Rule 24 Endorsement
Regular Program Folio Review Report

Endorsement Program and Grade Levels of Endorsement:

World Language French 7-12

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

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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	X		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	X

If No, please explain:

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The information provided by the institution in 1b does not match with what is requested. 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 may be elsewhere. There is no mention of fieldwork. Tables added to the folio.

Endorsement program student advising sheets are attached in Appendix A.

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X		No	X

If No, please explain:

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	X

If No, please explain:

The institution did not provide a description of how fieldwork experiences are organized or in what courses they are completed. Tables added to the folio.

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	X		No	

If No, please explain:

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Only three completers

Section 1 Overall Rating						
Met			Met with Conditions			Not Met	X

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - **Required**

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. Unsure of admission, retention, transition, completion information. Tables added to the folio.

Section 2 - KEY ASSESSMENTS AND FINDINGS

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)

Section 2 - ARTIFACT 1 – Required Key Assessments-

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.

1.Summary Chart of Key assessments Provided?

Yes	X		No	

2.Narrative Explanation of each Key Assessment Provided?

Yes	X		No	

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 (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*

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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.					
Select the Assessment that was presented:					
Praxis II					
GPA	X				
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?					
Yes	X			No	
If No, please explain:					
Met	X		Met with Conditions		Not Met
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required					
Uses 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	X			No	
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. Link added.					
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required					
The institution uses the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment.					
3.LEARNER/LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS - ***Candidate knowledge and skills related to learners and learning environments.***					
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?					
Yes	X			No	
If No, please explain:					

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The institution uses the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment

Met		Met with Conditions	X	Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

There is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section.

4.INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES – *Candidate knowledge and skills related to instructional practices Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?*

Yes	X		No	

If No, please explain:

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

The institution uses the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment.

Met		Met with Conditions	X	Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

There is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section.
Link added.

5.**EFFECT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES ON P-12 STUDENT LEARNING** - ***Candidate effects or impact on P-12 student learning.***

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X			No	

If No, please explain:

The institution uses the NDE Clinical Practice.

Met		Met with Conditions	X	Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - **Required**

There is no link to the NDE Clinical Practice Assessment scoring rubric, as requested in the instructions to this section. Link added.

6.PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY - ***Candidate knowledge and skills related to professional practice.***

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X			No	

If No, please explain:

Met	X	Met with Conditions		Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

The uses the NDE Clinical Practice.

7.OVERALL PROFICIENCY – *Candidate knowledge and skills related to overall proficiency.*

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes				No	X

If No, please explain:

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The institution used the NDE followup survey for first and third year

Met		Met with Conditions	X	Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - **Required**

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		No	

If No, please explain:

Met		Met with Conditions		Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - **Required**

N/A

SECTION 2 ARTIFACT 2 Data Tables (Required)

Summarized program completer data (disaggregated by program) for at least two complete academic years for each key assessment used for all candidates in the 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

2.CONTENT - *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*

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

past two years should be provided, including the most recent academic year. Aggregated data must be presented on all candidates.					
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?					
Yes	X			No	
If No, please explain:					
Low numbers no data provided					
Met	X		Met with Conditions		Not Met
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - **Required**					
Low numbers no data provided					
3.LEARNER/LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS - *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.*					
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?					
Yes	X			No	
If No, please explain:					
Met	X		Met with Conditions		Not Met
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - **Required**					
Low numbers no data provided					
4.INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES - *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.*					
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?					
Yes	X			No	
If No, please explain:					

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Low numbers no data provided

5.EFFECT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES ON P-12 STUDENT LEARNING - *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.*

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X		No	

If No, please explain:

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Low numbers no data provided

6.PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY - *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.*

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X		No	

If No, please explain:

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Low numbers no data provided

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.*

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X		No	

If No, please explain:

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Low numbers no data provided

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	X		No	

If No, please explain:

Low numbers no data provided. Summary discussion provided.

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Low numbers no data provided. Summary discussion provided

Section 2 Overall Rating

Met	X		Met with Conditions	X		Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Low numbers no data provided. Summary discussion provided

Section 3 - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT *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?*

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program from documentation provided:

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

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:

Clarify field work and where information is located in the folio

Areas for follow up by the on-site visitation team:

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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?
3) Just double checking: How many candidates did this institution have? 5 total in PK-6 and 7-12, or 10? Or were all candidates seeking the PK-12 endorsement? We are recommending that NDE figure out if things were reported in the correct fashion, depending on what the situation is.

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