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Abstract – The study surveyed the level of the use of Portfolios as a method of assessment in Selected Courses of the Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The study examined the lecturers’ and students’ understanding of the concept of Portfolio Assessment as well as determines the problems of using portfolios as a method of assessment. This is with the ultimate goal of establishing the need for Portfolio model in enhancing learning. Portfolios are being use but they do not provide rubric, self-reflection and portfolio model sheets. Lack of defined assessment scheme has been the gap the study bridges. The study used five research objectives. One thousand and one hundred (1,100) students and lecturers form population, while two hundred and ninety-three (293) served as sample size of the study. The selection was done by the use of Stratified Random Sampling technique. Experts were involved in order to scrutinize the research instruments in terms of construct and content validity. The study used Alpha Cronbach reliability Coefficient to ascertain the reliability of the research instrument that yield 0.951 which was obtained for student’s questionnaire and 0.981 for lecturers’ questionnaire. These results therefore confirmed that the instruments were reliable for collection of data. The responses were based on lecturers’ and students’ understanding of the concept of Portfolio Assessment, types and variations of portfolio assessment and problems of using portfolio assessment. The findings of the study showed that portfolios were mostly used as a folder. The findings indicated that both lecturers and students did not understand the concept of portfolio assessment which comprises rubric, guidelines; self-reflection and portfolio model sheets. The finding of the study on lecturers’ knowledge of using portfolio assessment revealed that majority of them disagreed that portfolios are supposed to be used with rubric, reflection and portfolio model. The finding of the study also identified time consumption, large class or crowdedness as problems of using assessment portfolios. Provides multiple ways of assessing students’ learning overtime and multiple opportunities for observation and assessment are the benefits of portfolio assessment among others.
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1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Teaching and learning play important roles in the life of human society. Education has been the means of development socially, economically, politically, morally and technologically. To
achieve development, public education has been shifting to standard or outcome-based on performance-oriented systems. Within such systems, the basic purpose of all education is students’ learning and assessment, and the primary purpose of all assessment is to support learning. The support is rendered through assessment which can improve the instruction, teaching method and assessment. For instance, the Assessment Reform that began in the 1980s in North America has had numerous impacts. Most significantly, it changed the way educators think about students’ capabilities, the nature of quality in learning as well as what can serve as assessment. During the educational reformation, the use of portfolios as a mode of assessment gained a lot of interest (Davies and Le Mahieu, 2003).

Portfolio is ‘a flat portable case’ or a large heavy envelope for carrying paper or drawings as well as design. Portfolio is created to give protection to works of the architect, fine artist, graphic and textiles designers. The works kept are usually two dimensional works. The portfolio protects the drawings and designs from effect of negligence, weathering and aging. It also stores all paper drawings or painting and design of any media (Ifeagwu, 2005).

Assessment Portfolio is the type that keeps design, painting and drawing collections but provides rubric, self-reflection and portfolio models which could be analytic or holistic. It also admits jurying that involves course examiners to assess the works of students together. That means, the assessment is not unilateral. It allows students to understand how they are being assessed. Portfolio assessment is the procedure used to plan, collect and analyze the multiple sources of data maintained in the portfolio. The process includes student participation in the selection of work, in criteria, goal setting and through self-assessment. Students and teacher collaborate in assessing and evaluating students learning from evidence in portfolio collection, then use the information to make plan and set goals for further learning. Assessment Portfolio contain guidelines for content, criteria for evaluating process and product as well as evidence of student’s reflection (Macleod and Erlandson, 2012).

Art and design teachers at all levels (9) Lower, (3) Middle and (4) Higher have traditionally used the end of lesson, a term test, semester test for parents and other stakeholders to view the works of their wards in creative arts. They use the simplest kind of judgment of “good” or “bad” or simply fix letter grades (A, B+, B, C+, and C) and arbitrary percentages to evaluate the works of the learners. Traditional Assessments are often considered as subjective (Mamza, 2006; Eisner, 2002; Mbahi, 2000; 1999, Olorukooba, 1990); because they are based on the teachers’ perception of aesthetic qualities of the art products such as: shape, line, colour, balance, harmony and composition among others.

