

Teaching Portfolios

for tenure track faculty *and* lecturers
in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of New Mexico

When reviewing faculty for tenure and promotion, the College of Arts and Sciences follows the policies in the UNM Faculty Handbook. Section 1.2 states that faculty performance will be evaluated in four categories: Teaching, Scholarly Work, Service and Personal Characteristics. “In order to earn either tenure or promotion or both, faculty are required to be effective in all four areas. Excellence in either teaching or scholarly work constitutes the chief basis for tenure and promotion.” Note that “effective teaching is one of the primary qualifications for promotion and tenure.”

To allow faculty an opportunity to better document the thought and effort they put into teaching, to help guide mentoring of new faculty, and to provide materials for the required annual reviews of faculty, all new tenure track faculty and lecturers in the College of Arts and Sciences will be asked to maintain a teaching portfolio.

Portfolio Guidelines

General questions:

1. Why are we asking you to develop a teaching portfolio (i.e., is UNM becoming a primarily teaching institution)?
 - a. The purpose of a teaching portfolio is to allow you to document the thought and effort you put into teaching.
 - b. Documenting this process allows you time to reflect on your teaching.
 - c. Documenting this process creates an opportunity for more meaningful evaluation of teaching.
 - d. We are not asking that you teach more, we are asking that you document the thought and creativity that you put into teaching.

2. What are the components of a teaching portfolio (i.e., is this going to take a lot of time)?
 - a. Practices at other research universities suggest that developing a teaching portfolio takes a few hours a year. Once started, keeping the portfolio current is easier than updating it after several years.
 - b. The teaching portfolio will include your philosophy of teaching, materials for a few courses that illustrate how you have developed courses and what you think did and did not work, assessment of student learning goals and your reflection on progress toward those goals. It will also include peer evaluation of teaching, student evaluation of teaching, and your

reflections on what you have learned and how your teaching has changed due to that feedback.

- c. Lists of courses, evaluations, funding, etc. will be included as tables or supplements. The text of the portfolio should be reflective. What are you trying to accomplish with your teaching, what kinds of feedback have you used to discover whether you are meeting those goals and how have you changed your teaching in response to assessment of student learning or evaluation from peers or students.
3. How will the teaching portfolio be used?
 - a. Please use this record to reflect on your development as a teacher.
 - b. Departments, the College and the University will use this as a more complete way to evaluate your teaching. Documentation of the thought and effort you put into teaching will allow better use of information about teaching in your evaluation. We are developing rubrics that standardize evaluations of these portfolios.

The elements of your teaching portfolio

The text should be 5-10 pages, with tables, evaluations, syllabi, etc. added as appendices to the portfolio. This should be a reflective document, not just a list of courses you have taught.

1. Statement of teaching philosophy. What are you trying to accomplish in your teaching? What methods do you use to accomplish your goals? How will you know if you have succeeded?
2. Summary of your teaching effort
 - a. What is your typical course load during an academic year? What courses do you teach, how many students are in the courses you teach, what level are these students (freshmen, sophomores, etc.)?
 - b. Which courses are new for you or for your department?
 - c. What informal teaching have you done?
 - d. Do you participate in service activities related to teaching?
 - e. Do you participate in funded student training programs (for example the NIH funded IMSD program)?
 - f. Have you participated in any mentoring or coaching programs?
 - g. Have you participated in workshops or other professional development that were intended to enhance your teaching?

3. Documentation of course development. Include complete information for at least one course. Information for more courses, up to three, is desirable if you have taught several courses or courses at different levels. Give a brief explanation of the reasons behind your choices of each course component. Lengthy course components such as the syllabus itself may be appended to the portfolio. For the portfolio text please explain your pedagogical choices. Course components may include:
 - a. Syllabus – is this a standard syllabus for the discipline or your department? Did you add topics to reflect new developments in the field?
 - b. How does your course fit into the curriculum for your department, your college or the university?
 - c. Assignments – these might include quizzes, papers, group work, service components, etc. Why did you choose to include these types of assignments? E.g., students are required to prepare an annotated bibliography so that they begin to read the primary literature.
 - d. What components of your course did you think would increase student engagement? E.g., I used clicker questions that asked students to hypothesize about the results of experiments such that the students had to produce the possible responses.
 - e. What were your learning goals for this course and how did you know whether students met those goals?
 - f. What were the major barriers to achieving your goals? E.g., the room was poorly configured; the students were less prepared than I expected; I could not afford to buy necessary equipment.
 - g. The next time you teach this course, what do you plan to change? Why?
 - h. If you have taught this course before, did you change anything? If so, why? Did the change improve student engagement or learning?
4. Peer evaluation of teaching – append at least three letters from faculty members who have observed your teaching. If your department does not assign you a mentor, ask colleagues or OSET staff to observe your course. Then, write a paragraph about any changes you will make in your teaching as a result of that evaluation. Reflection on what you have learned from these evaluations is an important component of the portfolio. (NOTE: if submitting a Teaching Portfolio for Retention/Promotion/Tenure review, these peer evaluations will be included separately in the dossier.)
5. Student evaluation of teaching – include a summary of student evaluations of the course(s) described above, a few representative student comments, and other letters from students if you like. This section should be representative, not exhaustive. Include a paragraph interpreting these evaluations of your teaching. Will this change the way you teach the course?

