

Iowa State Board of Education

Executive Summary

August 13, 2026

Agenda Item:	Emmaus University Educator Preparation Program Approval
State Board Goal(s):	Goal 3
State Board Role/Authority:	The State Board of Education sets standards and approves practitioner preparation programs based on those standards. Iowa Code section 256.7(3) and Iowa Administrative Code chapter 281-79.
Presenter(s):	Maryam Rod Szabo, Administrative Consultant Office of Educator Quality Lindsay Harrison, Education Program Consultant Office of Educator Quality Lori Kratzer, Elementary Education Program Director Emmaus University
Attachment(s):	Two
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the State Board grant Emmaus University's Teacher Preparation Program conditional approval for one year.
Background:	Emmaus University offers a teacher preparation program. The program was reviewed by the Educator Quality Team, and the curriculum was evaluated by the Department's Bureau of Educational Examiners and content experts. Under a conditional approval, Emmaus University will have one year to provide evidence that it is in compliance with all teacher preparation program requirements.

Educator Preparation Program Approval Report

Emmaus University

Site Visit: September 12, 2025

Presented to the State Board of Education: August 13, 2026



Department of Education

State of Iowa
Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
400 E. 14th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

State Board of Education

John Robbins, *Iowa Falls*
Cassandra Halls, *Carlisle*
Jeff Henderson, *Cedar Rapids*
Jeremy Lindquist, *Runnells*
Mary Meisterling, *Cedar Rapids*
Erica Roth, *Sioux Center*
Beth Townsend, *Director, Iowa Workforce Development*
Cecelia Harris, *Student Member, Spirit Lake*

Administration

McKenzie Snow, Director and Executive Officer of the
State Board of Education

Division of Teacher Quality and Innovation

Jay Pennington, Division Administrator

Office of Educator Quality

Maryam Rod Szabo, Administrative Consultant
Lindsay Harrison, Program Consultant
Amy Mayer, Education Program Consultant
Stephanie TeKippe, Education Program Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sexual orientation, national origin, sex, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.). If you have questions or complaints related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E. 14th Street, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number: 515-281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, Cesar E. Chavez Memorial Building, 1244 Speer Boulevard, Suite 310, Denver, CO 80204-3582, telephone number: 303-844-5695, TDD number: 800-877-8339, email: OCR.Denver@ed.gov

Contents

Program.....2

Recommendation.....4

Teacher Preparation Program.....4

Conditional Approval.....4

 Emmaus University Program Representatives.....4

Executive Summary.....5

 Emmaus University Overview.....9

 Program Review Fast Facts13

 Emmaus University Team Report.....18

 Site Visit Team Members.....18

 Acknowledgements.....18

2026 Site Visit Findings19

Review Team Members:

Dr. Maryam Rod Szabo, Iowa Department of Education
Dr. Stephanie TeKippe, Iowa Department of Education
Dr. Lindsay Harrison, Iowa Department of Education
Ms. Amy Mayer, Iowa Department of Education
Ms. Joanne Tubbs, Iowa Department of Education
Dr. Kelly Faga, Iowa Department of Education
Ms. Geri McMahon, Iowa Department of Education

Dr. Linda Lind, Iowa State University
Dr. Jen Thoma, Drake University
Ms. Dana Oswald, William Penn University
Ms. Janet Rohmiller, Briar Cliff University
Dr. Tanya Coffelt, Graceland University

Dr. Soh Meacham, University of Northern Iowa
Dr. Angila Moffitt, Northwestern College
Dr. Chad Biermeier, University of Dubuque
Dr. Carrie Thonstad, Northwestern College
Dr. Benjamin Forsyth, University of Northern Iowa
Ms. Stephanie Erps, St. Ambrose University
Dr. Elliott Johnson, Luther College
Dr. Sharon Dentlinger, University of Northern Iowa
Dr. Paula Ganzveld, Mount Mercy University

Recommendation to the Board

Program	Recommendation
Teacher Preparation Program	Conditional Approval

Emmaus University Program Representatives

Ms. Lori Kratzer, Department Chair and Elementary Education Program Director
Dr. John Jimo, Secondary Education Program Director
Dr. Yiyoung Yuk, K-12 ESL Program Director
Ms. Heather Madgwick, Clinical Practice Director, Education Faculty
Mr. Joel Carter, VP/Dean for Academic Affairs

Executive Summary

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Iowa State Board of Education (State Board) grant **conditional approval** for the educator preparation programs at Emmaus University.

