NORTH CAROLINA
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction

Report to the North Carolina General Assembly

Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Accountability Model Proposed Changes

Session Law 2026-59, Section 3.(b) and Session Law 2026-61, Section 3.15(b)

Date Due: October 15, 2026

DPI Chronological Schedule, 2026-27

State Board of Education

State Board of Education Vision: Every public school student in North Carolina will be empowered to accept academic challenges, prepared to pursue their chosen path after graduating high school, and encouraged to become lifelong learners with the capacity to engage in a globally-collaborative society.

State Board of Education Mission: The mission of the North Carolina State Board of Education and the North Carolina Superintendent of Public Instruction is to use their constitutional authority to guard and maintain the right to a public education for every student in North Carolina and to support public school units in providing every student an excellent education that prepares them for success in their next phase of life.

Eric Davis	Chair, At-Large – Charlotte
Alan Duncan	Vice Chair, Piedmont Triad Region – Greensboro
Rachel Hunt	Lieutenant Governor, Ex Officio – Charlotte
Brad Briner	State Treasurer, Ex Officio – Chapel Hill
Maurice "Mo" Green	Superintendent, Secretary to the Board – Greensboro
Jill Camnitz	Northeast Region – Greenville
Reginald Kenan	Southeast Region – Rose Hill
Vacant	North Central Region
Olivia Oxendine	Sandhills Region – Pinehurst
Vacant	Southwest Region
John Blackburn	Northwest Region – Linville
Janet Mason	Western Region – Forest City
J. Wendell Hall	At-Large – Ahoskie
Catty Moore	At-Large – Monroe

The above State Board of Education information is a record of the board members at the time of this document's approval for publication. A current list of State Board Members, Vision and Mission Statements, can be found on the State Board Website. (https://go.ncdpi.gov/ncsbe)

NC Department of Public Instruction – Maurice "Mo" Green, State Superintendent
301 N. Wilmington Street, Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

In compliance with federal law, the NC Department of Public Instruction administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:
Thomas Tomberlin, Senior Director, Educator Preparation, Licensure, and Performance, NCDPI
6301 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-6301 – Phone: (984) 236-2114

Visit the NC Department of Public Instruction Website (www.dpi.nc.gov)

SBE LIST #0826

Introduction

Section 3.15(b) of Session Law 2026-61 and Section 3.(b) of Session Law 2026-59 each state: "the State Board of Education, in consultation with the Department of Public Instruction, The University of North Carolina System Office, the Community Colleges System Office, and North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities, shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on recommendations for an educator preparation program accountability model, including any necessary changes to State law that would be required to implement the accountability model."

In response to this legislation, this report provides information on the following:

- Background on the educator preparation program (EPP) accountability model currently in law;
- Issues with the current EPP accountability model currently in law;
- Recommendations from the State Board of Education (SBE) for a revised EPP accountability model, developed in consultation with the UNC System Office, the NC Community Colleges System Office, and NC Independent Colleges and Universities; and
- The statutory changes that would be needed to implement the SBE's proposed EPP accountability model.

Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Accountability Model Currently in Law

North Carolina's EPPs are critical partners in educating our state's 1.5 million K-12 public school students. The 89 approved EPPs in North Carolina – 84% of which are affiliated with our state's public and private colleges and universities –prepare thousands of K-12 educators each year.

In 2017, the General Assembly enacted Session Law 2017-189, which substantially changed the SBE's oversight responsibilities for EPPs, including requiring the implementation of an accountability model focused on an EPP's effectiveness in preparing K-12 educators. The accountability model, which was later revised in Session Law 2019-149 and codified in state statute under GS 115C-269.35 and GS 115C-269.45, requires the SBE to hold EPPs accountable for, at a minimum, the following performance measures:

1. Performance based on the standards and criteria for annual evaluations of licensed employees.
2. Proficiency and growth of students taught by educators holding an initial professional license, to the extent practicable. When available, EVAAS data shall be used to measure student growth.

3. Results from an educator satisfaction survey, developed by the State Board with stakeholder input, performed at the end of the educator's first year of teaching after receiving an initial professional license.

For each of these performance measures, the SBE is required to hold EPPs accountable for the outcomes of all EPP completers in the aggregate, as well as for EPP completers disaggregated by race, sex and ethnicity. The SBE is tasked with adopting “rules to establish standards of performance” (GS 115C-269.35(a)) for each of these three performance measures.

Based on those three performance measures, the SBE is required to evaluate, at least annually, an EPP’s performance and assign an accountability status to each EPP based on their performance. The SBE is required to adopt rules for sanctioning EPPs that do not meet the standards of performance on the three accountability performance measures or comply with state law or rules. GS 115C-269.45 outlines the following criteria which the SBE must use in assigning the appropriate sanction status to an EPP that does not meet performance standards:

- *Warned* - An EPP is assigned a warned status if it meets any of the following criteria:
    - Fails to meet the performance standards for the overall performance of all students on any performance measure in one year;
    - Fails to meet the performance standards for any two disaggregated student demographic groups on any performance measure in one year;
    - Fails to meet the performance standards for any one disaggregated student demographic group on any performance measure for two consecutive years;
    - The SBE determines that the EPP has violated applicable laws and rules that should result in being assigned a warned status.

