



Rule 24 Endorsement Regular Program Folio Review Report

Endorsement Program and Grade Levels of Endorsement:

English as a Second Language, PK-6

Educator Preparation Program

Name of Institution:

Creighton University

Date of Review:

9/25/2025

Results of this review serve as a recommendation to the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) regarding continuing approval of this program.

Nebraska Department of Education Review For NDE Use Only	
Date of NDE Review:	9.25.25
NDE Reviewer:	Jim Kent

Met = Information provided supports that the requirements are adequately addressed.

Met with Conditions = The requirements are substantially met; however, the response lacks adequate information and/or a review of the information leads to an inconclusive decision that the standard is met. Institutions will be required to correct the conditions (or file a plan for correction) to maintain State Board approval.

Not Met = Required information is not provided and/or information presented does not provide adequate evidence that the standard is met. Institutions are required to address and correct the conditions (or file a plan for correction) to be considered for State Board approval.

Text in italics in each section is from the Program Review Guidance materials for institutions for your reference.

Section 1 - ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM/CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

1a. Provide contextual information about the institutions' overall Educator Preparation Program. (Found in Rule 20 Folio)

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If No, please explain:

1b. Provide a table and describe the major standards for admission, retention, transition and completion of the overall teacher education program (Rule 20 Att L), or if applicable, provide unique information specific to the endorsement.

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If No, please explain:

The information provided by the institution in 1b is not consistent with what is requested in the directions. Some of the requested information shows up in other places, but it is not collected here. Admission requirements are completely missing. Retention, transition, and completion requirements are stated in other places in the folio but need to be collected here. There is no mention of fieldwork as a requirement here, although it is briefly mentioned later on in the folio.

This information has been added to 1b.

Endorsement program student advising sheets are attached in Appendix A.

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If No, please explain:

The institution provided a list of courses needed for the ESL Endorsement, but not in a fashion that shows when classes are offered or what order students should take them in. Course descriptions would also be helpful.

A link to course description and advising sheet information has been added to 1b part 2.

1c. Describe all field experiences required for the endorsement, including the number of hours for practicum experiences and the number of hours/weeks of clinical experience or internships. (Rule 20 Att N)

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If No, please explain:

The institution did not provide a description of how fieldwork experiences are organized or in what courses they are completed. The 45 hours are mentioned in Section 2, Artifact 1 (in the descriptions of Clinical Practice Key Assessments), but not mentioned in 1c as requested.

Endorsement info and field experience hours added to 1c as a table. The field experience requirements for ECE Pk-3 were added to the Field Experience for Advanced Program doc. [Table 006.02-1](#)

1d. Provide information regarding the number and level of program completers for the data years included in the folio. (Rule 24 Att B)

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If No, please explain:

Section 1 Overall Rating			
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			
<p>It appears that much of the information requested is SOMEWHERE in this folio, but needs to be collected into the sections where it is required. We cannot find any information at all on fieldwork experiences and are confused about how fieldwork (and this ESL Endorsement in general) connects logistically with stackable specialist areas.</p> <p style="color: green;">The information has been placed in requested areas. The stackable masters is a masters that is made up of two endorsements with additional electives where needed. The fieldwork for each endorsement is simply part of the specified endorsement that make up the Masters. This information has been added in 1b.</p>			
Section 2 - KEY ASSESSMENTS AND FINDINGS			
<i>The focus of this section needs to be on types of key assessments used, findings from key assessments, analysis of data, information about candidate proficiency, and how data was used to inform candidate and program improvement decisions. (Textual information is in Rule 20 Folio Section 005.02, A-J)</i>			
Section 2 - ARTIFACT 1 – Required Key Assessments-			
<i>Summary table with required key assessments (the name/type of assessment, a brief description of each assessment, the purpose of the assessment, and when it is administered), in the Narrative of unit's assessment plan, and a link and scoring rubric to the key assessments for the endorsement. Initial level endorsements have seven key assessments required as listed below and an eighth key assessment is optional. Note: For 1: Content below, there should be aggregated data from Praxis II and/or GPA.</i>			
1.Summary Chart of Key assessments Provided?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.Narrative Explanation of each Key Assessment Provided?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.CONTENT - Praxis II or GPA: Data from Praxis II licensure tests should be provided in the form of aggregated pass rates for each year over the past two years			

