developing learner responsibility. *ELT Journal*, 54(3), 235-244.
- [15]. Gupta, R. C. (2006). *Toxicology of organophosphates and Carbamate Compounds* (2nd ed.). Elsevier Academic press. San Diego, California, USA.
- [16]. Dabbagh, N., & Reo, R. (2011). Back to the future: Tracing the roots and learning affordance of social software. In Lee, M. J. W., & McLoughlin, C. (Eds.), *Web 2.0-based e-learning: Applying social informatics for tertiary teaching* (pp. 1-20). Hershey, PA: IGL Global.
- [17]. Entwistle, N. J. & Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding student learning*. London: Croom Helm.
- [18]. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- [19]. Frank, M., & Brazilia, A. (2004). Integrating alternative assessment in a project-based learning course for pre-service and technology teachers. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(1), 41-61.
- [20]. Johnson, G. (2005). ePortfolios in higher education. Conference proceedings from the International ePortfolio Conference, Cambridge, UK.
- [21]. Jones, L. (2007). *The students-centered classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [22]. Kistantas, A., & Dabbagh, N. (2010). *Learning to learn with integrating learning technologies (ILT): A practical guide for academic success*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- [23]. Klenowski, V. (2002). *Developing portfolios for learning and assessment: Processed and Principles*. London: Routledge.
- [24]. Klenowskh, V. (2010). *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed.). Elsevier.
- [25]. Koster, B., & van den Berg, B. (2014). Increasing professional self-understanding: Self-study research by teachers with the help of biography, core reflection, and dialogue. *Studying Teacher Education*, 10(1), 86-100.
- [26]. Kuo, S. Y. (2004). *Educational test and assessment*. Taipei: Ching Hua.
- [27]. Lee, K.C. (2006). *Teaching assessment*. Taipei: psychology.
- [28]. Lamont, M. (2007). What are the features of e-portfolio implementation that can enhance learning and promote self-regulation? *European Institute for E-Learning*, 32-42.
- [29]. Loughran, J. J. (2007). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V.K. LaBoskey, & T. L. Russell, (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 7-39). Cham: Springer.
- [30]. McCarthy, J. (2015). *Student-centered learning: It starts with the teacher*. Edutopia. N. P.
- [31]. McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. J. (2010). Personalised and self-regulated learning in the Web 2.0 era: International exemplars of innovative pedagogy using social software. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(1), 28-43.
- [32]. Middendorf, J., & Pace, D. (2004). Decoding the disciplines: A model for helping students learn disciplinary ways of thinking. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 98, 1-12.
- [33]. Nguyen, C. F. (2013). The ePortfolio as a living portal: A medium for student learning, identity, and assessment. *International Journal of ePortfolio*, 3(2), 135-148.
- [34]. O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- [35]. Oskay, O. O., & Schallies, M., & Morgil, I. (2008). Reliability of Portfolio: A closer look at findings from recent publications. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 35, 263-272.

- [36]. Parkes, K. A., Dredger, K. S., & Hicks, D. (2013). ePortfolio as a measure of reflective practice. *International Journal of ePortfolio*, 3(2), 99-115.
- [37]. Phillips, D. C. (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher*, 24(7), 5-12.
- [38]. Pitts, W., & Ruggirello, R. (2012). Using the e-portfolio to document and evaluate growth in reflective practice: The development and application of a conceptual framework. *International Journal of ePortfolio*, 2(1), 49-74.
- [39]. Reese, M., & Levy, R. (2009). Assessing the future: ePortfolio trends, uses, and options in higher education. EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research – *Research Bulletin*, 2009(4).
- [40]. Richards-Schuster, K., Ruffolo, M. C., Nicoll, K. L., Distelrath, C., & Galura, J. A. (2014). Using e-portfolios to assess program goals, integrative learning, and civic engagement: A case example. *International Journal of ePortfolio*, 4(2), 133-141.
- [41]. Ring, G. L., & Foti, S. L. (2003). Addressing standards at the program level with electronic portfolios. *Tech Trends*, 47(2), 28-32.
- [42]. Royce, D. S. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144.
- [43]. Sandelowski, M. (1991). Telling stories: Narrative approaches in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 23(3), 161-166.
- [44]. Schreiner, L. (2016). Thriving: Expanding the goal of higher education. In D. W. Harward (Ed.), *Well-Being and Higher Education* (pp. 135-148). Washington, DC: Bringing Theory to Practice.
- [45]. Strangman, N., & Hall, T. (2004). *Background knowledge with UDL*. Wakefield, MA: National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum.
- [46]. Strivens, J. (2015). A typology of ePortfolios. *The International Journal for Recording Achievement, Planning and Portfolios*, 1, 3-4.
- [47]. Taylor, J., Dunbar-Hall, P., & Rowley, J. (2012). The e-portfolio continuum: Discovering variables for e-portfolio adoption within music education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(8), 1362-1381.
- [48]. William, D., & Black, P. (1996). Meanings and Consequences: a basis for distinguishing formative and summative functions of assessment? *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(5), 537-548.
- [49]. Xiang, W. (2004). Self-monitoring in writing by Chinese students. *ELT Journal*, 58(3), 228- 246.