Teaching Portfolios: Uses and Development

Laurie A. Babin, Teri Root Shaffer, and Amy Morgan Tomas

There is a trend in higher education to take teaching more seriously. Concurrent with this trend is a shift in undergraduate education from an instructional paradigm where the emphasis is on delivering instruction and transferring knowledge to a learning paradigm where the emphasis is on designing, developing, and creating a powerful learning environment. With these trends comes the dilemma of how to evaluate and improve teaching effectiveness. This has contributed to the growing popularity of the teaching portfolio. This article explores the concept and usefulness of a teaching portfolio for marketing educators. By defining a teaching portfolio, describing its uses, and providing guidelines for developing a teaching portfolio, the authors hope to encourage the implementation of teaching portfolios by marketing educators.

There is a movement in higher education to reevaluate the roles of college faculty. The Carnegie Foundation's 1990 report, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (Boyer 1990), delineates four scholarly roles for faculty: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. In 1994, the Carnegie Foundation surveyed chief academic officers at all of the country's 4-year colleges and universities and reported that more than 80% either had recently reexamined their systems of faculty roles and rewards or planned to do so (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997). The study also found that more than two thirds of the institutions were developing new methods to evaluate teaching, such as peer reviews of teaching materials, self-evaluations or personal statements, alumni opinions, and evidence of student achievement.

This movement calls for a more serious focus on teaching itself, the enhancement of its status as a scholarly activity as well as the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The movement has underpinnings in various constituencies. Given the escalating costs of a college education, many of the groups served by these institutions are calling for more accountability in providing value for those education dollars. Also, many educators themselves care deeply about teaching and are behind the movement (Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan 1991). Furthermore, the debate of teaching versus research has evolved into a perspective that teaching is a form of scholarship, a perspective gaining popularity among academe (see Boyer 1990; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997).

Barr and Tagg (1995) described another paradigm shift in undergraduate education as moving the educational community away from an instructional paradigm toward a learning paradigm. Under the instructional paradigm, the university provides students with the opportunities to learn. Under the learning paradigm, the university's responsibility shifts to the actual degree to which students learn (Barr and Tagg 1995). The faculty member under the old paradigm is charged with providing/delivering instruction, transferring his or her own knowledge to students, and offering courses. The faculty member under the new paradigm is asked to be far more active in helping to produce learning, through design, development, and creation of a powerful learning environment, one in which "effective learning technologies are continually identified, developed, tested, implemented, and assessed against one another" (Barr and Tagg 1995, p. 15).

Whereas the professor at a podium lecturing to students is a classic depiction of the instructional paradigm, the learning paradigm expands our view to encompass a "learning environment." This environment covers a wide range of professor-student interactions that may occur well beyond the bounds of traditional lecture formats to provide opportunities for learning to occur. These teaching methods, or learning technologies, may occur within the classroom setting such as multimedia course delivery, case-based teaching, group or individual in-class activities, creative production, or team teaching. The learning technologies may also extend the learning environment beyond the traditional classroom to include distance or Web-based learning, computer or media lab settings, supervised internships or independent studies, or on-site programs developed with business or practitioners.

With this movement to expand our views of effective teaching and learning methods, however, comes the dilemma of how to assess as well as improve teaching effectiveness. This dilemma has contributed to the growing popularity of the

Laurie A. Babin is an associate professor of marketing at the University of Southern Mississippi. Teri Root Shaffer is an associate professor of marketing at Southeastern Louisiana University. Amy Morgan Tomas is an assistant professor of marketing at Roger Williams University.

Journal of Marketing Education, Vol. 24 No. 1, April 2002 35-42
© 2002 Sage Publications

teaching portfolio (Anderson 1993; Knapper 1995; Seldin 1997). With emphasis on research as the only true scholarly activity at many institutions of higher education, teaching is considered a relatively private endeavor among professors. In fact, teaching is seldom shared openly. Rarely does one colleague visit another's classroom for purposes of evaluation or improvement. Rather, teaching effectiveness is usually determined through student evaluations, with 98% of the universities/colleges in the Carnegie study reporting using systematic student evaluations of classroom teaching.