- *Probation* – An EPP is assigned a probation status if it meets any of the following criteria:
    - Fails to meet the performance standards for the overall performance of all students on any performance measure for two consecutive years;
    - Fails to meet the performance standards in any three disaggregated student demographic groups on any performance measure in one year;
    - Fails to meet the performance standards for any disaggregated student demographic group for three consecutive years;
    - The SBE determines that the EPP has violated applicable laws and rules that should result in being assigned a probation status.

- *Revoked* – An EPP is assigned a revoked status and its approval to recommend students for licensure is revoked if it meets any of the following criteria:
    - Has been assigned probation status for three consecutive years;
    - Has been on probation status for one year and the SBE determines that the EPP’s approval should be revoked.

Appendix 1 includes a chart detailing the timeline of sanctions under the EPP accountability model currently in law.

According to current law, if an EPP is assigned a revoked status and loses its authorization to recommend students for licensure, the EPP is not allowed to admit new students but may complete the preparation of students already admitted to the program. Revocation is effective for at least two years. After two years, an EPP can seek initial authorization from the SBE to prepare educators again.

In addition to the accountability model and sanctions, current law also requires EPPs to submit annual performance reports to the SBE providing information on the three accountability performance measures detailed above as well as several other data indicators, including disaggregated data on students who applied, were admitted, and graduated from the EPP; graduation rates from the EPP; and pass rates of graduates on licensure exams. The SBE is required to publish annual report cards for each EPP that includes the information provided in the annual performance reports. Those EPP report cards and the underlying data are publicly available on the NC EPP Dashboard.

Issues with the EPP Accountability Model Currently in Law

The SBE, Department of Public Instruction (DPI), UNC System (UNCSO), NC Community College System (NCCCS), and NC Independent Colleges and Universities (NCICU) support the NC General Assembly's intent to ensure that our state's EPPs are preparing effective teachers to serve in North Carolina's K-12 public schools. However, through the process of developing rules to implement the EPP accountability model currently in law, the SBE, DPI, and the Professional Educator Preparation and Standards Commission (PEPSC)[1] have identified several issues with the current accountability model, including the model's insufficient alignment to appropriate EPP performance measures and outcomes. In addition, DPI's longitudinal tracking of the current model's impact on EPPs suggests the model could inadvertently have a negative impact on our teacher preparation pipeline. Specifically, the education sectors have identified the following concerns:

- **The current model does not include performance measures that effectively measure EPP outcomes.** The current model includes three performance measures – performance of first-year educators on the annual teacher evaluation, proficiency and growth of students taught by first year educators, and results from an educator satisfaction survey administered to first year educators. These three measures do not fully and adequately measure performance of EPP graduates, nor do they fully and adequately measure an EPP's success in preparing teachers for K-12 classrooms.

  In addition, student growth is a stronger indicator of educator preparation quality than student proficiency because it measures the learning gains that students make under a teacher's instruction rather than the level of achievement students bring to the classroom. North Carolina's Educator Effectiveness Model specifically emphasizes growth over proficiency, recognizing that effective educators can accelerate learning for

[1] PEPSC was also created through Session Law 2017-189.

students at all achievement levels. North Carolina's EPPs align their programs with North Carolina's teaching standards and performance expectations. As a result, growth provides a more direct measure of a teacher's instructional impact and, by extension, the effectiveness of the EPP that prepared the teacher.

- **The current model could have a detrimental impact on smaller EPPs or larger EPPs with diverse student bodies.** Because EPPs can face sanctions if they are below standard on any one measure, or below standard for any one student subgroup on any measure, the smaller the EPP, the more likely that EPP will be to face sanctions. In addition, larger EPPs that have more diverse student bodies may also be negatively impacted by the performance of smaller student subgroups. The performance of one small subgroup of students on one measure could put an entire EPP program in jeopardy of sanctions.

- **The timeline for sanctions is aggressive and does not allow for EPPs to focus on continuous improvement.** In the current model, an EPP could have its authorization to recommend candidates for licensure revoked within five years of first being sanctioned. Because the performance measures in the model utilize data from an EPP graduate's first year of teaching, under the current model, an EPP facing sanctions would already have a second cohort of students graduating and a third cohort of students halfway through their licensure program when the EPP receives an initial "warned" sanction. In this situation, both of these cohorts of graduates will have likely received the same or highly similar instructional program and supports as the cohort of graduates that triggered the initial sanction. If the EPP implements an improvement program, they cannot change the outcomes for the cohort that just graduated and may have limited impact on the cohort that is halfway through their licensure program. By the time the cohort of students that fully receives an improved instructional program graduates and begins teaching, the EPP could be on their second year of probation, leaving just one year of sanctions to measure the success of the improvements to their program before the EPP's authorization to prepare educators is revoked.

- **The current model does not differentiate between types of licensure programs offered by EPPs.** Under current law, EPPs prepare teachers for two different types of licenses – an initial professional license (IPL), which is typically issued to students who complete a bachelor's or master's degree leading to licensure, and a residency license (RL), which is typically issued to students who have already completed at least a bachelor's degree and are only seeking licensure. EPPs offer different programs to students seeking a degree leading to a license and to students only seeking licensure. However, the current model does not hold EPPs separately accountable for these two types of programs.