Thus the lack of the criteria or objectivity has often resulted in lack of proper monitoring of students’ progress in art, and in the wrong perception that art is not a serious academic subject when compared to other school subjects. Several studies like those of English (2010), Gruber (2008) and Lorna (2003) were made in the past to correct the situation by introducing some forms of assessment in art. Mbahi (2000) and Olorukooba, (2006) observe that such attempts were usually not related to “what is taught”. The emphasis is placed on learners’ efforts and not achievements. They also note that it is mainly concerned with cognitive, leaving out the affective and psychomotor aspects of the learners’ development.
1.1. Statement of the Problem

Traditional Portfolio techniques do not provide rubric, self-reflection, guidelines and feedback to the students in drawing and design courses. They store and safe keep designs and drawings which awaits arbitrary award of marks on students ‘performance at particular time. Assessment Portfolios could provide information on the academic development of the learner from the beginning to the end. Through the use of Portfolios, students are regularly asked to examine how they succeeded or failed or improved on a task or set goals for future work. No longer is the learning just about the final product, evaluation or grade but becomes more focused on students developing metacognitive skills that will enable them to reflect upon and make adjustments in their learning in school and beyond. If assessment portfolios are maintained, they may establish uniformity and standard criteria for the lecturers’ use. Do portfolio assessments really exist among lecturers in their evaluation of students in the Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria? If lecturers understand portfolio assessment they would provide the students room for expressing their full potentials. If the use of portfolio assessment is also popularized, it could be the flexible form of assessing students over a period of time.

The aim of this study is to evaluate the level of the use of assessment portfolio by the Departments in the Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, with the view to addressing the need for a model of assessment in the portfolio. Thus, the objectives of the study are to:

1. ascertain whether lecturers and students understand the concept of the portfolio method of assessment,
2. problems and the benefits of using portfolio method of assessment.

1.2. Significance of the Study

Findings of the study have possibility of helping lecturers to become familiar with portfolio assessment method as an appropriate technique for assessing design and drawing performance of students in professional courses in the Departments within the Faculty of Environmental Design of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. Students would also be aware that teachers are giving value more attention to their assessed works, free of bias in allocating marks for their evaluation. They will also know that all works in the portfolio are assessed. It serves as an important contribution of research towards providing guidelines for using portfolio method of assessment.

This research would also promote the use of portfolio assessment which is aimed at improving drawing techniques, skills, and competencies of students at the Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The findings of the study encourages the relevant departments in the faculty to think of not only the use of portfolio assessment at all times, but also would realized the strengths and weaknesses of their assessment practices, Students would understand the ways that teachers assess designs and drawing projects and assignments that they submit for grading. The outcome of the work would hopefully invite more researchers in this area of the study.
1.3. Scope of the Study
The study was on the use of portfolio assessment method as a tool to assess students’ performances in the selected Departments of; Architecture, Fine Arts, Industrial Design and Urban and Regional Planning of the Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

The study was delimited to the following:
1. Lecturers taking the related courses on portfolio; 300 and 400 level students) of the Departments of Architecture, Fine Arts, Industrial Design as well as Urban and Regional planning;
2. Attention was given to the opinion, knowledge, experiences and use of portfolio assessment among the academic staff members; 300 and 400 level students of the selected Departments in the Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
Gardner’s, (1983 and 1999) theory of multiple intelligences was adopted for this study. The theory of multiple intelligences identified nine (9) different human intelligences. These intelligences are seen as human cognition and potentials in terms of people’s different strengths and intelligences. The intelligences included: 1) Spatial-Visual Intelligence, 2) Verbal – Linguistics Intelligence, 3) Logical-Mathematics Intelligence, 4) Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, 5) Music Intelligence, 6) Interpersonal Intelligence, 7) Intrapersonal Intelligence, 8) Naturalistic Intelligence and 9) Existential intelligence. Of these nine human intelligences, Spatial-Visual Intelligence was chosen. The rationale for selection of Spatial-Visual Intelligence was that, it is directly related to the area of the study.

The Spatial-Visual intelligence has clearly described Architecture, Fine Arts, City Planning, Building, Graphic Design, Photography and Sculpture as closely related in learning styles, roles, tasks, activities and assessment. By the framework of the theory of Gardner, (1999) the study posits that professional courses such as found in the Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria possess related learning styles, activities and assessment.

