Introduction

Article XXIX.B. of the WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement requires that each school or college develop a policy for the creation of Teaching Portfolios for faculty. The School of Medicine will use the Teaching Portfolio for promotion and tenure and other personnel decisions. This policy should accurately and adequately reflect the nature of teaching in the School of Medicine.

Each faculty member will develop a Teaching Portfolio that provides a record of teaching activity, evidence of teaching competency, and special teaching achievements. The Teaching Portfolio for the promotion and tenure process should reflect the teaching activity for the period of time since the faculty member’s appointment or last promotion.

The Teaching Portfolio is utilized by the School of Medicine for the purposes of evaluating and counseling the faculty member. Although the Portfolio will be used by the committees evaluating faculty performance for promotion and tenure considerations, its contents are confidential and cannot be disclosed to any outside party without the permission of the faculty member.

Format for Teaching Portfolio

The Teaching Portfolio should contain enough detail to allow evaluation of teaching and yet be concise and selective. It should be no more than 20 pages in length and should include the following (see following pages for specific guidelines):

What you do:

1. a narrative statement describing your roles and responsibilities in teaching, including a description of your involvement in curricular development and administration.
2. a table (“grid”) summarizing your teaching activities

How well you do it:

3. a summary of evaluations of your teaching (on the “grid”), followed on the next page by representative evaluative comments.
4. (optional) a discussion of the significance of the evaluation data
5. (optional) additional information.

A description of each of these sections follows.
1. A narrative statement that helps readers at the Department, School, and University levels understand your teaching. Introduce and explain your teaching responsibilities and roles (the "landscape" of your teaching). Describe the scope of your teaching, including the settings in which you teach and the activities you carry out, such as course direction, delivery of lectures, mentoring, precepting, and advising. If applicable, please describe in narrative form your activities in curriculum development and administration of teaching, such as:

- Course/curriculum development and instructional design/development
- Departmental or school educational administration
- Educational committees or task forces (local, regional, national/international)

2. A table ("quantitative grid") summarizing each of your teaching activities in enough detail to determine your teaching load. Please group your activities according to effort, from most to least. Consider the following categories:

- Lectures
- Small-group interactive instruction
- Clinical bedside instruction
- Clinical procedure instruction
- Clinical ambulatory instruction
- Laboratory precepting
- Online instruction
- Mentoring/advising (Indicate number of mentees and time commitment for each: medical students, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, faculty, others)
- Essays/Theses/Dissertations directed (List students by name, level, title of project)
- Visiting Professor/Lecturer (e.g., invited short courses or lectures plus interactions with students/trainees)
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teaching Activity and Type of Learner(s)</th>
<th>Your Role</th>
<th>Total # of contact hours this year</th>
<th>Total # of hours in preparation this year</th>
<th>Total # of learners</th>
<th>Evaluation: Mean, SD (if appropriate and available), scoring scale; other evaluative/outcome data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Include summary evaluation data or outcome data in the last column of the grid. Provide representative comments from learner evaluations following the grid, identifying the associated teaching activity.

If you wish, please feel free to discuss the significance of the evaluation data presented. You may wish to include written evaluations of teaching from individuals familiar with your teaching performance.

Please describe awards and any other recognition of your excellence in teaching.

4. Include copies of supportive letters and teaching awards, if desired.
Procedure for Evaluation of Teaching Portfolio

The following factors are suggested to be used by the departmental committee charged with evaluating the Teaching Portfolio to assess the quality as well as the quantity of the faculty member’s teaching.

The committees charged with evaluating the teaching performance of faculty shall base their evaluations solely on the materials included in the Teaching Portfolio and on criteria established by the School of Medicine Faculty Senate. Each departmental committee shall prepare a Teaching Portfolio Evaluation, providing a numerical score from 1.0 (high) to 4.0.

**Score 1.** A faculty member placed in Group 1 should have a record of outstanding teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels (where there are graduate programs). Outstanding teaching should be evidenced by very high levels of performance on all pertinent teaching criteria, by concrete evidence of highly favorable student evaluation, by demonstrably high levels of student learning, and wherever possible by past recognition from faculty colleagues for teaching excellence. In general, “outstanding teaching” identifies faculty members who would be in the top quarter of those in their school or college in instructional effectiveness.

**Score 2.** Faculty members placed in Group 2 should have demonstrated effective teaching on most pertinent teaching criteria. There should be concrete evidence of favorable student evaluation and of high levels of student learning. The standard for placing a faculty member in Group 2 is that he/she must be engaged in teaching that, while not among the very highest group in the school or college, would clearly qualify him/her to meet the current standard for promotion to his/her present professorial rank.

**Score 3.** Faculty members placed in Group 3 should be engaged in effective teaching on some of the pertinent teaching criteria. Generally such faculty members will receive somewhat mixed reviews of teaching from students and from faculty colleagues, and evidence of student learning will be mixed. In general, a faculty member placed in Group 3 is engaged in satisfactory teaching, but his/her teaching would not be sufficient to gain promotion to his/her present rank using current promotion standards.

**Score 4.** A faculty member placed in Group 4 generally receives substantially less favorable student and peer evaluations of teaching as compared to faculty peers in the same school/college, and the evidence of student learning is mixed. The quality of teaching for faculty members in Group 4 is below that which would be expected to gain promotion to his/her present rank and would not be sufficient to gain appointment to the University in any rank.