

Box 10.

A procedure for portfolio assessment (Driessen *et al.*, 2005a)

The student submits the portfolio to the mentor, who examines the portfolio and writes a recommendation regarding the grading of the portfolio to be submitted to the assessment committee.

In their final meeting of the academic year the student and the mentor discuss this recommendation. When student and mentor agree on the grade, the student signs the recommendation. If the student disagrees, he or she does not sign.

Subsequently, the portfolio is submitted to the assessment committee. This committee consists of all the mentors. The committee members do not grade the portfolios of the students they mentored themselves. Portfolios on which student and mentor agree are rated by one committee member, who does not study the portfolio in any great detail, but typically scans the work of the student and mentor and checks whether all procedures have been followed correctly. When rater and mentor agree on the grading, the recommendation becomes the final decision.

If the rater does not agree with the student and the mentor, a second independent rater judges the portfolio. If the two raters agree, their judgement is the final assessment. If they disagree, the portfolio is submitted to the full committee. If the student and the mentor disagree, the portfolio is judged by two raters. If they agree, their decision is the final assessment. If the raters do not agree the portfolio is submitted to the full committee.

We examined the assessment of 237 portfolios (see the flowchart). Only 31 portfolios required assessment by a second rater and of these only 9 were submitted to the full committee. This implies that for 87% (202) of the portfolios one judge was sufficient to determine the final grade.

According to the mentors, this procedure was resource intensive but had not burdened them disproportionately.