<i>(if available), including the most recent academic year. Aggregated data must be presented on all candidates. For institutions that do not have two years of data available, Nebraska will accept the use of grades or GPA as an assessment of content knowledge. If GPA is used, the GPA should reflect grades from the required courses in the endorsement. It would also be appropriate to compare GPAs of endorsement completers with the students who majored in the content area who were not teacher education candidates.</i>			
Select the Assessment that was presented:			
Praxis II	<input type="checkbox"/>		
GPA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:			
Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			
The institution states that it utilizes course GPAs and final GPAs for assessment of candidate knowledge.			
2.CONTENT - Candidate knowledge and skills related to application of content.			
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:			
The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate content knowledge and skills. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section. Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE			
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			

The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate content knowledge and skills. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section.	
3.LEARNER/LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS - <i>Candidate knowledge and skills related to learners and learning environments.</i>	
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:	
The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate knowledge of learners and learning environments. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section. Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE	
Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Not Met <input type="checkbox"/>	
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required	
The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate knowledge of learners and learning environments. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section. Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE	
4.INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES – <i>Candidate knowledge and skills related to instructional practices</i> Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?	
If No, please explain:	
The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate knowledge of instructional practices. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section. Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE	

Met	<input type="checkbox"/>		Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required							
<p>The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate knowledge of learners and learning environments. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section.</p> <p>Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE</p>							
5.EFFECT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES ON P-12 STUDENT LEARNING -							
<i>Candidate effects or impact on P-12 student learning.</i>							
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?							
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>					No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:							
<p>The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate effect of instructional practices on p-12 learning. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section.</p> <p>Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE</p>							
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>		Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required							
<p>The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate effect of instructional practices on p-12 learning. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section.</p>							

<p>Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE</p>	
6.PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY - <i>Candidate knowledge and skills related to professional practice.</i>	
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:	
Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required	
<p>The institution provided a description of the portions of the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment that are used for determining candidate effect of instructional practices on p-12 learning. However, there is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section.</p> <p>Link to NDE Clinical Practice Assessment added on pg. 12 And HERE</p>	
7.OVERALL PROFICIENCY – <i>Candidate knowledge and skills related to overall proficiency.</i>	
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:	
<p>While the placement, procedures, and objectives for the Summative Project – ESL Learning Unit are clearly stated here, there is no link provided to the scoring rubric for it, as requested in the instructions to this section.</p> <p>Scoring rubric added on pages 11-12.</p>	

Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required							
<p>While the placement, procedures, and objectives for the Summative Project – ESL Learning Unit are clearly stated here, there is no link provided to the scoring rubric for it, as requested in the instructions to this section. Also, we are confused about why a preschool learning assignment is used as the assessment for all completers from pk-12. Does this have something to do with the stackable nature of Creighton's certificates? (Maybe all the completers thus far are ECE Certificate candidates? What happens if a completer is NOT an ECE Certificate candidate? Is the summative assessment the same?) At any rate, it seems like it would be important to state in this section what summative assessment is used for candidates who are NOT ECE certificate completers as well.</p> <p>The ECE Learning Unit assignment was pasted in error here. The ESL unit description and rubric have been added.</p>							
8.OPTIONAL - Institution choice if desired – Data from an assessment that demonstrates candidates are proficient in content knowledge; professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and/or student learning. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio or course projects, and follow-up studies. Assessments examples could include candidate projects that demonstrate candidate's (a) ability to observe and assess students through case studies or similar projects; and (b) understanding of the profession and candidates' future role as advocates and reflective, continuous learners.							
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?							
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:							
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required							
N/A							
SECTION 2 ARTIFACT 2 Data Tables (Required) <i>Summarized program completer data (disaggregated by program) for at least two complete academic years for each key assessment used for all candidates in the</i>							