6. Describe how your scholarship and teaching interact. (This section may not be applicable to lecturers.)
7. If you have graduate students, describe how you mentor graduate students, what you have learned about mentoring graduate students and the outcomes for these students. (This section may not be applicable to lecturers.)
8. Any other teaching activities that are important to a representation of the work you do in teaching.

How will we evaluate teaching portfolios?

Each department will be asked to develop a rubric to evaluate excellence in teaching. The rubric below is a draft from which departments will be asked to create specifics for their programs.

Teaching portfolio rubric - Draft

Note: Criteria may be customized for each department.

Improvement required to meet expectations	Meets expectations as an effective teacher	Meets criteria for teaching excellence
CA1. Strong content knowledge		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence that content has changed commensurate with changes in the discipline. <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviewers express concern about content knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence that content has been updated if the course has been taught over several years. <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviewers express confidence in content knowledge [peer reviews may be independent of portfolio] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Explains sources of content knowledge for courses, as described in syllabi <input type="checkbox"/> Peer reviewers express confidence in content knowledge [peer reviews may be independent of portfolio] <input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence of inquiry into how students master content knowledge
CA2. Growing knowledge of teaching/learning practice		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Attended no teaching-professional development activities (e.g., OSET, NMEL, professional organization . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Attended at least one teaching-professional development activity (e.g., OSET, NMEL, professional organization) and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Attended two or more teaching-professional development activities (e.g., OSET, NMEL, professional organization) and shows evidence for incorporating learned ideas into instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Facilitated a teaching-professional development event for other faculty/TAs <input type="checkbox"/> Published at least one paper on teaching in their discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Awarded at least one grant to improve teaching or training of students.
CA3. Adapting/revising to needs of learners		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Shows no evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for changing instruction based on comments from students and/or observations of student learning challenges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for changing instruction based on multiple inputs from students and observations of student learning challenges (e.g., SGID, surveys, classroom assessment techniques; frequent formative assessment)
CA4. Engage students to learn in the real/virtual classroom		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Shows no evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for using interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Explains and shows evidence for using and assessing the impact of multiple interactive engagement strategies to promote student learning (e.g., discussion, group/team learning experiences, peer instruction with clickers)

CA5. Can explain and support choices in content, pedagogy, assessment		
<input type="checkbox"/> Offers no explanation of choices in content, pedagogy or assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in content based on disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in content based on more than one of: disciplinary norms, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains choices in pedagogy in terms of more than one of: developments in the discipline, attempts to engage students, or specific needs of UNM students. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains specific choices of assessment methods.
CA6. Mentoring/Advising undergraduate, graduate, professional student scholars		
<input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of mentoring or advising students	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of mentoring of lower division, upper division, graduate or professional students <input type="checkbox"/> Mentoring activities have occurred over several years.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of mentoring more than one level of student (e.g. more than one of lower division, upper division, graduate, or professional students) <input type="checkbox"/> Description of outcomes of mentoring. <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent mentoring activity over several years.
CA7. Tracking learning outcomes for improvement		
<input type="checkbox"/> Provides no student learning outcomes for their courses. <input type="checkbox"/> Shows no assessment of student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student learning outcomes (SLO's) developed for all courses and listed on syllabi. <input type="checkbox"/> Explains and provides evidence for assessing student learning outcomes revising curriculum or instruction to improve learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Matches course SLO's to degree-program SLO's <input type="checkbox"/> Matches course SLO's to university core curriculum SLO's/competencies (if applicable) <input type="checkbox"/> Serves as coordinator for development, assessment and discussion of departmental SLO's
CA8. Fit of teaching activities within curriculum		
<input type="checkbox"/> Provides no explanation of fit of their courses into the curriculum of the department or university.	<input type="checkbox"/> Explains where courses fits within departmental degree requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Connects course goals and content to other courses within the department and across the university <input type="checkbox"/> Explains fit of the course within students' educational programs within the university