Recommendations for a Revised EPP Accountability Model

In 2019, the General Assembly in Session Law 2019-149 directed the SBE, in collaboration with DPI and PEPSC, to "develop a formulaic, performance based weighted model" for EPP accountability for consideration by the General Assembly. After seeking feedback from a broad stakeholder group including many EPPs, DPI and PEPSC submitted a report to the General

Assembly in February 2020 that identified some of the challenges with the current model detailed above and outlined a proposed performance-based weighted model. However, following the submission of the February 2020 report, the COVID-19 pandemic escalated in severity, shifting the state's education focus to supporting educators and students through this unprecedented event.

In February 2025, the SBE asked PEPSC to revisit the model that was proposed in 2020 for any additional recommended changes. PEPSC held numerous meetings and met with stakeholders from across the education sectors, and in June 2025 presented an updated proposed performance-based weighted model to the SBE. The revised performance-based weighted model proposed by PEPSC seeks to better measure EPP outcomes and is structured to encourage EPPs to focus on continuous improvement to ensure high-quality instructional programs for educating future teachers.

Based on PEPSC's proposed performance-based weighted model, the SBE, in consultation with DPI, UNCSO, NCCCS, and NCICU, recommends that the General Assembly enact the following changes to the EPP accountability model currently in law:

- **Increase the number of performance measures and include measures that are more closely aligned with EPP outcomes.** The SBE recommends removing the current performance measures regarding performance on the annual teacher evaluation and on student proficiency. Instead, the SBE recommends that the revised EPP accountability model include the following six performance measures:
    1. Growth of students taught by EPP completers (using EVAAS data when available to measure student growth);
    2. Percentage of EPP licensure candidates who pass the nationally normed and valid pedagogy assessment pursuant to GS 115C-270.15 (currently the edTPA);
    3. Percentage of EPP licensure candidates who pass the licensure exams in reading pursuant to GS 115C-270.15(a) (currently the Pearson Foundations of Reading exam, which is required for all K-6 licensure candidates and is aligned with the state's early literacy initiative);
    4. Percentage of EPP licensure candidates who pass their content area licensure exams pursuant to GS 115C-270.15(a);
    5. Results from an educator satisfaction survey developed by the SBE and administered at the end of the EPP completer's first year of teaching after program completion;
    6. Results from an employer survey, developed by the SBE and administered at the end of the EPP completer's first year of teaching after program completion.

- **Hold EPPs accountable for their performance on each of the six performance measures, as well as a weighted composite of the six performance measures.** Based on their performance, the SBE would assign each EPP a score for each of the six performance measures, as well as a score for a weighted composite of all six performance measures (for a total of seven accountability scores). As is the case under current law, the SBE, in collaboration with and based on recommendations from PEPSC, would adopt rules around the "standards of performance" (GS 115C-269.35(a)) for each of the six performance measures and would adopt rules regarding how the weighted composite score is calculated. Based on that weighted composite score, the

SBE would assign each EPP a rating on a one to four scale (with four being the highest rating an EPP could achieve). The qualifying composite scores for the one to four scale rating would also be defined through rules adopted by the SBE. Scores for each of the performance measures and the weighted composite would be calculated using data from the three most recent years.

Appendix 4 includes PEPSC's proposal for the "standards of performance" for each of the six proposed performance measures, a proposal for how the weighted composite score could be calculated, and what qualifying composite scores would qualify for each of the one to four ratings.

- **Remove the requirement to hold EPPs accountable for performance of disaggregated student subgroups.** As stated earlier, by including the performance of disaggregated student subgroups in the accountability model, the performance of one small subgroup of students on one measure could put an entire EPP program in jeopardy of sanctions. Instead of including the performance of disaggregated student subgroups in the accountability model, the SBE recommends requiring EPPs to report on student performance disaggregated by student subgroup as part of the EPP annual performance reports and that disaggregated student subgroup data be included in the published EPP report cards.

- **Assign separate accountability scores for an EPP's traditional (or degree-granting) licensure programs and their residency licensure programs.** As stated earlier, EPPs offer different programs for students seeking a degree leading to a license (often called traditional programs) and for students only seeking licensure (residency programs). Because of the nature of these different programs, EPPs should be held accountable for the performance of completers of the two types of programs separately. Under this proposal, EPPs would receive separate scores for each of the six performance measures and the weighted composite for completers for both their traditional licensure programs and their residency licensure programs. Because residency licensed educators are often employed as educators *while they are completing* their licensure programs, data on the growth of their students and the results from their educator and employer satisfaction surveys would only be included in the performance measures once a residency licensed educator has completed their licensure program and converted their license to an initial professional license, a continuing professional license, or a limited license.

- **Restructure the timeline for sanctions to be more accurately aligned with outcome data in response to effective improvements by EPPs.** Under this proposal, EPP's would face sanctions if they fail to meet performance standards on one or more of the six performance measures or achieves a weighted composite score of "1". The timeline of sanctions under this proposal are detailed below.

    - *EPP Fails to Meet Performance Standards for 3+ Performance Measures or Achieves a Weighted Composite Score of "1"* — If an EPP fails to meet the performance standards for three or more performance measures, or if it achieves a weighted composite score of "1" in any one year, the EPP will be sanctioned ("warned" status). If an EPP fails to meet performance standards for three or

more performance measures or achieves a weighted composite score of “1” for three consecutive years, the EPP will be assigned a “probation” status. If the EPP continues to be assigned a “probation” status for three consecutive years, then the SBE will revoke the EPP’s authorization to recommend candidates for licensure. Under this proposal, an EPP which fails to meet the performance standards for three or more performance measures or receives a weighted composite score of “1” would have four years to make improvements before its authorization to recommend candidates for licensure is revoked (compared to two years under the current model in law).

