

# A Scoping Review Protocol of the Teaching Portfolio in Higher Education: Past, Purposes, Processes, and Practices

## Authors

Cheryl Jeffs<sup>1</sup> K. Alix Hayden<sup>2</sup> Shauna Rutherford<sup>3</sup>

1. Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning, University of Calgary, AB, Canada
2. Taylor Family Digital Library, University of Calgary, AB, Canada
3. Systematic Review Specialist, Calgary, AB, Canada

## Objective

The objective of this scoping review is to document the extent and type of evidence of the teaching portfolio in higher education, including the past, purposes, processes, and practices. This review will address the research question “what is known about the teaching portfolio in higher education?”

## Introduction

Most seminal and foundational literature on the teaching portfolio (also known as a dossier) in higher education is from the 1990s to 2010 with one review completed by Wolf (1991) which includes a synthesis of research. What is known is a limited amount of detail about the *past* (history, definitions & terms), *purposes* (tenure, promotion, career development, awards), *processes* (evaluation & assessment), and *practices* (how to develop) a teaching portfolio (Chism, 2006; Knapper, 1995; Knapper & Wright, 2001; Millis, 1991; Seldin et al., 2010). What is not known is the current documentation of the teaching portfolio and this scoping review will fill this decade-long gap.

A preliminary search of Google Scholar was conducted to determine if there were previously documented scoping or systematic reviews on our topic. We discovered one current review that investigated the use of portfolios for medical educators. We decided to keep our context as any faculty, instructors, or other academic staff to investigate the topic of teaching portfolios in higher education.

## Methods

“Scoping reviews are used to identify knowledge gaps, set research agendas, and identify implications for decision making” (Tricco et al., 2016, p.1). Our scoping review will follow the Joanna Briggs Institute’s methodology for scoping reviews (Peters et al., 2020 version). Components will include the search strategy, sources of evidence, data extraction, analysis, and presentation of the results.

## Review question

This scoping review will address the broad question “What is known about the teaching portfolio in higher education?” The scoping review will produce a systematic, transparent, and reproducible search for information about the teaching portfolio, collate and synthesize to include current work, and inform future research (Colquhoun et al., 2014). The research intends to outline the history (past), definitions,

and terms related to the teaching portfolio in higher education, and to explore and document related purposes, processes, and practices.

## Eligibility criteria

### Participants

This review will include any academic staff in higher education who develops and or evaluates teaching portfolios, including (but not limited to) faculty, professors, instructors, deans, academic developers, academic librarians, and administrators (other roles will be identified and specific to global terms, eg., tertiary education). Excluded from the criteria are graduate students, postdoctoral scholars (or fellows), and/or teachers in training in higher education (pre-service teachers). Kindergarten to grade-12 staff, administrators, and students are also excluded.

### Concept

The concept in this scoping review focuses specifically on the teaching portfolio in higher education. Evidence that documents the history (past) and definitions, purposes of the teaching portfolio such as tenure, promotion, job postings, and award criteria, the institutional processes of evaluating and assessing a portfolio, and practices including individuals' development of a portfolio and its contents. Exclusion criteria include student learning portfolios and teaching philosophies that are not integrated into a document.

### Context

The context for this scoping review includes global higher education (postsecondary) institutions including universities, colleges, institutes, polytechnic, research-intensive, and comprehensive.

## Types of Sources

This scoping review will consider all types of study designs including experimental, quasi-experimental, and qualitative. Further, conceptual, descriptive articles as well as text and opinion papers will be included.

Literature reviews including any knowledge synthesis reviews will not be included.

Grey literature will not be included: Books, book chapters, dissertations, documents not published in a journal, conference abstracts, and preprints.

## Methods

The proposed scoping review will be conducted per accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping reviews (Peters et al., 2020 version).

## Search strategy

The search strategy aims to discover all relevant published studies. An initial discovery search of Google Scholar was conducted to identify key articles on the topic. Further, the PI provided seminal studies. The text words in the titles and abstracts of the key/seminal articles, along with the index terms from ERIC were used to develop a full search strategy. The search focuses on three main concepts: teaching

portfolio and/or dossier, faculty, and higher education. For each concept, both keywords and index terms are used. The search was piloted against the known seed/key studies. The final search, in ERIC, is available in Appendix A. The search strategy will be translated and adapted for each database.