Dissatisfaction with and perceived lack of control over the teaching evaluation process led the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) in the early 1970s to propose teaching portfolios, later named teaching dossiers in that country (Knapper 1995). It was not until 1980, however, that Shore and colleagues from the CAUT published the *Guide to the Teaching Dossier: Its Preparation and Use*. A growing body of how-to literature about developing teaching portfolios primarily mirrors the guidelines provided in the aforementioned monograph, the most prolific advocate being Seldin (1991, 1993, 1997). In addition to how-to literature, what are also surfacing are many unresolved issues regarding the implementation of teaching portfolios, primarily for evaluative purposes. Despite these issues, teaching portfolios cannot be ignored, as evidenced by the growing number of books, articles, and an entire issue of the *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching* (1995, vol. 6, no. 1) devoted to the topic.

Although no descriptive research reports the prevalence of teaching portfolios at either the university or college level, the 1994 Carnegie study does indicate a trend toward other methods of evaluating teaching in addition to student evaluations. For example, for purposes of tenure and promotion, many provosts reported currently using or considering the use of self-evaluation or personal statements (82% using, 12% considering); peer review of syllabi, examinations, and other teaching materials (62% using, 29% considering); peer review of classroom teaching (58% using, 33% considering); evidence of continuing student interest (34% using, 26% considering); alumni opinions (31% using, 29% considering); student evaluation of advising (24% using, 42% considering); and evidence of student achievement (24% using, 42% considering). Seldin (1997) claimed that the use of or experimentation with teaching portfolios for the purposes of evaluation and/or teaching improvement has grown dramatically, from only a handful of schools using them in 1990 to more than 1,000 in 1996. Anderson (1993) profiled the specific uses of portfolios at 25 college campuses.

The concept and application of teaching portfolios transcends levels of education as well as academic boundaries. While gaining widespread use in higher education, this concept is also well entrenched at other levels of education and is used for K-12 teacher assessment programs (e.g., Bird 1990; Shulman 1988; Wolf 1991) as well as teacher training programs (e.g., Wenzlaff 1998). There are several examples of applications across disciplines as well (for several examples, see Seldin 1991, 1993, 1997). Finally, the concept has been introduced into the marketing literature (e.g., Gifford 1997, 1998).

Despite its increasing prevalence, the portfolio concept is understandably met with skepticism. One may ask what is to be gained from the time invested in completing the teaching portfolio process when one is already required to submit a variety of teaching documents as a part of annual evaluations. This is certainly a logical question given the many demands on a faculty member's time. The answer lies in the critical distinction between evaluation and assessment. Both terms refer to processes in place to examine a performance, result, or skill. While the goal of the evaluation process is to "make a judgement or determination against a standard (or set of standards) to see if the standards were met," the goal of the assessment process is to offer feedback, "document growth and provide directives to improve future performance" (Pacific Crest 2000). Thus, the true strength of the teaching portfolio concept is its role in the *assessment* process, within the reflective nature of the process itself. The portfolio approach offers the possibility for teaching enhancement as a result of going through the development process. As Zubizarreta (1994) argued, the traditional evaluation process provides somewhat limited information in terms of assisting in improving and mastering teaching, while compilation of the portfolio encourages formative growth and development through reflection.

Attention to reflection, the regular and intentional research into one's own teaching practices, is referred to by Boyer (1990) in detailed discussion of the scholarship of teaching. Schon (1983) and Zubizarreta (1994, 1995) have also discussed this reflective aspect of the portfolio process at length. In his 1994 article, Zubizarreta illustrated several assessment-based applications of the teaching portfolio, which extend well beyond the boundaries of the standard evaluation process. He noted that

> faculty members have compiled portfolios for practical improvement, for the revaluation of specific methods and outcomes in designated courses, for post-tenure reviews, for reflection on pedagogical or methodological experiments, or for the purpose of leaving a legacy of valuable experience to junior faculty members. (p. 323)

The purpose of this article is to provide insight for marketing educators about this phenomenon called a teaching portfolio by defining it, describing its uses, and providing guidelines for its development. We claim neither originality nor exhaustiveness of this topic, but we hope to encourage the implementation of teaching portfolios by marketing educators. Even though some schools may already require a teaching portfolio or something like it without calling it that, many faculty members are still confused as to what exactly a portfo-

lio is and how to develop one. Personal experience of one of the authors in which all business faculty are required to submit a teaching portfolio for annual review without guidelines as to what it should entail or how it will be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness has led to much confusion and discontent. The university handbook guidelines merely state that "other material, " such as course syllabi, evidence of curriculum revision, and professional development, may be considered for evaluative purposes, with no clear guidelines as to how this should be submitted or evaluated.