- *EPP Fails to Meet Performance Standards for 1 or 2 Performance Measures* — Under the proposed model, the SBE would notify an EPP which fails to meet performance standards for one or two performance measures in one year, but would not sanction an EPP for failing to meet performance standards for one or two performance measures until they have failed to meet performance standards for five consecutive years (“warned” status). This timeline provides the EPP with adequate time to address any issues with its program as needed in order to improve student outcomes. If after seven consecutive years, the EPP has continued to fail to meet performance standards on one or two performance measures, then the EPP will be assigned a “probation” status. If the EPP is assigned a “probation” status for three consecutive years, then the SBE will revoke the EPP’s authorization to recommend candidates for licensure. Under this proposal, an EPP which fails to meet the performance standards for one or two performance measures would have eight years to make improvements to its program before its authorization to recommend candidates for licensure is revoked (compared to three years under the current model in law).

PEPSC’s proposed performance-based weighted model, which is the basis for these recommended changes, was developed before the passage of the 2026 Appropriations Act (SL 2026-41), which included several reforms to educator licensure. As those reforms are implemented in the coming months and years, there may need to be additional adjustments or revisions to the EPP accountability model to account for the impacts of those reforms.

Appendix 2 includes a chart detailing the timeline of sanctions under the SBE’s proposed EPP accountability model.

Recommended Statutory Changes

Appendix 3 includes revisions to GS 115C-269.35 and GS 115C-269.45 required to implement the SBE’s proposed EPP accountability model detailed above.

Appendix 1. Timeline of Sanctions Under the EPP Accountability Model Currently in Law

EPP fails to meet the performance standards for . . .	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Year 6**	**Year 7**
Overall student performance for at least one measure	Warned	Probation	Probation	Probation (authorization revoked)	Revoked	Revoked	May seek initial authorization
At least one measure for one student subgroup	-	Warned	Probation	Probation	Probation (authorization revoked)	Revoked	Revoked
At least one measure for two student subgroups	Warned	Warned	Probation	Probation	Probation (authorization revoked)	Revoked	Revoked
At least one measure for three student subgroups	Probation	Probation	Probation (authorization revoked)	Revoked	Revoked	May seek initial authorization	

Appendix 2. Timeline of Sanctions Under the State Board of Education's Proposed EPP Accountability Model

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
EPP fails to meet the performance standards for three or more performance measures **OR** **EPP achieves a weighted performance measure composite score of one**	Warned	Warned	Probation	Probation	Probation (authori-zation revoked)	Revoked	Revoked	May seek initial authori-zation		
EPP fails to meet the performance standards for one or two performance measures	Notified	Notified	Notified	Notified	Warned	Warned	Probation	Probation	Probation (authori-zation revoked)	Revoked

Appendix 3. Recommended Statutory Changes for Enacting the State Board of Education's Proposed EPP Accountability Model

SECTION 1. G.S. 115C-269.35 reads as rewritten:

"§ 115C-269.35. Accountability for educator preparation programs.

(a) Performance Measures. – The State Board shall adopt rules necessary to establish standards of performance to govern the continuing accountability of all EPPs. At a minimum, the performance standards shall be based on the following information: ~~that is disaggregated with respect to race, sex, and ethnicity:~~

~~(1) Performance based on the standards and criteria for annual evaluations of licensed employees.~~

(1) Growth of students taught by educators holding an initial professional license or by educators who have converted a residency license to an initial professional license, a continuing professional license, or a limited license, to the extent practicable. ~~Proficiency and growth of students taught by educators holding an initial professional license, to the extent practicable.~~ When available, EVAAS data shall be used to measure student growth.

(2) Percentage of licensure candidates who pass a nationally normed and valid pedagogy assessment selected by the State Board pursuant to G.S. 115C-270.15.

(3) Percentage of licensure candidates who pass the licensure examinations in reading selected by the State Board pursuant to G.S. 115C-270.15(a).

(4) Percentage of licensure candidates who pass licensure examinations in the content area of their license pursuant to G.S. 115C-270.15(a).

(5) Results from an educator satisfaction survey, developed by the State Board with stakeholder input, performed at the end of the educator's first year of teaching after receiving an initial professional license or after converting a residency license to an initial professional license, a continuing professional license, or a limited license.

(6) Results of an employer survey, developed by the State Board with stakeholder input, performed at the end of the educator's first year of teaching after receiving an initial professional license or after converting a residency license to an initial professional license, a continuing professional license, or a limited license.

(7) Repealed by Session Laws 2019-149, s. 1, effective July 22, 2019, and applicable to (i) educator preparation programs (EPPs) authorized by the State Board of Education on or after the date this act becomes law and (ii) reports submitted to the State Board and reviews by the State Board of an EPP beginning with those based on data from the 2019-2020 academic year.

(b) Calculating EPP Accountability Scores - The State Board shall annually award each EPP a score for each performance measure listed in subsection (a) of this section and a weighted composite score of the performance measures listed in subsection (a) of this section. The State Board shall adopt rules for how each performance measure is scored and for how the weighted performance measure composite score is calculated. The State Board shall assign each EPP a rating on a one to four scale based on the weighted performance measure composite score. Scores for each performance measure and for the weighted performance measure composite score shall include data from the three most recent years. The State Board shall assign each EPP separate scores for each performance measure and for the weighted performance measure composite score for licensure candidates who

held a residency license pursuant to G.S. 115C-270-20(a)(5) and licensure candidates who did not hold a residency license.