Only studies available in English will be included because of feasibility and translation concerns, and there will be no date restrictions.

Table 1 identifies the disciplinary databases and Table 2 identifies the interdisciplinary databases to be searched.

Table 1

*Disciplinary Databases*

| Disciplinary Databases               | Platform | Discipline                     |
|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| APA PsycInfo                         | OVID     | Psychology                     |
| Business Source Complete             | Ebsco    | Business                       |
| CINAHL Plus with Full Text           | Ebsco    | Nursing & Allied Health        |
| Compendex (Engineering Village)      | Elsevier | Engineering / Computer Science |
| ERIC                                 | Ebsco    | Education                      |
| Education Research Complete          | Ebsco    | Education                      |
| Library & Information Science Source | Ebsco    | Library Science`               |
| Medline                              | OVID     | Medicine / Health Sciences     |

Table 2

*Interdisciplinary Databases*

| Interdisciplinary Databases | Platform  | Discipline        |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Academic Research Complete  | Ebsco     | Interdisciplinary |
| Scopus                      | Elsevier  | Interdisciplinary |
| Web of Science              | Clarivate | Interdisciplinary |

## Study selection

Following the search, all identified records will be uploaded to Covidence, where duplicates will be automatically removed. A pilot test will be conducted on a sample of 50 randomly selected

titles/abstracts whose purpose is to clarify the inclusion/exclusion criteria, if required, and to ensure that all reviewers are applying the selection criteria in the same manner. The pilot test will be conducted through Excel, and a percent agreement amongst all reviewers of 85% is required before moving forward with screening.

Following the pilot test, titles and abstracts will be screened independently by two reviewers. Potentially relevant studies will be retrieved in full text and screened again by two independent reviewers. At this phase, reasons for exclusion will be documented. Any disagreements that arise at each stage of the selection process will be discussed to resolve differences. The results of the search and the study inclusion process will be reported in full in the final scoping review and will adhere to the reporting guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) (Tricco et al., 2018). The PRISMA 2020 Flow Diagram will be used to illustrate the study selection process (Page et al., 2021).

## Extraction of the results

Data will be extracted from the included studies by one reviewer. Prior to data extraction, the team will work together to pilot three to five included studies to ensure accuracy and team understanding as well as test the data extraction form. The data extraction form will be modified and adapted as required. Spot checking of the data extraction of 10% of included studies will be done by an additional reviewer. The categories for extraction are presented in Appendix A.

### Draft Data Extraction Chart

- Author(s)
- Year of publication
- Title of document or article
- Origin/country of origin
- Type of document or article (research, resource, guide, conceptual, opinion)
- Objective or aims of document or article
- Discipline specific
- History of the teaching portfolio
- Definition of a teaching portfolio
- Teaching philosophy focused
- Teaching portfolio focused
- Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI)
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)
- Both teaching philosophy and teaching portfolio focused
- Portfolio purposes (tenure, promotion, award, career development)
- Evaluation or assessment (processes) details
- Findings and/or recommendations
- Implications

## Presentation of the results

To address the broad question “What is known about the teaching portfolio in higher education?”, the presentation of the results of this scoping review will be categorized under four main concepts: Past, Purposes, Processes, and Practices and will be mapped to the previously identified PCC inclusion criteria.

1. PAST. This category will include highlights of the history of the teaching portfolio and common elements of definitions and terms used to describe and define the teaching portfolio.
2. PURPOSES. This category will identify the most common purposes of a teaching portfolio which to date include tenure, promotion, teaching awards, and career advancement.
3. PROCESSES. This category will explore the various processes institutions have developed for the evaluation and assessment of teaching portfolios and will include references to self-assessment and/or peer-review.
4. PRACTICES. This category will identify reports of how individuals develop a teaching portfolio and document various resources on how to develop a portfolio.

This section will be expanded on at the end of the scoping review.

This scoping review does not require institutional ethics approval. Results will be disseminated in at least one peer-review journal, published reports, and presentations at appropriate conferences.