The teaching portfolio concept described in this article provides a focus, which is summed up by Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (1991):

> General reflection, divorced from evidence of actual performance, fails to capture the situated nature of teaching. Work samples alone aren't intelligible. But work samples plus reflection make a powerful formula. The reflection is "grounded" by being connected to a particular instance of teaching; the work sample is made meaningful and placed in context through reflection. (p. 9)

WHAT IS A TEACHING PORTFOLIO?

While several have proffered definitions of the term *teaching portfolio*, the one used here is

> a factual description of a professor's major strengths and teaching achievements. It describes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance. It is to teaching what lists of publications, grants and honors are to research and scholarship. (Seldin 1991, p. 3)

First, a teaching portfolio is a factual description. While reflective comments are deemed the strength of portfolios, especially when used for formative evaluation, concrete evidence (i.e., syllabi, assignments, feedback to students, evidence of students' learning, and evidence of professional development) must be present to support the claims and reflective comments. (Factual evidence is particularly important when portfolios are used for summative evaluation.) At the very least, some required elements must be present for teaching portfolios to be used as an effective evaluation of faculty for personnel decisions such as tenure, promotion, and annual evaluations or in situations in which portfolios will be compared with one another, such as when selecting candidates to receive a teaching award (Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan 1991). However, a teaching portfolio is more than a collection of artifacts. The portfolio also communicates the significance of each item with respect to one's teaching effectiveness. Basically, the portfolio is a summary of teaching efforts, activities, and accomplishments with the "raw data" not necessarily included. Knapper (1995) analogized this distinction as a "shoe box in which receipts for income and expenses during the year are kept and the summary filed on an income tax return" (p. 50). The actual portfolio itself would be similar to completing the income tax return with the knowledge that every item claimed must be supported when called on.

Second, a teaching portfolio provides a factual description of an individual's major strengths and teaching achievement. Should everything a professor attempts (and perhaps fails) be included, or should a portfolio represent only "best" work and successes? Again, the purpose of the portfolio would drive the answer to this question, but experts (e.g., Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan 1991; Seldin 1991, 1993; Wolf 1991) conclude consistently that for summative evaluation purposes, a portfolio should represent best work, much like an artist's portfolio. Indeed, does one include in a curriculum vitae all the rejection letters or studies conducted that did not produce desired (or any?) results (Knapper 1995)? However, if a portfolio is used for formative evaluation, it would seem appropriate to include failures so that one can learn and improve by reflecting on what did or did not work (Van Wagenen and Hibbard 1998).

Finally, materials assembled in a teaching portfolio collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance. That is, multiple indications of teaching performance are used instead of relying on only one, which traditionally has been student course evaluations. Shackelford and Simpson (1994) reported on the value of teaching portfolios over traditional (student evaluation) methods of teaching assessment. The opportunity to provide a collection of evidence and examples related to teaching offers a more comprehensive assessment reflective of the actual scope of a faculty member's efforts. These authors emphasized that the true value of incorporating portfolios in faculty assessment is in taking the sum of that faculty member's efforts rather than isolated pieces of evidence. Thus, the teaching portfolio should paint a truer picture of one's teaching scholarship. Moreover, the Stanford Teacher Assessment Project conducted an empirical examination and recommended a holistic approach to evaluating teaching with portfolios rather than evaluating individual elements of a portfolio separately to come up with a "score" of one's teaching performance (Wolf 1991). The approach supports the portfolio as a document that contains evidence *collectively* suggesting one's performance.

USES OF TEACHING PORTFOLIOS

While specific uses for teaching portfolios are varied, they all can be classified as either for evaluation (i.e., summative evaluation) or for professional development (i.e., formative evaluation) purposes. Summative evaluation purposes include personnel decisions (e.g., promotion, tenure, annual reviews, teaching awards), salary decisions (e.g., market and merit pay considerations), and career decisions (e.g., position

searches and grant applications). Formative evaluation purposes encompass uses related to teaching practices (e.g., teaching enhancement, introspection, professional planning, revitalization, and constructive feedback/interaction) (Seldin 1993).

