Rule 24 Endorsement
Mini Program Folio Review Report

Endorsement Program and Grade Levels of Endorsement:

Religious Education 7-12

Educator Preparation Program

Name of Institution:

Creighton University

Date of Review:

9.25.25

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:	
NDE Reviewer:	

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

Nothing in the folio for 1b addresses standards for admission, retention, transition or completion. It only listed available endorsements.

Endorsement program student advising sheets are attached in Appendix A.

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X		No	

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	X		No	

If No, please explain:

The reviewers did not find any information related to this.

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

NA this is a mini folio

Section 1 Overall Rating					
Met		Met with Conditions		Not Met	X

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

Need additional information on field experiences and admission, retention, etc. standards

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	X	No	

2.Narrative Explanation of each Key Assessment Provided?

Yes	X	No	

1.CONTENT - *Praxis II or GPA: Institution utilizes Praxis II and/or GPA to show overall content knowledge.*

Select the Assessment that was presented:

Praxis II	X
GPA	S

Did the institution provide appropriate information to address this element?

Yes	X	No	

If No, please explain:

Data not required as this is a mini folio. General data discussion provided

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Mini folio so minimal data required but appropriate discussion was provided.

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. 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	X		No	

If No, please explain:

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. Data regarding candidate performance

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

4.INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES- Assessment that demonstrates candidate knowledge and skills related to instructional practices. Example of assessment could be the

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

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	X		No	

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	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

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	X		No	

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

If No, please explain:						
Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met
Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required						

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						

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	X		No
If No, please explain:			

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NA

Met	X	Met with Conditions		Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Optional

Appropriate information for a mini folio was provided

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 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:

NA

Met	X	Met with Conditions		Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

NA

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*

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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:

NA

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

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

NA

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:

NA

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

NA

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:

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Met	X	Met with Conditions		Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

NA

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:

Met	X	Met with Conditions		Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

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:

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Institution has minimal completers and limited data but did discuss what information they had available.

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:

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Provided what data and information they had available.

Section 2 Overall Rating

Met	X		Met with Conditions			Not Met	

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Provided what data and information they had available.

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*

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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			Met with Conditions			Not Met	X

Reviewer comment which supports decision (brief statement) - Required

Provided information regarding improvements to endorsement programs and referenced some analysis of student performance. Missing some information around admission retention, transition and completion.

Section 4 - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

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

NEBRASKA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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