<p><i>endorsement program. Reported separately by levels/tracks (baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate route, Master's, Education Specialist, or Doctorate). Assessment instruments and scoring rubrics for each data table included. Required: Assessment instruments, scoring rubrics for each assessment instrument and data tables for each key assessment</i></p>			
<p>2.CONTENT - <i>Assessment that demonstrates candidate knowledge and skills related to application of content. Example of assessment could be the Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation Rubric. Mean scores or aggregated performance levels for each year over the past two years should be provided, including the most recent academic year. Aggregated data must be presented on all candidates.</i></p>			
<p>Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?</p>			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If No, please explain:</p>			
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required</p>			
<p>Requested information on completer scores in Content Knowledge is clearly displayed here (on the assumption that means and ranges were inputted correctly). Important note for modification: The N's at the top of the columns do not match the number of completers indicated earlier in the folio. We are assuming this is a typo, or that something was cut and pasted from another document.</p> <p>Fixed so N=5 throughout</p>			
<p>3.LEARNER/LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS - <i>Assessment that demonstrates candidate knowledge and skills related to learners and learning environments. Example of assessment could be the Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation Rubric. Mean scores or aggregated performance levels for each year over the past two years should be provided, including the most recent academic year. Aggregated data must be presented on all candidates.</i></p>			
<p>Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?</p>			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If No, please explain:</p>			

Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required							
<p>Requested information on completer scores in Learners/Learning Environments is clearly displayed here (on the assumption that means and ranges were inputted correctly). Important note for modification: The N's at the top of the columns do not match the number of completers indicated earlier in the folio. We are assuming this is a typo, or that something was cut and pasted from another document.</p> <p>Fixed so N=5 throughout</p>							
4.INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES - <i>Assessment that demonstrates candidate knowledge and skills related to instructional practices. Example of assessment could be the Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation Rubric. Mean scores or aggregated performance levels for each year over the past two years should be provided, including the most recent academic year. Aggregated data must be presented on all candidates.</i>							
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?							
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:							
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required							
<p>Requested information on completer scores in Instructional Practices is clearly displayed here (on the assumption that means and ranges were inputted correctly). Important note for modification: The N's at the top of the columns do not match the number of completers indicated earlier in the folio. We are assuming this is a typo, or that something was cut and pasted from another document.</p> <p>Fixed so N=5 throughout</p>							
5.EFFECT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES ON P-12 STUDENT LEARNING - <i>Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects or impact on P-12 student learning. Example of assessments include those based on samples of student's work, such as a teacher work sample or instructional analysis project. Mean scores or aggregated performance levels foreach year over the past two years should be provided, including the most recent academic year. Aggregated data must be presented on all candidates.</i>							

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:			
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			
<p>Requested information on completer scores in Effect of Instructional Practices on p-12 Learning is clearly displayed here (on the assumption that means and ranges were inputted correctly).</p> <p>Important note for modification: The N's at the top of the columns do not match the number of completers indicated earlier in the folio. We are assuming this is a typo, or that something was cut and pasted from another document.</p> <p>Fixed so N=5 throughout</p>			
6.PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY - <i>Assessment that demonstrates candidate knowledge and skills related to professional practice. Example of assessment could be the Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation Rubric. Mean scores or aggregated performance levels for each year over the past two years should be provided, including the most recent academic year. Aggregated data must be presented on all candidates.</i>			
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:			
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/>