Emmaus University has demonstrated compliance with three standards, and there are three standards with concerns that will take additional time to resolve. While the program has developed a plan to address the concerns, because several concerns related to the assessment and clinical practice standards are similar to concerns identified during the previous site visit, the educator quality team will continue to monitor the program's steps to ensure that revisions to processes are sufficient to retain and sustain compliance.

It is important to note that some recommendations are intended solely for the program's continuous enhancement and often surpass basic standards. There is no immediate action necessary beyond a thoughtful response. Findings/Concerns will be revisited annually over the next three years following program approval. Additionally, the recommendations and concerns identified in this review will be reevaluated during the subsequent site visit cycle as part of our commitment to continuous improvement.

Governance and Resources Standard

The Governance and Resources standard is considered **met**.

In response to the site visit report, the unit developed a *Teacher Education Department (TED) Administrative Handbook* containing detailed procedures and processes for individuals responsible for administering the program. The purpose of the handbook is to document institutional knowledge, promote continuity during leadership transitions and ensure transparency and accountability. Creation of this handbook is an important step toward strengthening adherence to established processes, improving sustainability and reducing future concerns.

The review team identified three compliance concerns in the governance standard. The team found that the advisory committee was not meeting regularly. To resolve this concern, the unit developed a plan to convene the advisory committee consistently, documented in their *TED Administrative Handbook*, with specific months established for the meetings and worked to strengthen and expand committee membership. The program will be recording not only the evidence of program data shared with the advisory committee, but also the improvements made based on the data informed recommendations.

A second concern involved the lack of a systematic process for collaboration with content-area faculty who teach in other departments. The unit indicated that regular collaboration does occur and made a plan to track the collaboration moving forward. Moving forward the unit will record evidence of meetings amongst content faculty and the unit, which will include discussion related to state standards for the teacher preparation candidates in different endorsement areas.

The third concern related to resources to support unit functions, namely in terms of administrative support and also to support the new Clinical Practice Director in making some changes to the clinical structure. Additionally, a concern was raised regarding imbalance between secondary and elementary resources for program content oversight. To address this concern, the unit has improved documentation of regular meetings and strengthened collaboration with other programs. An administrative staff position has been posted, although the position has not yet been filled. The unit provided clarification regarding the appropriate distribution of resources and support for both the elementary and secondary programs' curriculum oversight.

Diversity Standard

The Diversity standard is considered **met**.

Candidates and faculty in the preparation program shared their experience as being heard and supported by the campus community.

Faculty Standard

The Faculty standard is considered **not met**.

The team found two instances of secondary preparation courses being taught by individuals with only elementary preparation. In one instance, the concern was addressed through the development of a co-teaching plan. In the second case, a professional development plan was developed that included training in the content and methods and completion of teaching or co-teaching hours in a high school setting to ensure that in addition to content and elementary teaching experience, the faculty member has first-hand experience and preparation to work with secondary students.

The team also identified inconsistent evidence of regular and formal evaluation of faculty and adjunct performance. In response to the concern, the unit developed an evaluation policy for both full-time and adjunct faculty, which is documented in the *TED Administrative Handbook*. It is important to note, this concern was repeated from the previous site visit. Therefore, the educator quality team recommends further monitoring to ensure implementation of the plan, before the standard is considered met.

Finally, the team required documented policies and procedures to communicate to, and collect the evidence of the 40-hour teaching and co-teaching in K-12 setting requirement for all faculty members, including adjuncts teaching methods and supervising students in the field. The unit developed policies in the *TED Administrative Handbook* outlining procedures for communicating and documenting compliance with the 40-hour requirement.

Assessment Standard

The Assessment standard is considered **not met**.

The team found limited evidence that the unit had a clearly defined and cohesive assessment system. The team also identified concerns related to the effective aggregation of assessment data to evaluate program effectiveness. In response to these concerns, the unit developed detailed plans for creating assessment systems, timelines, and data collection processes. A summer retreat was held to revise and reconfigure the assessment system. The team will need to monitor implementation of these processes to ensure sustainability and determine whether the data collected is meaningful, aligned with the program standards, and useful for program evaluation and continuous improvement.

