

Academic Programs Committee resolution on the 2030 Teaching and Mentoring Excellence (TME) Committee Report Discussion Resolution

I. Introduction

The full Academic Programs Committee reviewed the proposal to revise promotion standards for TT and NTT faculty by integrating the TME proposed *Teaching and Mentoring Effectiveness Framework* into the evaluation for promotion process on 9/10/2025. Subsequently, Sub-Committee A of the Academic Programs Committee, with some members from Sub-Committee B continued the review and discussion on 9/17/2025. Representing the TME Committee at both meetings were Laura Howes, Bridgette Hard, Jerry Reiter. APC was provided with documentation including a Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Report. Overall, the APC was pleased with the TME report valuing its foregrounding of pedagogy and enhancing a culture of teaching excellence.

II. A. Summary of APC discussion 9/10/2025:

Overall, the first meeting focused on the Teaching and Mentoring Effectiveness (TME) frameworks, with brief discussion of promotion standards.

Teaching Effectiveness topics:

- Difficulty in incentivizing student evaluations and improving feedback quality.
- Teaching assignments vary in desirability; weighting left to units.
- Frameworks may need to be adjusted for humanities; units may adapt further.

Mentoring Effectiveness topics:

- Mentor evaluation through self-reflection, mentee feedback, and evidence of mentees' progress.
- Relationships are personal/subjective; annual reports may help in long programs.
- Avoid "rubber stamping" by requiring authentic reflection and mentee letters.
- Learned from strong practices in Nursing and Psychology & Neuroscience; suggested external trainings (e.g., CIMER).
- Tools available for handling unprofessional mentoring.

Faculty Performance Evaluation topics:

- Recognition of less-visible service contributions.
- Mentorship expectations for non-tenure-track faculty set by units.
- Concern about workload of self-evaluations.
- Implementation would be decentralized, with oversight from deans and Office of Faculty Advancement

B. Summary of APC discussion 9/17/2025

Continued TME discussion for integration into promotion standards for TT and NTT faculty.

Promotion Standards:

- Limited research on mentoring in promotion; recommendations from other universities not fully adopted.
- Distinction between advising (UG, service) and mentoring (grad/peers, linked to research).
- Units set standards with Faculty Advancement for equity.

Governing Mechanisms:

- Evaluation across three levels: departments, university committee, and APT.
- APC advised forming support group to help departments tailor templates.

Implementation Challenges:

- Concern about burden on chairs; guidelines needed on interaction of peer input, unit standards, and university oversight.

Peer Input:

- Debate on using observers from adjacent vs. distant fields.
- Graduate School's "Teaching Triangle Report" found distant observers more effective.
- APC recommended continuing distant observers and training graduate students.

Career Track Pathways (replacing term NTT):

- Broad support for new "Career Track" structure.
- Questions about categories (POP, TP, TSP), title changes, salaries, and institutional history.
- TME response: deans/chairs decide on titles; salaries market-driven with "no harm" philosophy.

Title Reclassification Concerns:

- Current titles differ in meaning across schools; reclassification must account for history and consistency.
- Concerns about distinguishing between the Teaching Professor and the Teaching and Scholarship Professor Series and unit expectations around teaching for each track.

Scholarship and Teaching & Scholarship Title:

- Concerns about definition of scholarship, especially for interdisciplinary faculty.
- Suggested inclusion of external experts in evaluations.
- Clarification needed on expectations; TME indicated focus on pedagogical research (possibly too restrictive).

III. Resolution & Recommendations

- Broad support for the teaching and mentoring effectiveness frameworks in general, but desire for some flexibility to tailor within units to their approaches.
- Broad committee consensus on the “Career Path” title as replacement of NTT.
- General agreement that clearer more precise titles are helpful but understanding that implementation of the retitling categories may vary across schools.
- Regarding the concern over the definition of scholarship across units and categories (cf. Teaching and Scholarship), the Committee recommends that units define “scholarship” clearly, develop guidelines working with the Office of Faculty Advancement and revise bylaws accordingly.
- Regarding the concern about distinguishing the teaching load of a faculty in the Teaching Professor track versus the Teaching and Scholarship Professor track, the Committee recommends that units define their teaching expectations for each track, allowing time for Scholarship in the Teaching and Scholarship Professor track.
- The Committee recommends that ample support and working groups be established to help departments adapt and tailor materials and templates ensuring fair evaluation across units.
- There was committee support for the three tracks within the professor titles and their distinction internally but mixed opinions on the need to use the qualifiers externally. (// There was no consensus on the external use of general title without qualifiers (Of the Practice, Teaching, Teaching and Scholarship).
- The Committee welcomes more thought given to issues of agency, institutional history and issues of equity across categories and units in the reclassification process.
- The Committee supports and recommends a “No harm and no moving of goalposts” approach to the retitling process.
- Contracts & Leaves: Support for longer contracts but understanding of current 5-year cap within some schools. Consensus that decisions about leaves and titles rest with individual schools.

Voting Rights: Recommendation that schools/departments decide locally.

Overall, APC recommends:

1. Implementation of Teaching and Mentoring Excellence Frameworks and Promotion Standards, with institutional support and strong input from affected faculty.
2. The Office of Faculty Advancement serve as a mediator for mentoring and scholarship criteria, balancing departmental and unit tailoring with equity across the university.
3. Adoption of Career Track Faculty Titles at Duke, as outlined in the 2030 report.

III. Vote – to be added by J. Wallace

- a. Of the voting APC members who attended the discussion, 12 voted in favor of this resolution, 1 non-reply despite prompting