(c) Annual Performance Reports. – The State Board shall require all recognized EPPs to submit annual performance reports. The performance reports shall provide the State Board with a focused review of the EPPs and the current authorization process in order to ensure that the programs produce graduates that are well prepared to teach. At a minimum, the annual report shall contain the following indicators disaggregated by race, sex, and ethnicity unless disaggregated data would jeopardize individual candidate confidentiality:

(1) Performance data from subsection (a) of this section.

(2) Data related to the EPP's compliance with requirements for field supervision of students during their internship and residency experiences.

(3) The following information, disaggregated by race, sex, and ethnicity:
   a. The number of students who apply to candidacy of the EPP.
   b. The number of students admitted as candidates of the EPP.
   c. The number of students completing the program.
   d. The number of graduates of the EPP licensed in North Carolina.
   e. The number of graduates of the EPP employed in North Carolina.
   f. The number and percentage of students who convert from a residency license to either an initial professional license or a continuing professional license.
   g. Any other information required by federal law.
   h. Repealed by Session Laws 2019-149, s. 1, effective July 22, 2019, and applicable to (i) educator preparation programs (EPPs) authorized by the State Board of Education on or after the date this act becomes law and (ii) reports submitted to the State Board and reviews by the State Board of an EPP beginning with those based on data from the 2019-2020 academic year.

(4) Quality of students entering the EPP, including the average grade point average and average score on preprofessional skills tests or college entrance exams that assess reading, writing, mathematics, and other competencies.

(5) Graduation rates.

(6) Time-to-graduation rates.

(7) Pass rates of graduates on professional, pedagogy, and content area examinations for the purpose of licensure.

(8) Percentage of graduates receiving initial professional licenses.

(9) The activities offered by the program that are designed to prepare educators, including general education teachers and special education teachers, to effectively teach the following:
   a. Students with disabilities.
   b. Students of limited English proficiency.

(10) The activities offered by the program that are designed to prepare educators to do the following:
   a. Integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, including activities consistent with the principles of universal design for learning.
   b. Use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement.

(11) The retention of beginning educators in the profession for at least two years after

licensure in North Carolina.

(12) The results of surveys given to school principals that involve evaluation of the program's effectiveness in preparing participants to succeed in the classroom, based on experience with employed program participants.

(13) Any other information necessary to enable the State Board to assess the effectiveness of the program on the basis of educator retention and success criteria adopted by the State Board.

(d) Submission of Annual Performance Reports. – Performance reports shall be provided annually to the following:

(1) The State Board.

(2) The board of trustees or board of directors of the entity submitting the report.

(e) Information Requests by EPPs. – The State Board of Education shall annually provide to EPPs, upon request, the data required to be included in an EPP's annual performance report related to subdivisions (1) ~~and~~ through ~~(2)~~ (6) of subsection (a) of this section and subdivision (11) of subsection ~~(b)~~ (c) of this section. The State Board of Education shall provide this information to an EPP as aggregate data and disaggregated by race, sex, and ethnicity. ~~Notwithstanding Article 21A of this Chapter, local school administrative units shall provide to the State Board of Education for the purposes of these information requests any North Carolina Educator Evaluation System effectiveness status assigned to teachers based on queries from the State Board.~~ The State Board of Education shall not report aggregated or disaggregated data to the EPP that reveals confidential information in a teacher's personnel file, as defined by Article 21A of this Chapter, such as making the effectiveness status personally identifiable to an individual teacher."

SECTION 2. G.S. 115C-269.45 reads as rewritten:

"§ 115C-269.45. Sanctions.

(a) Accountability Statuses. – The State Board shall at least annually review the accountability status of each EPP. The State Board shall adopt rules necessary for the sanction of EPPs that do not meet accountability standards or comply with State law or rules. The rules shall provide for the assignment of ~~warned, probation, or revoked~~ warning and probation statuses according to the following criteria:

(1) Warned. – An EPP shall be assigned warned status if the program meets any of the following criteria:

a. Fails to meet the performance standards set by the State Board for one or two performance measures ~~the overall performance of all its students on any of the indicators~~ set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) for five consecutive years.

b. Fails to meet the performance standards set by the State Board for three or more performance measures set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) in any one year.

c. Achieves a weighted performance measure composite score of one as set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(b) in any one year.

~~d. Fails to meet the performance standards in any two sex, race, or ethnicity demographic groups on any of the indicators set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) in any one year.~~

~~e. Fails to meet the performance standards for any one sex, race, or ethnicity demographic group on any of the indicators set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) for two consecutively measured years, regardless of whether the deficiency is in the same standard.~~

f. The State Board determines that the EPP has violated applicable laws or rules that should result in warned status.

(2) Probation. – An EPP shall be assigned probation status if the program meets any of the following criteria:

a. Fails to meet the performance standards set by the State Board for one or two performance measures ~~the overall performance of all its students on any of the indicators~~ set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) for ~~two consecutively measured~~ seven consecutive years.

b. Fails to meet the performance standards set by the State Board for three or more performance measures set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) for three consecutive years.

c. Achieves a weighted performance measure composite score of 1 as set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(b) for three consecutive years.