The team also identified the need for stronger, valid and reliable measures related to candidate demonstration of the competencies. In response, the program recognized the need for stronger inter-rater reliability practices and revised the Know, Grow, Show rubrics and developed related assessment protocols.

Teacher Clinical Practice Standard

The Clinical standard is considered **not met**.

The team identified six concerns related to clinical partnerships, candidate supervision and documentation processes. First, the team did not find evidence of an appropriate process to ensure

supervisors' qualifications including those overseeing the special education student teachers. The university revised its policies to ensure qualified supervisors oversee student teaching. For the endorsements offered through a partnership with other programs, the program ensures clarity that the experience is monitored by the approved program. Additionally, the Assessment Coordinator and Clinical Practice Director (CPD) developed a process to collect and document supervisor credentials and qualifications.

Second, the team identified concerns related to the alignment of clinical observation and assessment tools with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. In response, the unit revised observation forms for clinical experiences to align with the InTASC standards. Additional time is needed to fully implement and evaluate these revised processes.

Third, the team found evidence of inconsistent tracking of clinical hours and a transfer candidate who had not completed the minimum number of required clinical hours. In response, the CPD developed a digital tracking system for candidate clinical hours and revised policies for accepting transfer credits now outlined in the *TED Administrative Handbook*.

Fourth, the team did not find evidence of a formal process to ensure that cooperating teachers were appropriately licensed. In response, the unit developed a policy for determining and documenting the qualifications of supervising teachers and evaluators, as outlined in the *TED Administrative Handbook*. Related to the same concern prior to the site visit, the unit discovered a compliance concern related to a practice of student teachers serving as the teacher of record for the K-12 school that did not require a recognized licensure, and therefore the candidate did not have mentorship and oversight of a cooperating teacher as it is required in Iowa Administrative Code section 281-79 (14). Emmaus University worked with the educator quality team to remedy the situation for the involved student teachers by providing them an opportunity to be placed with a qualified cooperating teacher for the full duration of their student teaching experience before they are recommended for an Iowa license. The unit updated policies to prevent the same concern in the future.

Fifth, the team identified concerns that student teachers did not consistently receive bi-weekly supervisor observations accompanied by meaningful feedback. Observation schedules and feedback practices were found to be inconsistent across placements. In response, the unit developed expectations and monitoring processes intended to improve the consistency and quality of bi-weekly supervisor observations and feedback during student teaching.

Finally, the team noted a repeat concern from the previous site visit related to the cooperating teacher workshop, which was found not to meet the required one-day length. In response, the unit expanded the 1.5-hour synchronous orientation by adding a video overview and a series of monthly newsletters equivalent to a day's worth of communication and training to provide professional learning and clarify the expectations for cooperating teachers.

Teacher Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

The Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions (KSD) standard is considered **met**.

The team commended the unit for their use of the Iowa Literacy Workbook to show alignment of their curriculum to Science of Reading.

The team identified four concerns in this standard. First, the team found no evidence that candidate preparation addressed behaviors related to substance use disorder. In response, faculty revised the course where supporting all students' needs are addressed, and required attendance at the session for students who had completed the course without this content.

Second, the team identified a concern related to the alignment of substituted transfer courses with approved curriculum exhibits. A formal process was devised for reviewing and accepting coursework to appropriately align with approved requirements.

Third, the team required revisions related to literacy content for better alignment with Science of Reading requirements. In response, the unit made the adjustments.

Finally, the team found that not all courses included on the K–12 ELL Endorsement curriculum exhibit was listed on the candidate’s plan of study. The unit submitted a detailed transcript analysis to the educator quality team for the candidates who graduated or were soon graduating to ensure candidates received the appropriate preparation and revised program planning documents to ensure that all required coursework is clearly identified and completed by candidates seeking the K–12 ELL Endorsement.