2.1. Concepts of Evaluation, Continuous and Portfolio Assessments
An evaluation in general is intended to enhance learning and foster further students’ growth in achieving the objectives of the programmes. According to Yusuf (2012), evaluation in art education is used as in other school subjects: to recognize progress and identify areas that need further learning. It is a derivative from the Latin word ‘curere’, which means to run. Curriculum has been defined by different authorities; to a few it is an educational system that will help growth and development of the child. Basically, it is seen as guides, syllabi or textbooks that facilitate teaching and learning.

If inadequacies or improvements are observed, there would be replacing, redeveloping and then reappraising. So evaluation is either about proving something is working or needing improvement (Gatawa cited by Mohammed,(2014). Measuring performance objectively
requires observing, setting up criteria for successful performance of the behavior and not in the situational context in which the behavior is to be performed.

Olorukooba, (2006) states that evaluation is the appraisal of an outcome or achievement of particular objectives. Mohammed, (2014) sees it as a process of determining the extent to which educational objectives are being realized by the programme of curriculum and instruction. With Eisner,(2002) evaluation is the method whereby students, teachers and materials are diagnosed in order to prescribe treatments that are educationally effective.

Continuous assessment is a systematic and regular method or technique of determining what a learner has gained from learning activities. These learning activities involve knowledge, thinking and reasoning (cognitive), character development (affective) and industry (psychomotor). Usuji and Okonkwo (2003), defined the Continuous Assessment as:

…… mechanism whereby the final grading of a student in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of behaviour systematically takes account of all his performances during a given period of schooling. Such an assessment involves the use of a great variety of modes of evaluation for the purpose of guiding and improving the learning and performance of the student (p 20)

When the Nigeria Curriculum Conference was held in 1969, it was suggested that continuous assessment be introduced as a remedy to the undesirable effect of the one-shot examination of students learning and achievement. It was not possible until 1977 that a bold attempt was made to adopt it as a policy to guide evaluation strategy of students learning and achievement. It is now entrenched in the National Policy on Education 1977, revised in 1981 and 2004. The policy has gone further to make elaborations of the Continuous Assessment (CA) for the various levels of our educational system. They describe it as a method of evaluating the progress and achievement of students in educational institutions. It aims to get the truest possible picture of each student’s ability at the same time helping each student to develop his or her abilities to the fullest. It is a method whereby the final grading of students takes account in a systematic way of their whole performance during a given period of schooling. It indicates that the individual student would be seen and assessed in totality. It also implies that the three ‘H’s – Head, Heart and Hand that relate to cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains respectively,

According to Abubakar and Naisi (2009), continuous assessment is a platform of the implementation of educational programmes has provided room for any essential instructional methods and assessment strategies. They further elaborate on the meaning and structure of the assessment techniques that are useful for continuous assessment. Since continuous assessment is formative in nature and its purpose is mainly improvement in learning; the following assessment techniques are suggested for formative assessment:

1. **Oral Technique:** this technique is important for testing skill of listening and speaking. Oral technique comprises answering questions; talk, reading aloud and describing things.

2. **Written Technique:** it is a technique which involves exercises and home works; and written assignments are ideal for evaluating the writing skills. They can be designed according to students’ level.
3. **Observation technique**: it is usually for testing the listening and speaking skills. Informal observation techniques can be used. The teacher can observe the students’ use of language; while participation in the class students are required to discuss role play, stimulate and express a point of view or answer question etc. the teacher should monitor the activities and quietly observe each students’ participation.

4. **Anecdotal Record**: this is note based on the teacher’s observation of how students’ learn. Observable behaviours can be recorded by teachers in anecdotal records. Anecdotal records provide cumulative information about students' development in learning objectives of the physical and social growth and development. By systematically collecting and analyzing anecdotal comments, teachers can evaluate students’ progress and abilities to design and draw then plan appropriate instruction.

