# Teaching Portfolio Feedback Form

The following rubric has been adapted from the [UBC Teaching Dossier Self-Assessment Tool](https://ctlt.ubc.ca/resources/teaching/portfolios/) and has been designed to reflect [McMaster’s Supplemental Policy Statement (SPS) B2](https://secretariat.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/SPS-B2-Teaching-Portfolios-.pdf) on Teaching Portfolios. This rubric includes three sections in which a reviewer may offer feedback to the author of a teaching portfolio: 1) Organization, 2) Content, and 3) Alignment.

## Section 1: Organization

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Yes | No | Comments |
| Does the portfolio include a title page (with the title “Teaching Portfolio,” the creator’s name, and the date, at minimum)?  |  |  |  |
| Is there a table of contents that outlines the parts of the portfolio with page numbers? |  |  |  |
| Is the portfolio organized in a logical, easy-to-follow manner? |  |  |  |
| Is the language used and tone of the portfolio appropriate/professional? |  |  |  |
| Is the portfolio free of grammar and spelling errors? |  |  |  |
| Is the formatting (font, text size, headings, sub-headings) consistent throughout? |  |  |  |
| Is each item in Part B: Supporting Documentation (as outlined by SPS B2) referenced in Part A? |  |  |  |
| Are the portfolio and its included materials accessible (use of headings, file format, etc.)? |  |  |  |

## Section 2: Content

[McMaster’s Supplemental Policy Statement (SPS) B2](https://secretariat.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/SPS-B2-Teaching-Portfolios-.pdf) on Teaching Portfolios outlines requirements for the format and organization of McMaster teaching portfolios, including specific instructions for two Parts. Section 2 of this rubric evaluates a teaching portfolio in accordance with those requirements.

### PART A: Executive Summary

As SPS B2 describes, Part A of a McMaster teaching portfolio consists of five elements that effectively form the executive summary of a potentially much larger portfolio. These five elements can be evaluated in the table below. Note that evidence supporting Part A is to be placed in Part B of a McMaster teaching portfolio (which is evaluated in a subsequent table below).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Yes | No | Comments |
| (i) There is a one-page “Description of Responsibilities and Mechanism of Evaluation drawn from the appointment letter, or updates thereto”. This should outline the percentage breakdown of responsibilities related to teaching, research, and service. |  |  |  |
| (ii) There is an approximately-one-page “Description of Teaching Philosophy/Approach” written in an honest and authentic manner in the first-person perspective. Effective teaching philosophy statements often include the following elements:* Focus on explaining their teaching beliefs/values (and where they came from)
* A brief description of their disciplinary teaching context
* A brief description of their teaching practices (evidenced by a few high-level examples)
* Their impact (e.g. on the student learning experience)
* Their teaching-related goals
 |  |  |  |
| (iii) There is a one-to-two-page “Description of Teaching Practice, including examples of how the approach/philosophy has been realized, or how teaching has been adapted to unusual conditions”. For each example provided, the author should explain what they did, how it aligns to their philosophy, the impact of their approach, and what they learned. These examples may include:* Their key teaching approaches, with explanations for why they teach in those ways
* How they approach designing learning experiences
* What they do to ensure the learning environment is one that is safe, accessible, and inclusive
* Risks they have taken or new/innovative methods they have tried, even if they did not go well
* How they have adapted their teaching in different situations
* How they encourage learning outside of the classroom
* The connection between their teaching or mentoring approaches and disciplinary best practices or McMaster priorities
 |  |  |  |
| (iv) There is an approximately-one-page “Description of Contributions to Teaching.” This section should highlight the author’s impact on teaching and learning beyond their usual classroom or virtual teaching, emphasizing the growth they have fostered in others. It should include a few detailed examples and not resemble a Curriculum Vitae. The examples may fit under some of the following categories: * Curriculum development projects and innovations (e.g., program and/or course design; innovative course materials, assessments, or learning products)
* Involvement in research/scholarship on teaching and learning (e.g., grants for teaching and learning projects; research, presentations, and publications on teaching and learning)
* Service related to teaching (e.g., involvement in curriculum or teaching committees; participation in program reviews; service as a referee for teaching awards)
* Educational leadership they have demonstrated within their department, faculty, or institution (e.g., service as a teaching mentor; facilitation of workshops and events on teaching and learning; coordination of a series, conference, or other event on teaching and learning; integration of key McMaster priorities into their teaching, such as community engagement, student wellness, or supporting international students)
* Reports on issues pertaining to teaching and learning
 |  |  |  |
| (v) There is a section detailing the author’s evidence of teaching effectiveness, which includes the “complete details of responses to the summative question in the student feedback on all courses taught over the past five years” (i.e., the question asking students to rate the overall learning experience).* For each course, include the title, course code, term, number of enrolled students, number of responses to the course evaluation, and the mean score, median score, and standard deviation for the question asking students to rate the overall learning experience.
* The information should be presented as summary tables and set in the context of all the teaching done in the department (e.g., the instructor’s scores for their second year course compared with the scores for all second year courses in the department). It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to provide all instructors with contextual data for all the courses given in each term.
* Students’ comments obtained via end-of-term course surveys are not permitted in Part A of the teaching portfolio. However, student voice is possible in other ways, such as including letters from past students in Part B.
* The author may also choose to supplement the numerical data from their department with a reflection explaining its meaning to them.
 |  |  |  |

### PART B: Supporting Documentation

[SPS B2](https://secretariat.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/SPS-B2-Teaching-Portfolios-.pdf) states that Part B “is optional and may contain additional material compiled by the faculty member in support of Part A”. Sample items may include course materials (e.g., a syllabus, assessment, and evaluation framework), scholarship of teaching and learning publications, participation in professional development in teaching, teaching and learning awards, and letters of support (e.g., from their Dean, Chair, fellow educators, or former students), and more.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item Serving as Supporting Evidence | Comments |
|   |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Are there any items of supporting documentation in Part B that seem unnecessary and do not support the narrative of teaching conveyed in Part A? Is there any missing evidence that would be beneficial to the claims made in Part A?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Section 3: Insight

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Yes | No | Comments |
| Alignment: Are the examples of teaching highlighted throughout the portfolio aligned with the beliefs/values articulated in the teaching philosophy? |  |  |  |
| Scholarly: Are the author’s practices, outcomes, beliefs, or other claims made throughout the portfolio supported by scholarly literature, where appropriate? |  |  |  |
| Complete: Does the author convey the impacts of their teaching? |  |  |  |
| Growth-Oriented: Does the author provide honest reflections on their areas for development? |  |  |  |
| Reflective: Does the author demonstrate thoughtful examination of their teaching beliefs, practices, experiences, or outcomes?  |  |  |  |