Emmaus University Overview

Source: U.S. Department of Education Scorecard, Emmaus University, Emmaus University Institutional Report; 2025 Annual Report

General Information

Type: Private Nonprofit
Size: Small
Location: City

Cost

Avg. Annual Cost: \$12,904 (midpoint for certificate schools is \$16,846/year)

Acceptance Rate, Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rate

Acceptance Rate: 98%
Enrollment: 183 undergraduate students
Retention Rate: 70% (% of students returning after the first year)
Graduation Rate: 78% (midpoint for certificate schools is 67%)

Student and Faculty Ratio

Student-to-Faculty Ratio: 8:1

Programs and Endorsements Offered

Awards Offered: Associate's, Bachelor's, Undergraduate Certificate or Diploma
Main Campus: Dubuque, IA
Alternative Paths: N/A
Online Programs: N/A

Education Programs

Elementary Education
Secondary Education

Endorsements Offered

Table 1: Emmaus University Endorsements Offered

K-6	Teacher Elementary Classroom
K-8	Music - Reading – Social Studies
5-12	English/Language Arts - Mathematics– Psychology –World History
K-12	English Language Learners

Bold designates 2024-25 Iowa teacher shortage area

Partnerships

Emmaus University's educator preparation program partners with the following:

- Advisory Committee
- Content area faculty and chairs
- K-12 community school districts
- Clarke University
- Loras College
- University of Dubuque
- Divine Word College

Program Initiatives

Emmaus University initiatives reported from the 2024 Annual Report:

- Weeklong intensive teaching placement - juniors travel to spend a full week observing in one classroom and teaching a unit of instruction that they have developed in collaboration with their cooperating teacher
- Bridge ESL Ministry - small group or one-on-one tutoring for adult English learners, in person or through video (many are overseas); provides cross-cultural and language teaching opportunities for all teacher candidates
- Living Word College partnership - Emmaus students tutor and teach at Living Word as part of the TESOL program at Emmaus; international students from Living Word audit teacher education courses at Emmaus and interact with teacher candidates for academic English exposure
- International school recruiting - small groups of faculty and Emmaus students have provided English teaching in K-12 and summer camp settings in South Korea which has resulted in partnerships with international institutions and in some South Korean students attending Emmaus

Program Trends

A series of tables below provides an overview of program trends.

Program Enrollment

Table 2: Emmaus University Education Enrollment

Semester	# FTE Candidates	# Graduates
Fall 2024	28	5
Fall 2023	29	4
Fall 2022	27	3
Fall 2021	28	8
Fall 2020	33	8

Source: Title II Reports

Program Completers

Table 3: Emmaus University Teacher Program Completers

Academic Year	Early Childhood Only	Elementary Only	Secondary Only	Combined K-6 and 7-12	Total
2023-24	-	4	-	1	5
2022-23	-	2	1	1	4
2021-22	-	1	1	1	3
2020-21	-	6	1	-	7
2019-20	-	5	2	1	8

Source: Annual Reports

Placement Rates

Table 4: Emmaus University Teacher Placement Rates

Academic Year	# Graduates	# Teaching Jobs	# Grad School
2023-24	5	4	-
2022-23	4	4	-
2021-22	3	3	-
2020-21	7	7	-
2019-20	8	8	-

Source: Annual Reports

Clinical Faculty, Adjunct and Cooperating Teacher Totals

Table 5: Emmaus University Clinical Faculty, Adjuncts and Cooperating Teachers

Academic Year	# FT Faculty	# Adjunct Faculty	# Cooperating Teachers	# Candidates in a Supervised Clinical Experience
2023-24	4	0	11	24
2022-23	4	0	3	12
2021-22	2	0	0	3
2020-21	5	0	8	8
2019-20	5	1	10	8

Source: Title II Reports

Program Review Fast Facts

Duration

Self-Study/Process Review Meeting: January 19, 2024

Cohort Meetings: 2024-2025

Institutional Report Received: May 14, 2025

Preliminary Review: June 17, 2025

Program Response Received: August 28, 2025

Site Visit: September 14-17, 2025

Out Brief to Program: September 17, 2025

Draft Report: October 16, 2025

Review Team

Four Iowa Department of Education (Department) program consultants

Fourteen faculty from Iowa educator preparation programs with five site visit volunteers and nine state panel volunteers, representing the following institutions:

- Briar Cliff University
- Drake University
- Graceland University
- Iowa State University
- Luther College
- Mount Mercy University
- Northwestern College
- St. Ambrose University
- University of Dubuque
- University of Northern Iowa
- William Penn University

Stakeholder Input

Surveys: 10-12 questions per survey

Includes short response, Likert scale and open-ended questions

Response - 33 responses from the following stakeholders:

Teacher Preparation

Adjuncts (2)

Alumni (9)

Candidates (2)
Cooperating Teachers (5)
Content Area Faculty (6)
Supervisors (6)
Advisory Committee (3)

Interviews:

Program overview presentation, program assessment presentation, individual faculty (3), classroom visits (4), content faculty (4), institutional administration (4), support staff (4) and student folder review

Class Visits:

Variety of courses, grade levels, majors and endorsements including:

Teaching Diverse Learners

Children's Literature

Social Studies

Student Teaching Meeting

Continuous Improvement

Previous site visit concerns (2018-19) and correlations with the recent visit (2025-26).

Previous Site Visit Concerns and Correlations to Recent Review

1. Governance Standard

2018-19 Site Visit Findings/Concerns: None

2. Diversity Standard

2018-19 Site Visit Findings/Concerns: None

3. Faculty Standard

2018-19 Site Visit Findings/Concerns:

1. **79.12(2)** The team finds evidence of two faculty not fully qualified for their teaching assignments.
 - One faculty member teaches reading practicum, but there is no evidence she has the qualifications for reading beyond an elementary generalist.
 - One faculty member has knowledge and preparation in elementary teaching but has little elementary experience. His teaching experience is 7th grade reading, language arts, and math. He is currently teaching elementary science methods, but there is not clear evidence that he is qualified to do so.
2. **79.12(3)** The team finds evidence that adjunct faculty and full-time faculty are not regularly evaluated. The Faculty Handbook states that “direct observation and evaluation of classroom teaching by the VP/Dean for Academic Affairs, his or her designate, or a peer” might be part of the evaluation process. The VPAA reported that fulltime faculty are evaluated every year in their first three years of employment. The unit chair reports doing evaluations for the adjunct instructors through student evaluations, observations and the handbook evaluation form. Several faculty members reported not having a formal observation-based evaluation based on current identified policy. The team notes a disconnect between policy and procedure.

2025-26 Site Visit Correlation:

- Two faculty members were teaching secondary classes with preparation and experience at K-8 level.
- Inconsistent evidence of reviewing faculty performance.

4. Assessment Standard

2018-19 Site Visit Finding/Concerns:

1. **79.13(1)** The team does not find clear evidence that candidates are assessed using performance measures of the teaching standards. For example, evidence suggests the portfolio is assessed based on candidates showing understanding of the standards, not on candidate performance on the standards. In addition, in a review of syllabi, the team found inconsistent

expectations of candidate performance on each standard in each course. Some courses did not have any Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards identified, some had the same standards identified, and others had different standards identified. Further, there is a lack of consistent rubrics and use of rubrics (other than the lesson plan) to gauge candidate developmental progress.

2. **79.13(6)** Evidence indicates inconsistent records of assessment and field experience/student teaching placement data. Further, the team finds that individual candidate assessment data is contained in multiple locations and formats. This makes tracking of student progress and overall program assessment, including clinical experiences, difficult.

2025-26 Site Visit Correlation:

- The team found limited evidence that the unit has a clearly defined, cohesive system of assessment. After the site visit, Emmaus engaged in rigorous work to tighten the assessment system.

5. Teacher Clinical Standard

2018-19 Site Visit Findings/Concerns:

1. **79.14(6)** Candidates have been placed for clinical experiences in Tri-State Christian School. Tri-State Christian is not a state approved school.
2. **79.14(8)** The cooperating teacher workshop is completed by cooperating teachers in 1-1 ½ to 2 hours. The standard requires the equivalent of one full day.

2025-26 Site Visit Correlation:

1. **79.14(6)b** The unit needed to revise their process to make sure candidates are placed with cooperating teachers who have a state-approved license. In the previous visit Emmaus was placing candidates in non-state approved schools.
2. **79.14(7)** The team did not find evidence that the cooperating teacher workshop and communication offered by the unit is equivalent to one day. Emmaus devised a plan to come to compliance and the state will monitor the offering of the workshop in this modality.

6. Teacher Education Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Standard

2018-19 Site Visit Findings/Concerns:

1. **79.15(1), 79.15(5)d.** The team is concerned students may not be receiving adequate math content knowledge instruction. Examination of the math content course syllabi indicates much of the coursework is methods of teaching rather than content. In interviews, students also describe the courses as containing significant methods.
2. **79.15(7)** The secondary math endorsement has 24 credits in math but does not include a 30-hour major.
3. **79.15 (9)** The Curriculum Exhibit sheets are currently under review.

4. **79.15 (9)** The team commends the unit for adjusting courses in the ESL major. **The unit is required to submit a revised ESL curriculum exhibit with the new courses.** The unit will also need to review/update the secondary professional core for ESL. The unit may want to consider developing a K-12 professional core for ESL only.

2025-26 Site Visit Correlation:

- **79.15(5)** This site visit also had a concern with the ELL endorsement, though different than the previous visit. Here, the team found some students in the ELL Endorsement were not required to take all courses as approved. The program adjusted the endorsement and remedied missing coursework.

Site Visit Report with Institution Responses

Emmaus University Team Report

Preliminary Review: June 17, 2025

Site Visit: September 14-17, 2025

Draft of Final Report: October 16, 2025

Site Visit Team Members

Dr. Maryam Rod Szabo, Iowa Department of Education

Dr. Lindsay Harrison, Iowa Department of Education

Dr. Linda Lind, Iowa State University

Dr. Jen Thoma, Drake University

Ms. Dana Oswald, William Penn University

Ms. Janet Rohmiller, Briar Cliff University

Dr. Tanya Coffelt, Graceland University

Acknowledgements

Team members would like to express their gratitude to the Emmaus University community for their hospitality and assistance in facilitating the team's work. The tasks associated with the review process necessitate intense focus by reviewers during a concentrated period of time. Everyone we encountered graciously responded to our questions and requests for materials. We interacted with a wide variety of individuals who demonstrated enthusiasm, professionalism and dedication to this program.

The team expresses its appreciation for the work of all involved with a special thank you to those whose roles were integral in the success of this visit, particularly Ms. Lori Kratzer, Education Department Chair and Elementary Education Program Director, Emmaus University.

2026 Site Visit Findings

Governance and Resources Standard

281—79.10(256) *Governance and resources standard. Governance and resources adequately support the preparation of practitioner candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.10(1) *The professional education unit has primary responsibility for all educator preparation programs offered by the institution through any delivery model.*

79.10(2) *The unit's conceptual framework and governance structure establishes the shared vision for the unit and provides the foundation for all components of the educator preparation programs.*

79.10(3) *The unit demonstrates alignment of unit and program standards with current national professional standards for educator preparation; teacher preparation aligns with InTASC standards; and each unit defines unit and program standards and embeds them in courses and field experiences.*

79.10(4) *The unit provides evidence of ongoing collaboration with appropriate stakeholders. There is an active advisory committee that is involved semiannually in providing input for program evaluation and continuous improvement.*

79.10(5) *When a unit is a part of a college or university, there is ongoing collaboration with the appropriate departments of the institution, especially regarding content knowledge.*

79.10(6) *The institution provides resources and support necessary for the delivery of quality preparation program(s). The resources and support include the following:*

- a. Financial resources; facilities; appropriate educational materials, equipment and library services; and commitment to a work climate, policies and faculty/staff assignments that promote/support best practices in teaching, scholarship and service;*
- b. Resources to support professional development opportunities;*
- c. Resources to support technological and instructional needs to enhance candidate learning;*
- d. Resources to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates;*
- e. Commitment of sufficient administrative, clerical and technical staff;*
- f. Equitable resources and access for all program components, regardless of delivery model or location; and*
- g. The use of part-time faculty and graduate students in teaching roles is purposeful and is managed to ensure integrity, quality, and continuity of all programs.*

79.10(7) *The unit has a clearly articulated appeals process, aligned with the institutional policy, for decisions impacting candidates. This process is communicated to all candidates and faculty.*

Team Findings - Governance and Resources

Recommendations

1. **79.10(2)** The team found the conceptual framework has room for improvement (through the Institutional Report, the Teacher Education Department (TED) Handbook and the overview presentation and interviews). The team recommends the unit establish and document a regular review of research that is current and broad to strengthen the conceptual framework and governance structure.

Unit Response: The Department recognizes the need to establish our conceptual framework on current research literature. Program improvement for this academic year has focused on strengthening our assessment and clinical practice policies and practices. Work on refining our conceptual framework will take place in three phases as depicted in the new *TED Administrative Handbook*.

Phase 1 – Initial research and collaboration (AY 26-27). During AY 26-27, the Department will work with the academic affairs administration, the external Advisory committee, and with other institutions to identify and review relevant literature related to teacher preparation programs.

Phase 2 – Synthesis (Summer 2027). At the summer 2027 retreat and AY 27-28 kick-off meetings, TED faculty will work on revising the current framework in relation to themes from the literature review.

Phase 3 - Refinement and policy (AY 27-28). During AY 27-28, the Department will share the conceptual framework with stakeholders for discussion and feedback. The TED will also review the development process and use this to define a policy in the *Administrative Handbook* for regular review and refinement of the conceptual framework.

2. **79.10(4)** The unit proposed a plan in the preliminary review responses to increase the number of advisory members. The team recommends the unit move forward with the planned action to increase the membership of the advisory committee with a broad representation of members aligned to the programs offered.

Unit Response: The Department added one committee member during AY 25-26 and two potential members have agreed to attend the spring committee meeting on April 14, 2026 – a second-grade teacher and a high school science teacher. TED will continue to recruit members to represent the various stakeholder groups for the university.

Evidence reviewed: Advisory membership document

3. **79.10(6)b** After review of the faculty handbook and interviews, the team recommends the development of a documented and transparent budget to provide capacity for the unit's long-term planning and professional development opportunities.

Unit Response: The Department has articulated a budget process in the *TED Administrative Handbook*. The Department Chair submitted a budget proposal for AY 26-27 in January 2026 to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The budget development process has been approved by the VPAA, but approval of the budget is pending the approval of the academic affairs budget in March 2026.

The budget proposal has been communicated to the full-time TED faculty. Once the budget and any required revision is approved, it will be shared again with the TED.

4. **79.10(7)** The team found an appeals process articulated in the TED Handbook. After review, the team recommends replacing the Iowa Department of Education as the final step of appeal with university administration.

Unit Response: In response to the recommendation, the Department has revised the appeals process to replace the Iowa Department of Education with the university administration as the final step of appeal. This change has been updated in the *TED Administrative Handbook* and the candidate program handbook and will be updated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in the next iteration of the university academic catalog.

5. **79.10(6)** The team did not find adequate resources to address compliance concerns, through development of policies and procedures, identified in 79.10(4, 5 and 6). The team recommends that a short-term contracted position be utilized to support the compliance concerns below.

Unit Response: In response to the concerns in the report, the Department Chair asked for and was given additional resources to enable the development of policies and tools to ensure communication and implementation of department roles and responsibilities. The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) provided an increase in administrative load (from 4 credits as Chair to 6 credits as Chair and 2 credits as Assessment Coordinator) and a corresponding decrease in teaching load. The university also provided release time from some university responsibilities. The additional administrative time enabled some of the following actions in addressing compliance concerns:

- Development of a department handbook to articulate policies and practices (begun Fall 2025)
- Collaboration with other teacher preparation programs regarding effective assessment practices and tools (Fall 2025; Spring 2026)
- Revision of the program and candidate assessment system and collection tools (begun Fall 2025)
- Revision of the Clinical Practice program policies and development of a responsibility checklist to ensure meeting clinical practice requirements (AY 2025-2026)
- Training for the Clinical Practice Director (CPD) (AY 2025-2026)

Findings/Concerns

1. **79.10(4)** The team did not find evidence (through review of advisory committee minutes, interviews and surveys) that an active advisory committee meets semiannually. The team requires the unit to provide a documented plan for sustainable advisory committee input, on a semiannual basis, including how the advisory members will be involved with program evaluation and continuous improvement.

Unit Response: The Emmaus TED has developed a policy for regularly convening the advisory committee in the *TED Administrative Handbook*, as well as tools for communicating with the committee and the faculty regarding program evaluation and program improvement. The Chair uses an agenda template to ensure committee review and discussion of program data, and department accountability to report on program action plans. The templates for each semester are aligned with the timing of program reports (e.g., the Title II report in the spring; Table 10.2).

Table 10.2: Advisory Committee Agenda Items

Meeting	Agenda items
Fall semester (November)	• Department updates - roster, planners and courses, faculty • Review and discussion ◦ Novice Teacher and Employer Survey ◦ TEP Assessment Report (Previous AY) • TED report on action steps
Spring semester (April)	• Department updates, if needed • Review and discussion ