



Rule 24 Endorsement Mini Program Folio Review Report

Endorsement Program and Grade Levels of Endorsement:

Mathematics Field 7-12 Master's

Educator Preparation Program

Name of Institution:

Creighton University

Date of Review:

9-22-2025

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:

9.22.25

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:

Updated

Endorsement program student advising sheets are attached in Appendix A.

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?		
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:		
<i>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)</i>		
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?		
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:		
<i>1d. Provide information regarding the number and level of program completers for the data years included in the folio. (Rule 24 Att B)</i>		
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?		
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:		
Section 1 Overall Rating		
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 contextual information is comprehensive and clearly aligned with Rules 20 and 24. The program's history and completer data are also provided, even though the number of completers is small.

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

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"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

Select the Assessment that was presented:

Praxis II	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Praxis II administered prior to beginning the program with minimum score for Secondary Math 159.
-----------	-------------------------------------	--

GPA	<input 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 work was very well organized, detailed, and addressed all required categories. It also demonstrated a thorough understanding of the Praxis II content knowledge.

2. CONTENT - Assessment that demonstrates candidate knowledge and skills related to the application of content. An example of assessment could be the Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation Rubric. Data regarding candidate performance is not included in mini-folios; however, it is expected that performance data be maintained by the institution.					
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?					
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No <input type="checkbox"/>		
If No, please explain:					
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required					
The clinical assessment aligns with InTASC.					
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. Data regarding candidate performance					
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 assessment demonstrates coverage of learning environments.					
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. Data regarding candidate performance is					

not included in mini folios; however, it is expected performance data be maintained by the institution.

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**

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. Data regarding candidate performance is not included in mini folios; however, it is expected performance data be maintained by the institution.

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	--	--	----	--------------------------

If No, please explain:

The clinical practice rubric is listed, but there is a requirement in this section to “demonstrate candidate effects or impact on P-12 student learning” using key assessments related to teacher work samples or projects.

Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>		Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	--	---------------------	--------------------------	--	---------	--------------------------

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

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

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

Standards 9 & 10 on Clinical Practice Assessment. Clear alignment with ethics and collaboration.

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	<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

Employer and Completer Surveys used and survey data meet the requirements.

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"/>						No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	----	--------------------------

If No, please explain:

Met	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------

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

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 are 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 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

If No, please explain:

“Program Completers and Level” (Table 1.d, pg. 6) provided for two academic years and a “Summary of Key Assessments for Initial Programs” (pg. 7). Aggregated data not provided per “Mathematics is a mini folio. No data tables provided” (pg. 11); however, there were only 2 completers for 22-23 and none for 23-24 and the institution cannot provide aggregated data.

Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------

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

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

If No, please explain:

“Program Completers and Level” (Table 1.d, pg. 6) provided for two academic years and a “Summary of Key Assessments for Initial Programs” (pg. 7). Aggregated data not provided per “Mathematics is a mini folio. No data tables provided” (pg. 11); however, there were only 2 completers for 22-23 and none for 23-24 and the institution cannot provide aggregated data.

Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

If No, please explain:

“Program Completers and Level” (Table 1.d, pg. 6) provided for two academic years and a “Summary of Key Assessments for Initial Programs” (pg. 7). Aggregated data not provided per “Mathematics is a mini folio. No data tables provided” (pg. 11); however, there were only 2 completers for 22-23 and none for 23-24 and the institution cannot provide aggregated data.

Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

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 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

If No, please explain:			
<p>“Program Completers and Level” (Table 1.d, pg. 6) provided for two academic years and a “Summary of Key Assessments for Initial Programs” (pg. 7). Aggregated data not provided per “Mathematics is a mini folio. No data tables provided” (pg. 11); however, there were only 2 completers for 22-23 and none for 23-24 and the institution cannot provide aggregated data.</p>			
Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			
<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></p>			
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:			
<p>“Program Completers and Level” (Table 1.d, pg. 6) provided for two academic years and a “Summary of Key Assessments for Initial Programs” (pg. 7). Aggregated data not provided per “Mathematics is a mini folio. No data tables provided” (pg. 11); however, there were only 2 completers for 22-23 and none for 23-24 and the institution cannot provide aggregated data.</p>			
Met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required			
<p>7.OVERALL PROFICIENCY - <i>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.</i></p>			
Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?			
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, please explain:			

“Program Completers and Level” (Table 1.d, pg. 6) provided for two academic years and a “Summary of Key Assessments for Initial Programs” (pg. 7). Aggregated data not provided per “Mathematics is a mini folio. No data tables provided” (pg. 11); however, there were only 2 completers for 22-23 and none for 23-24 and the institution cannot provide aggregated data.

Met	<input checked="" 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

Mathematics is a mini folio. No data tables 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

If No, please explain:

Met	<input checked="" 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

Narrative summary provided: 2 completers, both successful; program faculty analyze Praxis II and Clinical Practice Assessment annually.

Section 2 Overall Rating

Met	<input checked="" 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

Assessments are aligned to InTASC and NDE requirements

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 the implications for overall unit improvement initiatives for 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Met with Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>		Not Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	--	---------------------	--------------------------	--	---------	--------------------------

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

The program outlined clear, data-driven revisions: discontinuing the undergraduate secondary program, redesigning it into a 14-month and later a 12-month accelerated master’s program with extended clinical practice. It demonstrates strong continuous improvement through data analysis and assessment of program outcomes.

Section 4 - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Other Comments/Findings/Recommendations not addressed in sections 1-3:

Alignment with state assessments (NDE Clinical Practice Assessment, Praxis II) ensures consistency and reliability. Even with a small number of completers, the Folio reveals trends that helped guide decisions regarding program redesign.

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



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