

# 2020-2021

## EPP Bachelor Performance Report

### Duke University

---



North Carolina Department of  
**PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

### Overview of the Institution

Since its establishment in 1924, Duke University has been guided by the vision of its first benefactor, James B. Duke, who wanted to establish an institution that would attain “a place of real leadership in the educational world.” Duke’s undergraduate liberal arts college and its graduate and professional schools — in business, divinity, engineering, the environment, law, medicine, nursing and public policy — are among the leaders in their fields, and the university boasts a Carnegie designation of Doctoral/Research Universities – Extensive. This distinction is supported by the university’s recruitment of a select group of truly distinguished faculty and the admission of an equally select group of exceptional undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. Enrollment for the 2020-2021 school year included 6,542 undergraduates and 9,009 students in the graduate and professional schools and related programs. There were 1,682 tenured and tenure-track faculty members, with an 8:1 student/faculty ratio. Duke’s commitment to academic excellence is articulated in the university mission statement, which states, in part: “the mission of Duke University is to provide a superior liberal education to undergraduate students, attending not only to their intellectual growth but also to their development as adults committed to high ethical standards and full participation as leaders in their communities; to prepare future members of the learned professions for lives of skilled and ethical service; . . . to promote an intellectual environment built on a commitment to free and open inquiry; . . . to provide wide ranging educational opportunities . . . and to promote a deep appreciation for the range of human difference and potential, a sense of the obligations and rewards of citizenship, and a commitment to learning, freedom and truth.”

## **Special Characteristics**

Teacher preparation has been central to Duke's mission throughout its history. The beginnings of that history can be traced to 1851, when Union Institute (founded 1839) began preparing teachers and was reorganized into Normal College. In 1858, it became Trinity College, a liberal arts institution in which teacher training assumed a central and major role. For all of that history, the Arts and Sciences faculty have offered teacher training by preparing Duke students to teach in public school classrooms and to assume leadership roles in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. Teacher preparation at Duke is organized around the central theme of preparing liberally educated, reflective professionals – prepared to lead. This theme is consistent with the university's goal for all students – that they develop as liberally educated, reflective citizens – and reflects the wider culture of Duke with its emphasis on breadth and depth of the liberal arts education. Thus, Duke's teacher preparation programs directly complement the broader university goals. It follows, then, that the contributions of the faculty across the institution are a vital part of teacher preparation at Duke. Important, too, is Duke's continuing partnership with Durham Public Schools. Durham's teachers serve as voting members on each teacher preparation committee, and they are compensated for their work with the university. Durham Public School teachers and administrators collaborate with Duke researchers on grant proposals and ongoing research. Duke's Office of Durham and Community Affairs, with its commitment to nine neighborhood partner schools and five afterschool programs surrounding Duke's campus, has focused the broader university community -- from the President to entering freshmen -- on contributing to the education of our community's children and to the professional development of their teachers through volunteer work, a substantial financial commitment, and ongoing collaboration in technological and academic programs.

## **Program Areas and Levels Offered**

At the undergraduate level, through Trinity College, the Program in Education offers an elementary program and secondary programs in the areas of English, mathematics, comprehensive science, and social studies. An Academically/Intellectually Gifted (AIG) add-on licensure program is also offered for non-degree, graduate credit through continuing studies. At the graduate level, through the Graduate School, the Master of Arts in Teaching Program offers secondary programs in the areas of English, mathematics, comprehensive science, and social studies.

## Pathways Offered

Traditional	Lateral Entry	Residency
X		

### **Brief Description of the unit/institutional efforts to promote SBE priorities.**

**For the report, briefly describe your current efforts or future plans to the recent legislation provisions below.**

### **Share the extent to which your EPP prepares educators, including general education teachers and special education teachers, to effectively teach students with disabilities.**

In their coursework, teaching candidates learn how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning. Through relevant course assignments and fieldwork, candidates practice using a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies, plan and differentiate learning experiences, and use multiple methods of assessment to make educational decisions regarding P-12 students with exceptionalities. Candidates also learn how to create safe, inclusive, and responsive learning environments so that individuals with exceptionalities become active and effective learners and develop emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and self-determination. Candidates engage with other specialized topics in special education via readings, discussion, reflection, small group presentations, and through action research within their clinical and field experiences.