~~d. Fails to meet the performance standards in any three sex, race, or ethnicity demographic groups on any of the indicators set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) in any one year.~~

~~e. Fails to meet the performance standards for any one sex, race, or ethnicity demographic group on any of the indicators set forth in G.S. 115C-269.35(a) for three consecutively measured years, regardless of whether the deficiency is in the same standard.~~

f. The State Board determines that the EPP has violated applicable laws or rules that should result in probation status.

(3) Revoked. – An EPP shall be assigned revoked status and its approval to recommend students for educator licensure revoked if it meets any of the following criteria:

a. Is assigned probation status for three consecutively measured years.

b. Has been on probation status for one year and the State Board determines that revoking the program's approval is reasonably necessary to achieve the purposes of this Article.

(b) Revocation. – Any revocation of an EPP's accountability status shall meet the following criteria:

(1) Complies with the requirements of notice as described in subsection (f) of this section.

(2) Upon assignment of revoked status of EPP approval, the EPP shall not admit new students, but may complete the training of students already admitted by the program and recommend them for licensure. If necessary, the State Board and other EPPs shall cooperate to assist the previously admitted students of the revoked EPP to complete their training.

(3) A revocation shall be effective for a period of at least two years. After two years, the program may seek initial authorization to prepare educators for licensure.

(c) Range of Sanctions. – In addition to revocation as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the rules described in subsection (a) of this section shall provide for the State Board to assign other sanctions deemed necessary, including one or more of the following:

(1) Requiring the EPP to obtain technical assistance approved by the State Board.

(2) Requiring the EPP to obtain professional services under contract with another entity.

(3) Appointing a monitor to participate in and report to the State Board on the activities of the EPP.

(4) Managing the EPP's enrollment.

(c1) Small Group Exception. – Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section and G.S. 115C-269.35, the State Board of Education shall adopt a rule to establish a small group exception for circumstances in which there is a risk of identifying individual program participants. The rule shall include the number of students necessary to qualify for the exception and the alternative method of performance assessment and assignment of sanctions. The rule may provide for measuring performance of small student groups cumulatively over multiple years for EPP accountability purposes.

(d) Particular Fields of Licensure. – Any sanction authorized or required to be taken against an EPP under subsection (c) of this section may also be taken with regard to a program for a particular field of licensure authorized to be offered by an EPP.

(e) Costs. – Any costs associated with the sanctions under subsection (c) of this section shall be paid by the EPP.

(f) Notice, Hearing, and Appeal. – The State Board shall give written notice to the EPP by certified mail of an EPP's revocation of authorized status, including a written explanation of the basis for the revocation. An EPP may commence a contested case as provided in Article 3 of Chapter 150B of the General Statutes as to the revocation by the State Board."

Appendix 4. PEPSC Recommended EPP Accountability Model (from 8-21-2025)

NC EPP Accountability Model

All Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) undergo state evaluation. However, nationally accredited programs are exempt from state sanctions. Sanctions for these programs are exclusively issued by the national accrediting body and must be reported to the state in the annual Institution of Higher Education (IHE) Report. Furthermore, EPPs must submit improvement measures in response to Areas for Improvement (AFIs) or Stipulations issued by their national accreditor. All EPPs will receive percentage scores for each performance measure and a rating based on their weighted composite score. Regardless of accreditation status, all EPPs must meet the required threshold on all state-defined measures or submit a plan of improvement for any measures not meeting this threshold as part of the IHE Report. Traditional and residency programs within the same EPP will be evaluated separately, as numbers allow. Confidence intervals will be established for each EPP to reduce the chances of error in the evaluation process. *The threshold represents the minimum required percentage to achieve a satisfactory performance level.*

EPP Performance Measures	Individual Measure Thresholds	Composite Score Weights
edTPA - Pass Rate	**60%**	**60%**
Recent Grad Survey – Percentage of candidates who rate their EPP as preparing them "Somewhat Well", "Well", or "Very Well".	**70%**	**15%**
Employer Survey - Percentage of employers who rate the EPP's completers as "Comparable To" or "Better Than" other EPPs.	**70%**	**15%**
Pearson Foundations of Reading Test - Percentage of students passing licensure content exams. *EPPs without Elementary or Special Education GC programs will not be evaluated on this measure.*	**60%**	**5%**
Praxis II and all other content exams. - Percentage of students passing licensure content exams.	**60%**	**0%**
EVAAS - Percentage of completers who meet or exceed student growth goals.	**70%**	**5%**
		Total: 100%

Composite scores will be determined using the weights above in relation to the most recent three years of data. The newest year's data will be given the greatest amount of weight in computing scores. EPPs must have 5 or more students and have data in at least 4 of the six performance measures to receive a composite score rating. EPPs will be provided with ratings using the following scale:

4 - Exemplary Earns a total percentage of **88-100**
3 - Strong Earns a total percentage of **76-88**
2 - Developing Earns a total percentage of **64-76**
1 - Needs Improvement Earns a total percentage less than **64**

A composite score rating of 1 triggers the notification and sanction process for non-nationally accredited EPPs and triggers the notification and continuous improvement process for nationally accredited EPPs.

Performance below the required threshold on any individual measure triggers the notification and improvement process. for non-nationally accredited EPPs and triggers the notification and continuous improvement process for nationally accredited EPPs.

NC EPP Accountability Model Monitoring Process

The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) monitoring process aims to provide EPPs with dependable data on completer performance. This information is intended to highlight program strengths and pinpoint specific areas for improvement. The evaluation considers both the annual weighted composite score rating (ranging from 1 to 4) and the established minimum performance threshold for each individual measure.

The monitoring system operates through two distinct tracks: Continuous Improvement and Corrective Action.

- **Continuous Improvement Track:** This track proactively informs EPPs of identified areas for improvement and provides a realistic timeframe for addressing them.
- **Corrective Action Track:** This track addresses critical performance issues, providing timely notification and support to EPPs for necessary remediation.

The monitoring system uses the following categories to denote stages of improvement:

NOTIFICATION	The EPP is informed of a specific performance concern. *This notification is non-public.*
AREA FOR IMPROVEMENT (AFI)	The EPP is formally notified of a persistent performance issue and provided a designated period for improvement. *This notification is non-public.*
STIPULATION	If the EPP needs continued support beyond the AFI period to meet improvement targets, or if significant performance challenges are recognized, the program will move into a phase of enhanced collaboration and public accountability to ensure positive growth. *This action is made public.*
PROBATION	If the EPP needs continued support beyond the STIPULATION period to meet improvement targets, or if significant performance challenges continue, the program will move into a phase of elevated collaboration and public accountability to ensure positive growth. *This action is made public.*
REVOCATION	The EPP's approval as a provider within the state is rescinded due to ongoing and unresolved performance issues. *This action is made public.*

Continuous Improvement Track

Prior to the implementation of the monitoring process, the state will collect and provide each EPP with two years of data, including composite scores and individual measure percentages. Following the implementation, EPPs will undergo annual evaluation utilizing the most recent three years of data. This three-year data set will be evaluated in two ways:

All EPPs will address in their annual IHE report any area that is below the benchmark with a plan for action for the area(s).

There will be no public notices of EPPs with areas of improvement on the continuous improvement track.

The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**	**The EPP achieves a satisfactory composite score (2 or above), with one or two performance measures identified for focused development.**
NOTIFICATION	**AFI 1**	**AFI 2**	**AFI 3**	**STIPULATION 1**	**STIPULATION 2**	**PROBATION 1**	**PROBATION 2**	**REVOCATION**
EPP has 3 years from notification to meet the required threshold on any performance measure(s) identified as deficient. EPP creates a plan of improvement submitted to NCDPI within 60 days of notification. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP reports to NCDPI on improvement process as part of the annual IHE Report. If improvement is met after the first year, the EPP goes off notification. If not, the reporting requirements continue for the following year. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP reports to NCDPI on improvement process as part of the annual IHE Report. If improvement is met after the second year, the AFI is removed. If not, the reporting requirements continue for the following year. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP reports to NCDPI on improvement process as part of the annual IHE Report. If improvement is met after the third year, the AFI is removed. If not, the EPP goes into Stipulation 1. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP submits a revised plan of improvement within 60 days of notice and receives peer technical assistance selected by PEPSC. EPP has one year after receiving stipulation to meet the required threshold on any AFI measure(s). EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP reports to NCDPI on improvement process as part of the annual IHE Report. If improvement is met in this reporting year the stipulation is removed. If not, the EPP goes on Probation. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process. .	EPP submits revised plan of improvement and receives peer technical assistance selected by PEPSC. EPP has one year after receiving probation to meet the required threshold on any Stipulation measures. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP reports to NCDPI on improvement process as part of the annual IHE Report. If improvement is met in this reporting year, the EPP goes off probation. If not, the EPP may be granted additional time in probation for improvement or may have their status as an EPP revoked. Recommendation to SBE from PEPSC with SBE making any final decision. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	Determined by the State Board of Education with recommendation from PEPSC. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.
Non-Public	*Non-Public*	*Non-Public*	*Non-Public*	*Public*	*Public*	*Public*	*Public*	*Public*

Corrective Action Track

Upon implementation of the monitoring system, an Educator Preparation Program (EPP) that receives a composite score rating of 1, or that has areas for development on three or more performance measures will be placed on the Corrective Action track with a status of Stipulation 3. This public sanction establishes a defined timeframe for the EPP to rectify all identified program performance needs. Under this track, EPPs will have immediate access to peer technical assistance as selected by the Professional Educator Preparation and Standards Commission (PEPSC). Nationally Accredited EPPs will not be subject to the corrective action track as long as they are in good standing with their accreditator. However, if an EPP receives a stipulation from the accreditor, the EPP is subject to the corrective action track and, therefore, possible revocation.