5. **Self and Peer Assessment**: these two devices are crucial to the continuous assessment process. They provide for a wider range of input to learners than one person alone, such as the teacher can give. They are the skills to be developed that learners can take with them when they leave school and then use for life—long learning. Self-assessment is any assessment that requires students to judge their own drawing skills or ability or drawing and design performance; thus self-assessment provides some idea of how students see their own development and help them to be aware of their own learning. The opportunity is provided to the learner to reflect upon their learning and assess their own strengths and weaknesses. Peer assessment is a response in some form to other learners’ work. It gives students some idea of how other students perceive their drawing or design performance providing external perspectives. It can be given by a group or individual.

6. **Pair works Assessment**: This type of assessment is any observation or scoring done for the purpose of giving students feedback while those students are working in groups, whether the group work was specifically designed for assessment purposes or occurred naturally for other pedagogical purpose. The pair work assessment helps the teacher to assess actual students’ works. Students feel more relax and less threatened when tested in groups or pair.

7. **Conferences**: this usually involves students coming to the office or studio alone or in groups for brief meetings to get feedback on their works. it provides opportunity for students to understand their own learning processes and strategies and develop a better self-image, and let teachers elicit specific skills or task that students may need to review and afford teachers an opportunity to inform, mold, observe and gather information about students.

8. **Portfolio Assessment**: portfolio assessment is a folder that keeps students’ two dimensional works and provides assessment scheme. The students’ work usually exhibits the students’ effort, progress and achievement in one or more areas. It is important that the student be a participant in the selection of his or her work. Portfolio helps a student to see all the positive growth that is taking place during the learning process, thus enhancing his or her esteem and nurturing further growth. Portfolio is valuable to students, parents and teachers. It presents a practical approach to
assembling students’ works interpreting evidence of students’ performance and assessing students’ performance relative to instructional objectives.

2.2. Description of Types, Categories and Contents of Assessment Portfolio

Assessment Portfolio is a collection of student work specifically selected to tell a particular story about the student (Mueller, 2012). Student portfolios take many forms which include,, developmental, showcase and evaluation portfolios. Portfolio is not therefore the pile of student work that accumulates over a semester or year. Portfolio contains a purposefully selected subset of student work. Portfolio might contain samples of earlier and later work, often with the student commenting upon or assessing the growth. There are two forms of portfolio; which are common in art and design courses. They are known as ordinary (hard) and e-portfolio (soft). The portfolio forms are used to capture the process of learning and growth. Portfolios have most commonly been associated with the collection of art and design work. In considerate portfolio assignments students are asked to reflect on their work, to engage in self-assessment and goal setting. There are three types of portfolios which include developmental portfolio, showcase portfolio and evaluation portfolio.

2.2.1. Developmental Portfolio

It is the category of portfolio used for growth over a time to show progress to help develop process skills such as self-evaluation and identify strengths and weaknesses. This portfolio contains a checklist and all art and design works for the semester.

2.2.2. Showcase Portfolio

It is the category of portfolio that shows the best works of the student. It prepares the samples of the best works for assessment for teachers to look at. It contains a checklist and the best art and design works.

2.2.3. Evaluation Portfolio

It contains assessable art and design works, checklist, rubric, self-reflection and list of members of jury. This portfolio documents the achievement for grading purposes, progress towards standards.

2.3. Contents of the Evaluation Portfolio

The evaluation portfolio contains very important records of evaluation. The content of evaluation portfolio is usually the assessable collection of either drawing or design works; checklist, guidelines for student and teacher conference, conference sheet and self-reflection sheets(Al-serhani,2007). The following are the description of the content of assessment portfolio:

a. Checklist sheet: this is a sheet which can be used for recording the items of the portfolio, particularly the art and design works. It is design in an order with columns that features date of entry, title of entry; student’s signature and teacher’s signature.

b. Guidelines for Conference Sheet: it provides guidelines the teacher and students would follow for successful conduct of portfolio assessment.
c. **Conference Sheet**: it comprises questions that the teacher expects the student to respond to in order to direct the students.

d. **Rubrics**: these are scoring instruments used when evaluating students’ performances. There are two types of rubric: 1. Analytic and 2. Holistic rubrics.

1. **Analytic Rubric**: The analytic requires the teacher to score in parts separately; then sum up the parts of individual scores to obtain a total score. It is usually a four-point rating scale which provides criteria, explanation of the level of progress and score of a particular assignment.