Summative evaluation was the original intent for the development of teaching portfolios when they were proposed by the CAUT (Knapper 1995). The campus uses of teaching portfolios profiled in Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (1991) also indicate that they are used primarily for this purpose. What a teaching portfolio provides, in essence, is a more concrete, defendable tool to evaluate an individual's teaching ability and effectiveness. This is probably the primary objective for one to develop a portfolio, either voluntarily or required: to communicate to others one's teaching effectiveness.

However, Seldin (1993) as well as others (e.g., Anderson 1993; Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan 1991) argued that this objective might actually be secondary to the "process" of developing a teaching portfolio. These authors claimed that the process of developing a portfolio is actually more beneficial than the resulting portfolio itself. Anyone who has endeavored to develop a teaching portfolio will readily agree that the process of developing one does provide insight into one's teaching, which, in turn, may facilitate improvement. Furthermore, since it is recommended that faculty members develop their portfolio collaboratively with colleagues and administrators, experts claim that the true benefit is open discussion about teaching and what constitutes *good* teaching, enhancing its status as scholarship and encouraging improvement.

DEVELOPING A TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Many experts on teaching portfolios recommend following a step-by-step approach to creating a portfolio (e.g., O'Neil and Wright 1993; Seldin 1991, 1993, 1997). Included in these sources are several examples, for it is recommended that models be available when developing a portfolio. Developing an initial teaching portfolio may require substantial time and commitment, but once an initial portfolio is established, updating and modifying becomes a much less time-intensive endeavor. Developing a portfolio requires reflection on what one teaches, how one teaches, why one teaches that way, how effective that is, and, if necessary or desired, effectively communicating that to others. This encompasses precisely what Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) put forth as standards by which any scholarly work should be assessed. Possible items to reflect on and include in this process are given in Table 1.

The scope encompassed by the portfolio would be dictated by the intended use as well as the time frame covered by the portfolio. For example, a teaching portfolio used for tenure and promotion decisions should cover several years. One for an annual evaluation would typically cover the immediately preceding year. If one wanted to demonstrate improvement over time, however, it would be appropriate to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness over time. A portfolio could also be developed for an individual course (e.g., Cerbin 1994) or for an entire department (e.g., Knapper 1995). The process described below would be applicable regardless of the scope of the portfolio.

TABLE 1
POSSIBLE ELEMENTS TO INCLUDE IN A TEACHING PORTFOLIO

- Teaching responsibilities
  - Courses taught
  - Number of different preparations
  - Number of students in each class
  - Level of students taught
  - Ratio of majors to nonmajors in classes
  - Discussion of and hours per week spent on teaching-related activities
  - Course content
  - Off-campus, overload, and summer teaching
  - Advising and office hours
  - Internship or mentoring responsibilities (i.e., theses, dissertations)
  - Nature of class schedule
- Teaching philosophy
  - Basic goals and outcomes desired
  - Your image of students
  - Different goals and missions for different courses
  - Role of your discipline in students' education
  - Teaching style
  - Lessons from mentors and role models
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness
  - Self-evaluation
  - Statements from observers of your classes
  - Colleagues' evaluations of course materials
  - Student evaluations
  - Teaching awards/honors
  - Audiotape or videotape of teaching with outside evaluation
  - Pretesting/posttesting
  - Samples of student work
  - Evaluation by alumni and/or business community
  - Evidence of curricular revision
  - Student performance on standardized tests
- Instructional improvement
  - Participation in teaching seminars
  - Participation at sessions at professional meetings dealing with teaching
  - Papers/presentations related to teaching
  - Texts published or reviewed for publishers
  - Evolving course content
  - Innovative activities
  - Integrative and cross-functional approaches

Step 1: Describe Recent and Current Teaching Responsibilities

Most teaching portfolios begin with a description of teaching-related activities. This description should include a listing of courses taught, the course content, the number of different preparations, and which courses are required and which are elective. The courses should also be described with respect to undergraduate and graduate classes, class enrollment sizes, and ratio of majors to nonmajors. However, in addition to describing teaching responsibilities, this section should also include other activities that are related to teaching, such as being a faculty advisor for a student organization, academic advising activities, office hours, internship and mentoring responsibilities, or any other information related to teaching responsibilities. This factual description can typically be accomplished in less than one page.

While this step is basically descriptive, it can also be enlightening. For example, one faculty member was surprised to learn that of the 50 or so students enrolled in one of his courses, a marketing elective, marketing majors comprised only 30% of the students. This realization led him to analyze enrollments for previous semesters to learn if this semester was unusual. He found that for the previous 3 years, the majority of students enrolled in that particular course were not only nonmarketing majors, but they were non-*business* majors taking that course for a required marketing minor. This information led him to revise how he taught that course, resulting in better student understanding, not to mention better student evaluations of the course. Knowledge of this fact also encouraged him to analyze why he was attracting so few marketing majors to this elective, which opened dialog among faculty members teaching "competing" marketing elective courses.

Step 2: Construct a Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Strategies

While the first step is a factual statement of teaching responsibilities, the second step is a reflective statement of teaching philosophy, strategies, objectives, and methodologies, which encompasses the standards of clear goals and appropriate methods espoused by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997). This step requires a faculty member to reflect on his or her teaching philosophy and the methodologies that are employed to implement this philosophy to achieve learning-based outcomes for different courses. It may also require an individual to explore his or her image of students and the role of his or her discipline and course in the lives of students.

On reflection, a faculty member should develop a concise statement (two to three pages) narrating his or her teaching philosophy and pedagogy. In this reflective statement, the faculty member should discuss what he or she hopes students will accomplish and why these particular learning objectives are important and how they fit the content of the course. Detailed descriptions of instructional methods used to achieve these objectives will make the teaching portfolio more effective.

In truth, one of the most significant parts of the portfolio is this self-reflection on one's teaching philosophy. Preparing it can help an individual unearth new discoveries about oneself as a teacher (Seldin 1997). Seldin (1997) cautioned against rushing through this step and compiling portfolio contents and supporting data prematurely, however. This is analogous to putting the cart before the horse. Taking time to reflect on one's teaching philosophies and strategies should serve as a guide to constructing the rest of the portfolio. This philosophy and approach to teaching should guide subsequent steps, including selecting portfolio items, arranging the order of the items in the portfolio, and compiling supporting data for the portfolio appendix. The emphasis is shifted from what is done in the classroom to why it is done.

Step 3: Select Items for the Portfolio

The original guide for developing a portfolio proffered by Shore et al. (1980) listed 45 different potential items that could be included in a portfolio, which was later expanded to 49 items (Shore et al. 1986). Of course, no one portfolio could, or should, contain all the items listed, as each portfolio is unique, especially when constructed without guidelines as to what items are required. Regardless of whether specific items are required, it is recommended to include a balance of material from (1) products of good teaching, (2) material from oneself, and (3) information from others (Seldin 1991, 1993, 1997; Shore et al. 1980, 1986). While the statement of teaching philosophy and strategies outlines a faculty member's goals and methods, this step provides evidence of adequate preparation, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique, the other standards by which scholarly activity should be assessed (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997).

Although the portfolio is very individualized, there are certain items that seem to consistently appear across all disciplines. Seldin (1997) reviewed more than 300 portfolios and found that the statement of current teaching responsibilities and the reflective statement by faculty members discussing their teaching objectives, strategies, and methodologies are both commonly included in teaching portfolios. Other items most often included are student evaluation data; representative course syllabi detailing course content and objectives, teaching methods, readings, tests, and assignments for all courses taught; and teaching enhancement efforts, such as participation in seminars and workshops.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness can take many forms. Consequently, it is probably the most difficult aspect of the teaching portfolio to document. Included items should be applicable to teaching responsibilities, philosophy, and instructional methods. The choice of items for inclusion may

depend on personal preferences, teaching styles, one's discipline, and the nature of the courses taught. As can be seen in Table 1, some of the items come from the faculty member, while other items may come from students, colleagues, administrators, and alumni; still other items may be products of teaching/student learning.

In addition to constructing a description of teaching responsibilities and a narrative statement of teaching philosophy and methodologies, other reflective statements might be included, such as (1) a description of curricular revisions including new course projects, materials, and class assignments; (2) a personal statement describing teaching goals for the next 5 years; and (3) a description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching including changes resulting from self-evaluation and/or time spent reading publications on improving teaching. A faculty member may also describe instructional innovations and how the effectiveness of these innovations are/were assessed.

Colleagues may contribute items to a faculty member's portfolio. Peers who have observed one's class(es) or reviewed one's teaching materials are equipped to make powerful statements that attest to teaching excellence. Team-teaching and integrative learning assignments can facilitate this process. Audiotape or videotape of teaching with outside evaluation is another alternative. Certainly, honors or recognitions from colleagues for teaching excellence should be included in the teaching portfolio. Statements from alumni or members of the business community can make positive contributions to the effectiveness of the teaching portfolio. An example would be letters from companies/organizations employing interns under a faculty member's supervision. For marketing classes that engage in client-based projects, statements from the clients can provide evidence of effective teaching.

In addition to letters from clients, there are many other products of teaching/student learning that may be selected for inclusion in a teaching portfolio. Such items may include student scores on pre- and postcourse examinations, examples of graded projects/assignments along with the professor's explanation of the grading system, student publications or conference presentations that resulted from course-related works, and performance in student competitions.

Finally, the purpose of a teaching portfolio is not to supplant the use of student evaluations but rather to supplement them for purposes of evaluating and improving teaching effectiveness. For this part of the portfolio, students' responses to individual questions on the evaluation questionnaire can provide evidence of teaching/learning achievement, and this can be highlighted in this part of the portfolio. While some simply include student evaluation reports in an appendix, others use them to effectively illustrate achievement of specific goals. For example, one faculty member's objective in a specific course was to make students aware of current events/issues facing marketers through discussion of articles from the trade and popular presses. This was adequately explained in the statement of philosophy and strategies used, but to show that students actually became aware of current events, she highlighted students' responses to one question on the student evaluation form with the following table:

Item	*MKT 355 Section 1 Mean*	*MKT 355 Section 2 Mean*	*All College Mean*
Instructor adequately discussed current developments in field	4.86	4.83	3.92

She also supplemented this information with students' open-ended comments reflecting the successful attainment of this goal. Even though the entire student evaluation report and the open-ended responses were provided in an appendix of her teaching portfolio, this faculty member made her case much more effectively than relying on her chairman to sift through the reports/comments to find this information. This allows information from student evaluations to be used effectively rather than merely relying on the overall scores at the end of the report, which is recommended by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997).

Step 4: Prepare Statements for Each Item

Once the portfolio items are carefully selected, each should be described. Seldin (1997) cautioned that unexplained evidence is difficult for readers to understand and interpret. For example, including two course syllabi from different years provides evidence of instructional change over time. But the significance of the change and why it took place are not apparent. That is why the addition of a commentary explaining why specific changes were made as well as the impact of those changes on student learning provides more convincing evidence about the professor's efforts to improve instruction (Seldin 1997).

For the portfolio to provide hard-to-ignore evidence on which to make judgments about teaching effectiveness, it must be user-friendly. Preparing statements for each item enhances the ability of the user to understand the significance of the items included in the portfolio.

Step 5: Arrange the Items in Order

The purpose of the portfolio will influence the sequencing of items. If the purpose is to improve teaching over time, items reflecting teaching enhancement efforts, reflections, and self-evaluations may be stressed. If the purpose of the teaching portfolio is for tenure and/or promotion evaluation, items specified by the institution's tenure and promotion guidelines may be emphasized. In the absence of such guidelines, it is imperative for the faculty member to arrange the items such that they communicate adequately, clearly, and persuasively one's teaching effectiveness.

Step 6: Compile the Supporting Data

As previously discussed, there are certain key items, such as syllabi and student ratings, that are commonly found in portfolios and, consequently, that are expected. Supporting materials for these items should be included to validate the contents of the portfolio. These materials may be retained by the professor and made available for review, or they may be placed in an appendix. If the supporting data require substantial physical space (e.g., videotapes, large bound student projects, and compact discs), it is best to discuss these materials in the narrative of the portfolio and make them available on request.

For the appendix to be effective, it must not be overwhelmingly large. Other materials to be submitted as supporting data should, like the items of the portfolio, be painstakingly selected. Items included in an appendix should be clear to readers of the portfolio, especially those readers outside the faculty member's discipline.

Step 7: Incorporate the Portfolio into the Curriculum Vitae

Depending on its purpose, the teaching portfolio can serve as a stand-alone document, or it can be incorporated into a curriculum vita under the heading of "teaching." Anderson (1993) recommended similar treatment with respect to service activities as well, demonstrating a broader picture of one's total scholarship. In essence, the teaching portfolio, combined with one's list of publications and service portfolio, is one's professional portfolio, similar to the dossier developed for major personnel decisions, such as tenure and promotion. It is generally recommended that this dossier be organized into a single document. A three-ring binder works well. In fact, for promotion and tenure decisions, many institutions restrict the curriculum vitae to such a container, often with size restrictions. These restrictions would necessarily limit the size of the teaching portfolio.