Opportunities exist for the EPP to improve 3+ performance measures or its composite rating (to 2+), supported by targeted resources.	**Opportunities exist for the EPP to improve 3+ performance measures or its composite rating (to 2+), supported by targeted resources.**	**Opportunities exist for the EPP to improve 3+ performance measures or its composite rating (to 2+), supported by targeted resources.**	**Opportunities exist for the EPP to improve 3+ performance measures or its composite rating (to 2+), supported by targeted resources.**	**Opportunities exist for the EPP to improve 3+ performance measures or its composite rating (to 2+), supported by targeted resources.**
STIPULATION 3	**STIPULATION 4**	**PROBATION 3**	**PROBATION 4**	**REVOCATION**
EPP has one year to meet the required threshold on at least two of the three areas for development or to earn a composite score rating of 2 or better. The EPP must submit a comprehensive improvement plan to NCDPI within 60 days of official notification of this status. EPP receives peer technical assistance selected by PEPSC. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	The EPP will report its improvement progress to the NCDPI as part of the annual IHE Report. The following outcomes will determine the EPP's sanction status based on the improvement demonstrated on the previously identified deficient measures: **Removal of Sanction:** If the EPP meets the required threshold on all three areas for development and/or achieves a composite score rating of 2 or better, it will be removed from any sanction status. **Transition to Stipulation 1** (Continuous Improvement): If the EPP meets the required threshold on two of the three previous areas for development and has a composite score of 2 or better, it will transition to Stipulation 1 within the continuous improvement process. **Transition to Probation 3**: If the EPP meets the required threshold on only one of the three previous areas for development or maintains a composite score rating of 1, it will move to Probation 3. EPP receives peer technical assistance selected by PEPSC. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP submits an updated comprehensive plan of improvement and receives peer technical assistance selected by PEPSC. EPP has one year after receiving probation to meet the threshold or better on all remaining areas for development or move to a composite score of 2+. **Removal of Sanction:** If the EPP meets the required threshold on all three areas for development and/or achieves a composite score rating of 2 or better, it will be removed from any sanction status. **Transition to Stipulation 1** (Continuous Improvement): If the EPP meets the required threshold on two of the three previous areas for development and has a composite score of 2 or better, it will transition to Stipulation 1 within the continuous improvement process. **Transition to Probation 4**: If the EPP meets the required threshold on only one of the three previous areas for development or maintains a composite score rating of 1, it will move to Probation 4. EPP receives peer technical assistance selected by PEPSC. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	EPP reports to NCDPI on improvement process as part of the annual IHE Report. If required improvements are met in this reporting year, the EPP is removed from sanction. If not, the EPP may be granted additional time in probation for improvement or may have their status as an EPP revoked. Recommendation to SBE from PEPSC with SBE making any final decision. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.	Determined by the State Board of Education with recommendation from PEPSC. After a minimum of two years on probation, the EPP can have its program revoked. EPP may appeal based on factors identified in the Appeals Process.
Public	*Public*	*Public*	*Public*	*Public*

Special situations:

1. **Move to Corrective Action:** An EPP will immediately move to PROBATION 3 if **either** of the following occurs within any three years during a five-year period:
    a. The EPP receives a composite score rating of 1.
    b. The EPP has three identified areas for development.

    Example: EPP A receives a composite score rating of 1 in Year 1 and Year 2 of implementation. In Year 3, the EPP achieves a composite score rating of 2. While this improvement *could* potentially lead to a reduction in sanction status under normal progression, the prior occurrences of a composite score rating of 1 trigger the immediate move to PROBATION 3 if, in Year 4 or Year 5, the EPP *again* receives a composite score rating of 1.

    Once placed on PROBATION 3 under this rule, the EPP will remain at this status until **either**:

    i. The EPP meets all performance standards for two consecutive years.
    ii. The EPP progresses through the remainder of the sanction model as outlined in subsequent stages.

2. **Data Sufficiency and Evaluation:** When an EPP graduates fewer than **5** <u>total</u> completers over the three-year evaluation period or has available data in less than 5 performance measures, the resulting performance measure data is unlikely to provide a valid basis for assessing program performance or identifying meaningful areas for improvement. In such instances, NCDPI will implement the following procedures:

    a. **Notification of Insufficient Data:** NCDPI will formally notify the EPP that the current completer dataset is insufficient for reliable evaluation.

    b. **Evaluation Waiver:** The EPP will be granted an evaluation waiver for the current evaluation cycle.

    c. **Required Explanation and Improvement Plan:** NCDPI will require the EPP to submit a written explanation for the low enrollment and graduation rates. Additionally, the EPP must develop and submit a comprehensive plan to NCDPI within sixty (60) days. This plan should detail specific strategies aimed at increasing enrollment and graduation rates to a level that permits meaningful data analysis in future evaluations.

    d. **Reporting on Improvement Strategies:** The EPP will be required to report on the outcomes and progress associated with the planned enrollment and graduation strategies in the subsequent year's IHE Report.

Evaluation Waivers and Alternative Evaluation Methods:

An EPP may receive a maximum of two (2) consecutive evaluation waivers. Following two consecutive waivers, an alternative evaluation method will be implemented. The EPP will have the following two options for data usage under the alternative evaluation method:

a. **Extended Historical Data:** NCDPI will generate a historical performance dataset extending beyond the standard three-year period, aiming to include as close to ten (10) completers as possible. This extended dataset will then be used for evaluating the program.

b. **Current Cohort Evaluation:** The current three-year cohort data will be used to evaluate the program, regardless of the sample size. Any null measures will be counted as 0%. If this option is selected, the EPP explicitly waives the right to appeal any sanction based on the argument that the data is invalid due to the small sample size.

3. **Loss of National Accreditation:** Should an EPP lose national accreditation status for any reason or choose not to be reaccredited, it will immediately be subject to state issued public sanctions.

4. **Teaching Out of Area:** If an EPP has completers who are teaching outside of the licensure area for which they were prepared by the EPP, the completer(s) will not be included in the evaluation process.