

Complete Policy Title:
Teaching Portfolios

Policy Number (if applicable):
SPS B2

Approved by:
**Senate
Board of Governors**

Date of Most Recent Approval:
**December 14, 2011
December 15, 2011**

Date of Original Approval(s):

Supersedes/Amends Policy dated:
April 8, 2009 (SPS 10)

Responsible Executive:
Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Enquiries:
[University Secretariat](#)

***DISCLAIMER:** If there is a Discrepancy between this electronic policy and the written copy held by the policy owner, the written copy prevails*

A teaching portfolio is a record of a faculty member's teaching methods, accomplishments and goals. One purpose of a teaching portfolio is to represent the faculty member's involvement in teaching to potential reviewers.

Every faculty member should have a teaching portfolio, which he/she updates regularly. The portfolio is owned by the faculty member and may contain any and all information that the faculty member wishes to document.

Structure of Teaching Portfolios

The portfolio consists of two main parts, Part A – Executive Summary, which consists of the items (i) – (v) listed below and Part B – Supporting Documentation, which is optional and may contain additional material compiled by the faculty member in support of Part A.

- (i) description of responsibilities and mechanism of evaluation drawn from the appointment letter, or updates thereto (maximum one page);
- (ii) description of teaching approach/philosophy (about one page);
- (iii) description of teaching practice, including examples of how the approach/philosophy has been realized, or how teaching has been adapted to unusual conditions (one to two pages);
- (iv) description of contributions to teaching, for example, course design, publications and research on teaching and learning, presentations on teaching and learning, professional development, educational leadership, reports on issues pertaining to teaching and learning (about one page);

- (v) complete details of responses to the summative question in the students' ratings of all courses taught over the past five years. The numerical ratings should be set in the context of all the teaching done in the department and should, at a minimum, include the means (better a histogram) of the scores for the summative question for all departmental courses with possible distinctions (e.g., by level). It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to provide all instructors with contextual data for all the courses given in each term.

This structure of the teaching portfolio accords with best practice and will ensure that departmental evaluation of a candidate's teaching can be conducted most effectively. The above elements of Part A constitute, in effect, an "executive" summary of a potentially much larger portfolio. The intent of this summary is to provide a means to manage the larger portfolio rather than to require that all such portfolios have a distinct length and uniformity. For example, the supporting documentation in Part B could record the changes and evolution in the items (i) through (iv) and collect relevant items such as course outlines, exams and assignments.

Students' comments are not to be included in the Executive Summary – Part A, or in the Departmental Evaluation Report. Anonymous statements from students are unreliable and typically unverifiable, and a summative evaluation (such as is conducted when candidates are considered for tenure and promotion or permanence) should not be based, in whole or in part, on such comments.

When a candidate is being considered for re-appointment, permanence, tenure or promotion the teaching portfolio will be reviewed at the department level, and the department will construct a departmental report, incorporating the elements of the Executive Summary that capture the substance of activities (see SPS B1).