CONCLUSION

Under the new learning paradigm described by Barr and Tagg (1995), the value of the faculty member's portfolio becomes even clearer. While traditional methods of faculty assessment can easily quantify the amount of instruction offered through documenting the number of courses taught, activities assigned, and exams given, traditional methods do little to help capture evidence of a learning environment. Through construction of a portfolio, the faculty member is better able to provide a complete picture of the learning environment, as well as a thorough description of the dynamics at work within that environment.

Despite the clear benefits of portfolio development for both individual faculty and the administrators who work with them, anecdotal evidence suggests that the portfolio development process may be met with a less than enthusiastic response. Wolverton (1996) reported on the "portfolio paranoia" (p. 300) that accompanied the introduction of a mandatory portfolio requirement at her school. Assessing the situation, she found that many colleagues " viewed the preparation of portfolios as an activity designed to punish them" (p. 300). Through her case study, Wolverton uncovered several trends detracting from the potential benefits of portfolio development. One issue was difficulty in determining what a portfolio should (or should not) be.

Providing a definition of a portfolio is fairly straightforward. Virtually every definition offered explains the portfolio as some compilation of an individual's professional activity. But what is also important is to provide an explanation of what the portfolio is not. Several ideas should be considered here. First, a portfolio is not a "steamer trunk." The successful portfolio should not be viewed as a repository for every activity, quiz, and homework assignment one has ever used in a class (Wolf 1996). The portfolio should not be viewed as an exhaustive collection of everything but rather a selective and carefully chosen representation of one's teaching experiences.

On the other hand, the tendency to create a scrapbook of personal bests or sentimental favorites with the portfolio also misses the point of the endeavor (Wolf 1996; Wolverton 1996). The faculty member will then become an expert at portfolio development rather than a faculty member searching for opportunities to improve his or her classroom performance (Wolverton 1996). One valuable aspect of portfolio development is its ability to truly capture the faculty member's professional evolution in the classroom. Traditional evaluation methods provide only snapshots in time of classroom activity. The portfolio can "capture the complexities of professional practice in ways that no other approach can" (Wolf 1996, p. 34). As it illustrates activities at various points in time, the portfolio can show some less successful classroom efforts, the steps taken to address problems in those areas, and subsequent efforts improving on the first, showing that learning and development are an ongoing process.

The key to successful implementation of teaching portfolios, it seems, is acceptance by faculty as a means for effectively communicating their teaching effectiveness as well as for enhancing their teaching effectiveness. This is best done with open discussion of the uses, standards, and formats expected of the portfolio. However, in the only empirical study conducted to evaluate the added value of teaching portfolios when compared to student evaluations, it would seem that, for evaluative purposes, teaching portfolios provided no added value when portfolios were scored by deans and a dean-selected peer. That is, the portfolio score correlated highly with several measures from student evaluations with respect to a faculty member's motivational, interpersonal, intellectual, and innovative skills, which seems to imply that the traditional method for evaluating teaching is valid and sufficient since it has also been shown that student evaluation

scores and learning are highly correlated (Centra 1994). However, the underlying benefit will be the open discussion of what is expected of faculty and what constitutes excellent teaching, which in the eyes of many is the true power of teaching portfolios in enhancing teaching and learning excellence. Furthermore, while this study may lead one to conclude that student evaluation scores are adequate for evaluating teaching effectiveness, lone numbers do not provide others, particularly colleagues, with information concerning the activities that resulted in those scores, good or bad. By publicizing portfolios, the sharing of experiences can take place among faculty.

The promise of portfolios lies in their ability to professionalize the scholarship of teaching, similar to the promise of student portfolios. By incorporating student portfolios for marketing students, Goldgehn and Soares (1986) reported that students added more effort and professionalism to the projects included in the portfolios, faculty reported an increase in office-hour visits related to class projects, the quality of the curriculum improved, students were provided with a competitive edge in the job market, and faculty members had concrete information at their access when called on as a reference for a student seeking a job. While student portfolios allow the benefit of providing employers with information of identifiable and measurable job skills for marketing students, requiring teaching portfolios in hiring decisions for faculty would seem to offer the same benefits. Perlman and McCann (1996) gave guidelines in how to use teaching portfolios when recruiting new faculty, stressing that portfolios should be required. Otherwise, how will you learn about the teaching skills of candidates? Certainly, two lines on a resume that mention the teaching interests of the applicant cannot convey this information.

