

Rule 24 Endorsement

Mini Program Folio Review Report

Endorsement Program and Grade Levels of Endorsement:

Educator Preparation Program

Name of Institution:

Date of Review:

Results of this review serve as a recommendation to 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:	

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:

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:

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:

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 Met with Conditions Not Met

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

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 No
2. Narrative Explanation of each Key Assessment Provided? Yes 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 GPA

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**

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 No

If No, please explain:

Met Met with Conditions Not Met

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 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 No

If No, please explain:

Met 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 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

No

If No, please explain:

Met

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

No

If No, please explain:

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

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

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. 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

No

If No, please explain:

Met

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

No

If No, please explain:

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

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

8. OPTIONAL - Institution choice if desired - 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 if applicable**

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

No

If No, please explain:

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

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

Section 2 Overall Rating

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met

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

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

Met with Conditions

Not Met

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

Section 4 - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

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

Email Completed form to NDE: marlene.beiermann@nebraska.gov