## References

- Chism, N. (2006) Teaching awards: What do they award? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(4), 589-617, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3838709>
- Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., O'Brien, K., Straus, S., Tricco, A., Perrier, L., Kastner, M., & Moher, D. (2014). Scoping reviews: Time for clarity in definition, methods, and reporting. *J. Clin Epidemiol*, 67(12), 1291-1294, <https://doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.03.013>
- Knapper, C. (1995). The origins of teaching portfolios. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 5(1), 45-56.
- Knapper, C., & Wright, W. A. (2001). Using portfolios to document good teaching: Premises, purposes, practices. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 88, 19-29.
- Millis, B. (1992). Putting the teaching portfolio in context. *To Improve the Academy*, 220. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1219&context=podimproveacad>
- Page, M., McKenzie, E., Bossuyt, M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, C., Mulrow, D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J., Akl, E., Brennan, S., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M., Li, T., Loder, E., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., . . . Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372(71), 1-9, <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Peters, M.D.J., Godfrey C., McInerney P., Munn Z., Tricco A.C., & Khalil, H. (2020). Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E., & Munn Z. (Eds). (2020 version). *JBIM Manual for Evidence Synthesis*, <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-01>
- Seldin, P., Miller, J. E., & Seldin, C. A. (2010). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- The Joanna Briggs Institute. (2015). *Joanna Brigs Institute reviewers' manual supplement*. <https://nursing.lsuhscc.edu/JBI/docs/ReviewersManuals/Scoping-.pdf>
- Tricco, A., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K., Colquhoun, H., Kastner, M., Levac, D., Ng, C., Sharpe, J., Wilson, K., Kenny, M., Wilson, C., Stelfox, H., & Straus, S. (2016). A scoping review on the conduct and reporting of scoping reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 16(15), 1-10, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-016-0116-4>
- Tricco, A., Lillie, E., Zarin W., O'Brien, K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M., Garritty, C., . . . Straus, S. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169, 467–473, <https://doi:10.7326/M18-0850>
- Wolf, K. (1991). Teaching portfolios: Synthesis of research and annotated bibliography. *Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development*, 1-36, ERIC Number: ED343890

## APPENDIX A

### ERIC Search

January 10, 2022

| #   | Query  | Limiters/Expanders                      | Results |
|-----|--|---|---------|
| S1  | DE "Portfolios (Background Materials)" OR DE "Portfolio Assessment"  | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 5,652   |
| S2  | TI ( teach* N2 (portfolio* or dossier* or philosophy or statement* ) ) OR KW ( teach* N2 (portfolio* or dossier* or philosophy or statement* ) ) OR AB ( teach* N2 (portfolio* or dossier* or philosophy or statement* ) )   | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 3,485   |
| S3  | TI ( (academic or faculty or tenure or promotion) N2 (portfolio* or dossier* ) ) OR AB ( (academic or faculty or tenure or promotion) N2 (portfolio* or dossier* ) ) OR KW ( (academic or faculty or tenure or promotion) N2 (portfolio* or dossier* ) )   | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 164     |
| S4  | S1 OR S2 OR S3   | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 8,307   |
| S5  | SU faculty   | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 85,309  |
| S6  | DE "Faculty" OR DE "Deans" OR DE "Department Heads" OR DE "Academic Rank (Professional)"   | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 7,009   |
| S7  | TI ( (faculty or professor* or "department head*" or dean or deans) ) OR KW ( (faculty or professor* or "department head*" or dean or deans) ) OR AB ( (faculty or professor* or "department head*" or dean or deans) )  | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 94,608  |
| S8  | TI ( (universit* or college*) N2 (teacher* or instructor* or scholar or scholars) ) OR KW ( (universit* or college*) N2 (teacher* or instructor* or scholar or scholars) ) OR AB ( (universit* or college*) N2 (teacher* or instructor* or scholar or scholars) )  | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 14,932  |
| S9  | S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8   | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 149,197 |
| S10 | DE "Higher Education" OR DE "Postsecondary Education" OR DE "Colleges" OR DE "Universities"  | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 512,425 |
| S11 | TI ( tertiary or "higher education" or universit* or college* or postsecondary or post-secondary or academia or polytechnic* ) OR KW ( tertiary or "higher education" or universit* or college* or postsecondary or post-secondary or academia or polytechnic* ) OR AB ( tertiary or "higher education" or universit* or college* or postsecondary or post-secondary or academia or polytechnic* ) | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 409,857 |

|     |                   |   |         |
|-----|-------------------|---|---------|
| S12 | S10 OR S11        | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 622,679 |
| S13 | S4 AND S9 AND S12 | Search modes - Find all my search terms | 1,341   |