2. **Holistic Rubric**: the holistic rubric requires the teacher to score the overall process or product as a whole without judging the component parts separately. The holistic rubric features score; grade and category of the level of the students’ performances.

3. **Self-Reflection Sheet**: this is a reflection questionnaire which provides student’s name and identity number. It also provides some questions the teacher expects the students involved in the class activity to answer. The reflection of the students helps the teachers to understand why and how the students perceive their experiences and ability to recollect their intuitive knowledge. Other question on how to improve the drawing and design were also formulated.

2.4. **Validation of Research Instruments**

Fifty questionnaires were distributed to 200 level students and thirty copies of questionnaires to postgraduate students of Architecture. The postgraduate students and 200 level students of Architecture are not part of population of the study. Experts in and outside the Departments of Architecture critically observed and improved the questionnaires in term of construct and content validity of the questionnaires. As a result of this, the research instruments were corrected and items in lecturers’ questionnaire were also reduced from sixty items to forty-four. And that of students’ from thirty-one to twenty-two. The reduction of items was done to avoid repetition and tautology of statements in the questionnaires.

2.5. **Reliability of the Research Instruments**

The administration and retrieval of the research instrument took the researcher two weeks before it was completed. The study having retrieved the questionnaires used Alpha Cronbach reliability coefficient to compute the reliability of the research instrument. The results of the reliability were 0.951 for students’ questionnaires and 0.981 for the lecturers’ questionnaires. These values therefore, confirmed that the instruments were reliable for collection of data.

2.6. **Procedure for Data Collection**

The researcher having collected an introduction letter from the Supervisory Committee through the Head of Department, and visited the selected Departments in the Faculty. This was to enable him to officially make it known that the administration of questionnaires was going to the selected Departments. Both lecturers and 300/400 levels students were involved. The distribution and retrieval of the questionnaires took the researcher sixty-five (65) days. The
researcher distributed two hundred and ninety-three questionnaires. Two hundred were for undergraduate students and ninety-three for lecturers of the different Departments comprising Architecture, Fine Arts; Industrial Design and Urban and Regional Planning. The researcher retrieved only two hundred and sixty-two (262) which was 89.41% of 293(100%). The non-retrieved copies were 11.26%.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analyzed data collected from respondents and discusses the results. The results are presented in order of research questions on tables that follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Retrieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lecturer I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Lecturer II</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Asst. Lecturer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300/400 Level Students</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Demographic Information of Respondents and Sample Size

Table 1 shows the sample size of the study which categorized academic ranks of lecturers in the universities and level of students as well. The study distributed two hundred and ninety-three (293) questionnaires (100%) but was able to retrieve two hundred and sixty-two (262) questionnaires (89.41%). The retrieved data was used for data analysis.

3.1. Analysis

The study used quantitative analysis to analyze the responses of students and lecturers according to the categorization research questions of this study in the survey questionnaire. Data were analyzed using Descriptive statistics like mean, standard deviation, frequency of counts provided in Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Research Question 1; Do Lecturers and Students understand the concept of Portfolio method of Assessment?
Table 2. Lecturers’ Understanding of the concept of Portfolio Assessment Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I know portfolio method of assessment</td>
<td>1(1.6)</td>
<td>3(4.8)</td>
<td>3(4.8)</td>
<td>33(53.2)</td>
<td>22(35.5)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Portfolio assessment is characterized by using rubric, guidelines, self-reflection form and portfolio model.</td>
<td>25(40.3)</td>
<td>10(16.1)</td>
<td>13(21.0)</td>
<td>3(4.8)</td>
<td>11(17.7)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Portfolio assessment is storing and awarding of marks before and by the end of semester.</td>
<td>10(16.1)</td>
<td>15(24.2)</td>
<td>6(9.7)</td>
<td>24(38.7)</td>
<td>7(11.3)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Portfolio Assessment requires joint lecturers’ attention for proper assessment in design and drawings.</td>
<td>1(1.6)</td>
<td>6(9.7)</td>
<td>7(11.3)</td>
<td>27(43.5)</td>
<td>21(33.9)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I do not understand the concept of portfolio method of assessment</td>
<td>3(4.8)</td>
<td>14(22.6)</td>
<td>9(14.5)</td>
<td>17(27.4)</td>
<td>19(30.6)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the lecturers understanding of the concept of Portfolio Assessment method. The knowledge of portfolio assessment were 55(75%) with 4.16 mean value, agree. But the responses to characteristics of portfolio were (35%) with 2.50 mean, disagree. Portfolio assessment is just storing and awarding of marks 31(50.0%). Joint lecturers co-working for proper assessment were (48%) with 2.98 mean value. Whereas I do not understand the concept of portfolio method of assessment were also 36(58.0%).

Research Question 2: what are problems of the use of Portfolio Assessment?

Table 3. Problems of using portfolios as a method of assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Too much time to spent using portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>4(6.5)</td>
<td>20(32.3)</td>
<td>13(21.0)</td>
<td>19(30.6)</td>
<td>6(9.7)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Developing portfolio assessment criteria model can be difficult for the teachers</td>
<td>4(6.5)</td>
<td>17(27.4)</td>
<td>12(19.4)</td>
<td>20(32.3)</td>
<td>9(14.5)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Students incur financial expenses in using portfolio.</td>
<td>3(4.8)</td>
<td>13(21.0)</td>
<td>7(11.3)</td>
<td>34(54.8)</td>
<td>5(8.1)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Assessment Portfolios demand the joint commitment of teachers, students and parents.</td>
<td>1(1.6)</td>
<td>4(6.5)</td>
<td>8(12.9)</td>
<td>32(51.6)</td>
<td>17(27.4)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 indicates the problems of using portfolios as method of assessment. Both lecturers and students responses were lecturers responses on time consumption of using portfolios were 25(40.3%); students responses were 84(41.0%). Difficulty of using portfolios in a large class according to lecturers responses were 44(71.0%) whereas students were 111(55.5%).

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The following were the major findings of the study: The finding on lecturers’ understanding of the concept of portfolio assessment was that, lecturers have the knowledge of portfolios but did not understand the structure of assessment portfolio, as their responses to the questionnaire were 35(56.4%) disagreed and 13(21.0%) undecided. The analyzed responses on problems of using assessment portfolios; 40.8% of the respondents agreed that portfolio assessment is time consuming; 46.8% agreed that it is difficult to use the structure of assessment portfolio, while 79.0% of the respondents agreed that the use of assessment portfolios requires the joint commitment of lecturers, parents and students.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings generated by the interpretation of the first research question under the Table above concerning whether lecturers understand the concept of portfolio assessment; showed that respondents did not understand the concept of portfolio assessment. The outcome of the study is in tandem with that of Birgin and Baki, (2007) in whose study revealed that, teachers do not have enough knowledge and experience about portfolio assessment methods. The authors therefore recommended training for the pre-service teacher concerning the use of assessment methods in Turkish Schools.

6. SUMMARY

The study examines lecturers’ and students’ understanding of the concept of portfolio assessment; types and variations of portfolios and identified the problems and benefits of using portfolio assessment with a view to the need to use portfolio model which include rubric, self-reflection and portfolio model. The study has provided types of portfolios every student need in a semester (Developmental, Showcase and Evaluation portfolios). The study found that lecturers and students know portfolios as folders but did not understand the concept of rubric, self-reflection and portfolio model. Based on the findings of the study it was recommended that there is need for training of lecturers to understand the new concepts concerning portfolios. Suggestion for the use of portfolios along rubric, self-reflection sheets and portfolio model was also proffered.

7. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that lecturers and students of selected courses: Architecture, Fine Arts, Industrial design as well as Urban and Regional planning know portfolios without understanding the concept of portfolio assessment which is characterized by rubric, self-
reflection and portfolio model sheets. There were agreements across the opinions of all the respondents that the portfolios vary. The majority of the respondents also agreed that they depended on portfolios without rubric, self-reflection and portfolio model sheets. The study also concludes that use portfolio assessment is difficult all the times because of time consumption and burdensome in large class. This study concludes that several studies have shown evidences of the workability of portfolios in enhancing learning when use with rubric, self-reflection and portfolio model sheets.
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