### **Share the extent to which your EPP prepares educators, including general education teachers and special education teachers, to effectively teach students of limited English proficiency.**

Across all educator preparation programs, invited speakers facilitate discussions and share strategies and best practices for reaching English Language Learners and for planning and implementing culturally responsive teaching practices that reach all students. Candidates process these topics via reflection/refraction journals and in-class discussions, as they consider the practical implications for their teaching practice. Additionally, all field and clinical work is conducted within a school system that is 33.2% Hispanic/Latinx, so candidates have many authentic opportunities to teach and assess English Language Learners.

**The activities offered by the program that are designed to prepare educators to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, including activities consistent with the principals of the EPP.**

Technology is viewed across all programs as a critical component of both content and pedagogical knowledge. As such, candidates are expected to demonstrate their knowledge of pedagogy, their content-area expertise, and their integration of technology from the TPACK framework. Duke University's EPP has a steadfast commitment to integrate technology across all program aspects. The EPP uses various applications of technology to ensure all candidates are able to use technology adeptly in their teaching and learning. Furthermore, the EPP provides opportunities and necessary support for candidates to model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess student learning experiences. Beyond the development of technology usage, which includes Web design tools, digital storytelling and Internet-based tools, students focus on the five 21st century learning skills (communication, critical thinking and problem solving, collaboration, creativity and contextual learning) needed for all students to be successful in 21st century classrooms and beyond. Candidates across all programs design and implement content-rich curriculum units that incorporate 21st century themes and skills to maximize P-12 student learning. Emphasis is specifically placed on ways technology can be utilized in a meaningful way to enhance P-12 student learning and/or better accommodate for individual learning differences.

**The activities offered by the program that are designed to prepare teachers to use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic success.**

Realizing the role technology has in assessment within North Carolina Public Schools, the EPP exposes candidates to a variety of ways technology is used for assessment. For example, candidates become familiar with EVAAS by using an interactive graphing tool that enables the user to plot a specific school's growth profile as well as make comparisons among many schools. In the elementary program, candidates also receive training in the administration of reading assessments. Through action research, candidates also collect and analyze assessment data and must produce a visual representation of these data.

**Candidates (preparing to teach in elementary schools) are prepared to integrate Arts education across the curriculum.**

Duke is fortunate to have an art museum on campus –the Nasher Museum of Art. The museum offers educator workshops and elementary candidates participate in these and additional private sessions offered by the Museum's staff. Through these sessions, candidates have learned about Visual Thinking

Strategies, the integration of the visual arts into the language arts curriculum, the connection of the visual arts to the natural sciences, and methods for exploring culture through art with children.

**Explain how your program(s) and unit conduct self-study.**

The collection and analyses of candidate, program, and unit data comprise the EPP's assessment system. Assessments for each program in the EPP have always been comprehensive, utilizing multiple instruments across transition points. Data from the undergraduate and graduate programs are regularly and systematically compiled, analyzed and reported for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality and unit operations. Every year in June, every program in the EPP submits a short, formal report to the Committee on Teacher Preparation and to their respective advisory committees that outlines program accomplishments, recommended program-level changes, and the results of previous changes. Areas of focus include: candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions; program assessment; field experiences; diversity; faculty; and program budget. Duke's EPP programs are accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

**Provide a description of field experiences to occur every semester, including a full semester in a low performing school prior to student teaching.**

Teacher Preparation Program candidates spend a minimum of two semesters in low performing schools prior to their senior year, which is when student teaching takes place. These field experiences are connected to two required gateway courses: Foundations of Education and Educational Psychology. The field experiences for these courses include a tutor training program with follow up training/support as well as weekly tutoring sessions lasting 60 – 75 minutes over the course of the semester. Duke undergraduates mentor/tutor Durham Public Schools students in math and/or literacy during school hours or in the late afternoon/early evening at an after-school site and complete written reflections related to the experiences. Partners for Success (Pfs), a Duke program, assists in the coordination of these early field experiences.

Elementary candidates also apply theory to practice through observing, assisting, and teaching in a variety of grade levels and content areas. Professors purposefully integrate these field experiences in class readings and discussions and use these experiences as springboards for student projects and independent research. Students observe in schools with varying needs and demographics using an observation guide focused on specific topics/practices (e.g., school climate, student engagement, learning differences, classroom management, etc.). School observations begin during the first two weeks of the academic year. The semester prior to student teaching, each student begins work with his/her mentor teacher to begin establishing and building relationships with students and the school community.

**How will student teaching be scheduled to allow for experiences to occur at both the beginning and end of the school year.**

It will not be difficult to ensure students have experiences at the beginning of the school year— Undergraduate students will be able to complete these experiences through their fall methods coursework. The end-of-the-school-year experiences will be a bit more challenging since Duke students graduate in May and the public schools continue into June.

Currently, the MAT Program's interns teach at the beginning of the school year through the end of the third, 9-week period. As Duke University's spring semester ends in early May, we cannot require MAT students to teach during the fourth quarter; however, the students continue to serve in the schools part-time as they complete their final thesis. Many MAT students choose to substitute for pay through the end of the school year.

**Percent of candidates in the EPP that are first generation college attendees and percent Pell Grant eligible.**

15      % of candidates in the EPP that are first generation college attendees

20      % of candidates in the EPP that are Pell Grant eligible

NOTE: Data collected for percent Pell Grant eligible is based on candidate participation in the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). Candidates self-reporting populates the percent first generation college attendees.

**In June 2020, the North Carolina State Board of Education adopted recommendations to support the improvement of K-3 reading instruction, which included incorporating the science of reading into educator preparation and licensure. For those EPPs that have programs that focus on literacy instruction, especially for early childhood, elementary, special education and educational leadership; please broadly share what efforts are being done to meet the requirement. If you do not have one of these programs, please respond with N/A.**

Over the past 7 years, Duke’s Elementary Teacher Preparation Program has collaborated with the Hill Center in Durham to provide literacy workshops and site-based observations (including the Center’s reading intervention, HILLRAP) for Elementary Program pre-service candidates. In 2019, Duke’s

Elementary Teacher Preparation Program was invited by the Center to participate in a field test of the Center’s new Foundations of Reading micro-credentials that include five pillars recognized in the National Reading Panel Report: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. This partnership supports and enriches the literacy training for Duke Elementary Program candidates.

In addition, instruction in the academic language of reading (literacy terms) is incorporated into reading methods classes.

**I. SCHOOL/COLLEGE/DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SCDE) INITIATIVES**

**A. Direct and Ongoing Involvement with/and Services to Public Schools**

LEAs/Schools with whom the EPP has Formal Collaborative Plans	Durham Public Schools
Start and End Dates	Ongoing
Priorities identified in Collaboration with LEAs/Schools	Partners for Success (PFS) was created in the Fall of 1998 in response to the need for an organized tutoring program that would support Durham Public School students within the Duke Durham Neighborhood Partnership. The current goals of PFS are to: 1. Connect DPS with a constant source of supervised and trained volunteer tutors. 2. Provide opportunities for Duke undergraduates to participate in and observe school and community-based learning environments. 3. Encourage Duke undergraduates to engage prek-12th grade students academically through the cultivation of positive relationships. 4. Facilitate Duke undergraduates’ development through critical reflection that connects field experiences with education coursework
Number of Participants	In 2020-2021 approximately 142 Duke undergraduates served as volunteer tutors. The

	program involved 18 community sites and approximately 66 host teachers and staff.
Activities and/or Programs Implemented to Address Priorities	Since the inception of Partners for Success (PFS) in the Fall of 1998, over 2,500 Duke students have provided academic tutoring to students at 18 Neighborhood Partnership schools and community programs. PFS is dedicated to providing high quality tutoring that will have a positive impact on students' academic development. PFS meets this goal by providing on-going tutor training, Internet accessible learning activities and tutorial materials, and interactive reflection activities. PFS is continually modified and improved with the help of principals, teachers, and tutor reflection, as well as student data, in hope that it will serve as a model for other Neighborhood Partnership tutoring programs.
Summary of the Outcome of the Activities and/or Programs	Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the following represents outcomes for the 2018-2019 academic year. 92% of community partners agreed that PFS volunteers were dependable 95% of community partners agreed that volunteers cultivated positive relationships and actively participated in activities with students 84% of Duke students agreed that the service-learning experience was an integrated and relevant part of their coursework 88% of Duke Students felt they had a positive impact on the academic skills of students 54% of Duke students are interested in continuing as volunteers beyond their course commitment
LEAs/Schools with whom the EPP has Formal Collaborative Plans	Durham Public Schools
Start and End Dates	Ongoing



<p>Priorities identified in Collaboration with LEAs/Schools</p>	<p>Duke TeachHouse is a first-of-its-kind living and learning community for graduates of the Duke University teacher preparation programs: Elementary, Secondary, and Master of Arts in Teaching Programs aimed at equipping young educators with the knowledge and networks to support teacher well-being and cultivate leadership, culturally responsive practices, creative problem-solving, and school innovation. Expanded in 2021 to two neighboring houses located in the heart of the Durham community, TeachHouse is rooted in purpose and place. New teachers live, learn, and engage in the community they serve, and in so doing, become grounded in the history, stories, assets, and culture that shape the lives of their students.</p>
<p>Number of Participants</p>	<p>9</p>
<p>Activities and/or Programs Implemented to Address Priorities</p>	<p>TeachHouse Fellows are awarded two-year fellowships and work as teachers in the local schools. The first year of the program focuses on transitioning to the professional workplace, building relationships, embracing and empowering teacher identity and voice, and engaging as members and students of their own learning context – their school, their district, their community, their profession. In the second year, fellows work collaboratively with faculty and administrators at the school sites to identify a critical school priority, and design innovation projects to help address that priority.</p>
<p>Summary of the Outcome of the Activities and/or Programs</p>	<p>TeachHouse Fellows emerge as confident and effective educators, lead in the classroom and in their schools, and consistently receive teaching and leadership awards, including Durham Public Schools Beginning Teacher of the Year. An evaluation by Duke’s Social Science Research Institute identified benefits of TeachHouse as combatting demoralization, validating challenges,</p>

	<p>cultivating self-care, and supporting and enhancing teaching practices.</p> <p>Since its inaugural year (2015), TeachHouse has established vibrant partnerships with educators and educational organizations across the state, U.S. and globe. These include the National Humanities Center in the Research Triangle Park, Durham Public Schools Foundation Teacher Leadership Academy, Harvard Business School/Case Method Institute, Central Connecticut State University Teacher Leader Fellowship Program, Peaceful Schools NC, Teach for Nepal, and Renfrew County Schools (Ottawa, Canada).</p>
--	--

**II. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS**

**A. Number of Students Who Applied to the Educator Prep Program.**

Gender	Number
Male	2
Female	8
Gender Neutral	
Gender Not Provided	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>
Race/Ethnicity	Number
African-American	2
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	1
Asian	2
Hispanic/Latino	1
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	
White	4
Two or More Races	
Race Not Provided	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

**B. Headcount of students formally admitted to and enrolled in programs leading to licensure.**

<b>Full-Time</b>						
	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Gender Neutral</b>	
<b>Undergraduate</b>	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	1	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	4	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0
	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	1	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0
	Asian	0	Asian	3	Asian	0
	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	2	Hispanic/Latino	0
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0
	White	2	White	7	White	0
	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0
	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	1	Not Provided	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Licensure-Only</b>	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0
	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0
	Asian	0	Asian	0	Asian	0
	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0
	White	0	White	1	White	0
	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0
	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Residency</b>	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0
	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0
	Asian	0	Asian	0	Asian	0
	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0

	White	0	White	0	White	0
	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0
	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Part-Time</b>						
	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Gender Neutral</b>	
<b>Undergraduate</b>	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0
	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0
	Asian	0	Asian	0	Asian	0
	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0
	White	0	White	0	White	0
	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0
	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Licensure-Only</b>	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0
	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0
	Asian	0	Asian	0	Asian	0
	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0
	White	0	White	2	White	0
	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0
	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Residency</b>	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0	Black, Not Hispanic Origin	0
	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native	0
	Asian	0	Asian	0	Asian	0
	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0	Hispanic/Latino	0

	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0
	White	0	White	0	White	0
	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0	Two or More Races	0
	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0	Not Provided	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>

**C. Program Completers and Licensed Completers (reported by EPP).**

Program Area	Bachelor Degree		Licensure Only		Residency	
	PC	LC	PC	LC	PC	LC
<b>PC - Completed program but has not applied for or is not able for a license.</b>						
<b>LC-completed program and applied for license.</b>						
Prekindergarten	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elementary	3	0	1	0	0	0
Middle Grades	0	0	0	0	0	0
Secondary	9	0	0	0	0	0
Special Subjects	0	0	0	0	0	0
Exceptional Children	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vocational Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Services	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Comment(s):</b>						

**D. 2019-2020 Program Completers, Percentage of 2019-2020 Program Completers Licensed, and Percentage of 2019-2020 Program Completers Employed in 2020-2021.**

Bachelor		2019-20 Program Completers	2019-20 Licensed		2019-2020 Completers Employed in 2020-21	
		N	N	%	N	%
Alternative	Institution	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	State	825	686	83.15	689	83.52
Traditional	Institution	5	*	*	N/A	N/A
	State	2,307	1,996	86.52	1,531	66.36

N/A – Data Not Available \* - Less than five reported

Note: The purpose of this table is to provide information on candidates that become employed within one year of their program completion to meet reporting obligations in law. To calculate the number of graduates of the EPP employed, the following definitions are applied:

- Completers: represents all candidates that completed either a traditional or alternative route in 2019-2020.
- Licensed: completers in 2019-2020 (either traditional or alternative) that earned either an IPL or CPL.
- Employed: completers in 2019-2020 (either traditional or alternative) that were employed as a teacher of record in a North Carolina Public or Charter School between the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school year.

For a more detailed examination of Program Completer data over time, please visit the NCDPI EPP Dashboard at [EPP Performance | NC DPI](#).

**E. Top 10 LEAs employing teachers affiliated with this EPP. Population from which this data is drawn represents teachers employed in NC in 2020-2021.**

LEA	Number of Teachers
Durham Public Schools	92
Wake County Schools	30
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	17
Winston Salem / Forsyth County Schools	11
Orange County Schools	10
Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools	10
Rockingham County Schools	8
Guilford County Schools	7
Raleigh Charter High School	6
Alamance-Burlington Schools	5

**F. Quality of student teachers admitted to programs during report year.**

Measure	Baccalaureate
MEAN SAT Total	1,394.55
MEAN SAT Math	690.00
MEAN SAT Verbal	711.43
MEAN ACT Composite	32.31
MEAN ACT Math	*
MEAN ACT English	*
MEAN CORE Combined	N/A
MEAN CORE Reading	N/A
MEAN CORE Writing	N/A
MEAN CORE Math	N/A
MEAN GPA	3.49
* To protect confidentiality of student records, mean scores based on fewer than five test takers are not printed.	
Comment(s):	

**G. Scores of student teachers on professional and content area examinations.**

*Pass rates are calculated using only program completed candidates employed in North Carolina Public or Charter Schools.*

Note: State Board Policy LICN-001 1.20b.1 requires teachers issued an initial license to attempt all content exams in the first year of teaching and successfully pass them before or during their third year of teaching. Given this extended period to complete, pass rates are presented by cohort annually to capture the progression of cohort progress over time. While this provides a more frequent data point on EPP pass rates, it's important to remember that only the fourth year cohort data point provides the final, fixed pass rate.

Cohort	License Area	1st Year		2nd Year		3rd Year		4th Year	
		Test Takers	Pass Rate	Test Takers	Pass Rate	Test Takers	Pass Rate	Test Takers	Pass Rate
2017	Elementary (grades K-6)	2	*	2	*	2	*	2	*
2017	Institution Summary	2	*	2	*	2	*	2	*
2018	Elementary (grades K-6)	1	*	1	*	1	*		
2018	Institution Summary	1	*	1	*	1	*		

**H. Teacher Education Faculty.**

Appointed full-time in professional education	Appointed part-time in professional education, full-time in the EPP	Appointed part-time in professional education, not otherwise employed by the EPP
5	15	8

**I. Field Supervisors to Students Ratio (including both internship and residencies).**

2:3
-----

**J. Teacher Effectiveness.**

Teacher Effectiveness							
<p>This section includes a summary of data collected through the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System (NCEES) and Educator Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) for beginning teachers prepared by this Educator Preparation Program. North Carolina defines a ‘beginning teacher’ as one who is in the first three years of teaching and holds a Standard Professional 1 license. The evaluation standards identify the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected of teachers. School Administrators rate the level at which teachers meet Standards 1-5 as they move from ratings of ‘Developing’ to ‘Distinguished’. Effective 2020-21, at the end of their third year beginning teachers must be rated ‘Proficient’ on Standards 1-5 on the most recent ‘Teacher Summary Rating Form’ in order to be eligible for the Standard Professional 2 license. New teachers are more likely to be rated lower on the evaluation standards as they are still learning and developing new skills and knowledge. Student Growth is determined by a value-added measure as calculated by the statewide growth model for Educator Effectiveness. Possible student growth ratings included ‘Does Not Meet Expected Growth’, ‘Meets Expected Growth, and ‘Exceeds Expected Growth’. Additional information about NCEES and EVAAS is available at <a href="https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/districts-schools-support/district-human-capital/educator-effectiveness-model">https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/districts-schools-support/district-human-capital/educator-effectiveness-model</a> .</p>							
- Sample Size represents the number of teachers that obtained educator effectiveness data during the 2020-21 school year.							
- Blank cells represent no data available.							
- If the Educator Preparation Program has fewer than five beginning teachers evaluated during the 2020-21 school year, it is reported as N/A.							
<i>Standard One: Teachers Demonstrate Leadership</i>							
	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished	Sample Size	Missing
Inst Level:	0.00%	0.00%	87.50%	12.50%	0.00%	8	0
State Level:	0.00%	2.46%	73.79%	22.75%	0.99%	2,316	89



<b>Standard Two: Teachers Establish a Respectful Environment for a Diverse Population of Students</b>							
	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished	Sample Size	Missing
Inst Level:	0.00%	0.00%	62.50%	37.50%	0.00%	8	0
State Level:	0.00%	2.99%	64.54%	31.25%	1.22%	2,208	197
<b>Standard Three: Teachers Know the Content They Teach</b>							
	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished	Sample Size	Missing
Inst Level:	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	8	0
State Level:	0.05%	4.30%	76.77%	18.21%	0.68%	2,208	197
<b>Standard Four: Teachers Facilitate Learning for Their Students</b>							
	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished	Sample Size	Missing
Inst Level:	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	8	0
State Level:	0.04%	4.02%	69.91%	25.26%	0.78%	2,316	89
<b>Standard Five: Teachers Reflect on Their Practice</b>							
	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished	Sample Size	Missing
Inst Level:	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	8	0
State Level:	0.00%	3.85%	75.32%	20.20%	0.63%	2,208	197

<b>Student Growth: Teachers Contribute to the Success of Students</b>					
	Does Not Meet Expected Growth	Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth	Sample Size	Unavailable*
Inst Level:	*	*	*	1	7
State Level:	13.49%	81.42%	5.09%	1,238	1,169

\* 'Unavailable' indicates those program completers for the reported year that are teaching in an area where EVAAS is not collected. Percentages reported in this table are calculated off the sample size and do not include 'unavailable' in the calculation.