In conclusion, the concept of the teaching portfolio has gone beyond theory and is realizing many useful purposes, the least of which may be the evaluation of teaching. While it may provide a richer picture of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness, its true value is its ability to stimulate interest in teaching as a type of scholarship. This value can only be realized, however, if there is open disclosure and trust in the system in which the portfolio will be used. If implemented in a consistent and constructive manner, benefits will befall those who develop portfolios as well as those who evaluate them by encouraging an open dialog of what exactly is excellence in teaching.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Erin. 1993. *Campus use of the teaching portfolio: Twenty-five profiles*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Barr, Robert B., and John Tagg. 1995. From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, November/December, 13-25.

Bird, T. 1990. The schoolteacher's portfolio: An essay on possibilities. In *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*, edited by J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond, 241-56. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Boyer, Ernest. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Centra, John A. 1994. The use of the teaching portfolio and student evaluations for summative evaluation. *Journal of Higher Education* 65 (5): 555-70.

Cerbin, William. 1994. The course portfolio as a tool for continuous improvement of teaching and learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 5 (1): 95-105.

Edgerton, Russell, Pat Hutchings, and Kathleen Quinlan. 1991. *The teaching portfolio: Capturing scholarship in teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Gifford, Jack. 1997. The teaching portfolio: Documenting teaching effectiveness as marketing professors (part I). *Marketing Educator* 16 (fall): 4.

———. 1998. The teaching portfolio: Documenting teaching effectiveness as marketing professors (Part II). *Marketing Educator* 17 (spring): 8.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professorate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goldgehn, Leslie A., and Eric Soares. 1986. Student marketing portfolios: Professionalizing our discipline and integrating our curriculum. *Journal of Marketing Education* 8 (summer): 14-17.

Knapper, Christopher K. 1995. The origins of teaching portfolios. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 6 (1): 45-56.

O'Neil, M. C., and W. A. Wright. 1993. *Recording teaching accomplishment: A Dalhousie guide to the teaching dossier.* 4th ed. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Office of Instructional Development and Technology, Dalhousie University.

Pacific Crest. 2000. *Assessment and evaluation* [online]. Available from http://www.pcrest.com/evalassess.htm.

Perlman, Baron, and Lee I. McCann. 1996. *Recruiting good college faculty.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Schon, D. 1983. *The reflective practitioner.* New York: Basic Books.

Seldin, Peter. 1991. *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

———. 1993. *Successful uses of teaching portfolios*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

———. 1997. *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. 2d ed. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Shackelford, R., and N. Simpson. 1994. Peer review via the teaching portfolio. Conference proceedings—1994 National Symposium on Improving Teaching Quality, San Antonio, TX.

Shore, B. M., S. F. Foster, C. K. Knapper, G. G. Nadeau, N. Neil, and V. Sim. 1980. *Guide to the teaching dossier: Its preparation and use*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

———. 1986. *The teaching dossier: A guide to its preparation and uses*. Rev. ed. Montreal: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Shulman, Lee. 1988. A union of insufficiencies: Strategies for teacher assessment in a period of education reform. *Educational Leadership* 46 (3): 36-41.

Van Wagenen, Linda, and K. Michael Hibbard. 1998. Building teaching portfolios. *Educational Leadership* 55 (February): 26-29.

Wenzlaff, Terri L. 1998. Dispositions and portfolio development: Is there a connection? *Education* 118 (summer): 564-73.

Wolf, Kenneth. 1991. The school teacher's portfolio: Practical issues in design, implementation, and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan* October: 129-36.

———. 1996. Developing an effective teaching portfolio. *Educational Leadership* 53 (March): 34-37.

Wolverton, Mimi. 1996. Teaching portfolios: The experience at Miami-Dade Community College. *Journal of General Education* 45 (4): 295-305.

Zubizarreta, John. 1994. Teaching portfolios and the beginning teacher. *Phi Delta Kappan* 76 (December): 323-26.

———. 1995. Using teaching portfolio strategies to improve course instruction. In *Improving college teaching*, edited by P. Seldin and Associates, 167-79. Bolton, MA: Anker.