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			
<p>Requested information on completer scores in Professional Responsibility is clearly displayed here (on the assumption that means and ranges were inputted correctly). Important note for modification: The N's at the top of the columns do not match the number of completers indicated earlier in the folio. We are assuming this is a typo, or that something was cut and pasted from another document.</p> <p>Fixed so N=5 throughout</p>			
<p>7.OVERALL PROFICIENCY - Assessment that demonstrates candidate overall proficiency. Institutions preparing for off-site review in summer 2016 and after will be required to use NDE Follow-up Survey data for this assessment. In the interim, institutions follow-up survey data from recent graduates and employers of those candidates is recommended. However, this key assessment requirement may be met with any institution- determined assessment which documents overall proficiency.</p>			
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:			
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			
<p>Requested information on completer scores in Overall Proficiency is clearly displayed here (on the assumption that means and ranges were inputted correctly). The N's are correct for this assessment! We are confused about why a preschool learning assignment is used as the assessment for all completers from pk-12. Does this have something to do with the stackable nature of Creighton's certificates?</p> <p>Fixed so N=5 throughout</p>			
Section 2 - ARTIFACT 3 – Narrative Summary of Assessment Data			
Interpretation/summary of the assessment data from the institution's perspective.			
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>			No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:					
<p>The institution presents the data for scores for completers for each key assessment in narrative form but does not provide an interpretation of what those scores mean for the program, as requested in the instructions.</p> <p>Fixed so N=5 throughout Interpretation of scores (proficiency level goals) added.</p>					
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>		Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Met <input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required					
<p>The institution needs to add to its narrative a statement of interpretation for each key assessment to indicate what the significance of candidate scores is for the program.</p> <p>Interpretation of scores (proficiency level goals) added.</p>					
Section 2 Overall Rating					
Met	<input type="checkbox"/>		Met with Conditions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Met <input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required					
<p>Completer data from each key assessment is provided, and the institution indicates where these scores fall in terms of "proficient" and "advanced." However, it does not indicate anything about the program based on these results. What range were the goals for the institution for these completers? Did the completers achieve that?</p> <p>Ranges of scores added. Goal for proficiency also added. Yes, all completers exceeded proficiency goals.</p>					
Section 3 - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT <i>Discuss endorsement program changes and improvements made to the endorsement program since the last visit as a result of documented assessment data analysis findings and other information related to the endorsement program area. What did the data indicate and what endorsement program changes were made as a result of data analysis? How were decisions made? What has been the effect of these program changes? What future program improvements are planned? What are implications for overall unit improvement initiatives to the endorsement program?</i>					

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program from documentation provided:							
Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>		Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required							
Information is clearly presented about course and program improvements. We commend the institution's plan for participating in ongoing review for continuous improvement.							
Section 4 - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS							
Other Comments/Findings/Recommendations not addressed in sections 1-3:							
<p>1) Related to the folio: Please just make sure that information is collected together and labeled so that the reader knows better what goes with what. Also don't forget to include links to scoring rubrics, even the one for the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation! Links added</p> <p>2) Related to the folio: You need to be clear about how and where in the program fieldwork hours are completed. Other than a general reference to 45 hours of required fieldwork, it is completely unclear if those happen in a certain course, are spread across courses, etc. fixed - clarified in</p> <p>3) Related to the folio: Could you explain the stacking certificate item more fully? We would be interested in what the most popular twin specialist area is for stacking purposes. Would it be pertinent to include that information in your descriptions in Section 1? Done</p> <p>4) (Extra) Related to program improvement: You mention the SIOP Model in your summative assessment. How are your students learning about and implementing Science of Reading, since that is a current focus of the state? Science of Reading added to program improvement.</p>							
Areas for follow up by the on-site visitation team:							

- 1) What action steps has the institution taken towards the program improvement related to the implementation of the new module in EDU 692? Do these include ways of connecting completers relevantly to ELL families and their issues?
- 2) Should there be a discussion about the creation of a non-ECE version of the summative assessment?

Email Completed form to NDE: crystal.humm@nebraska.gov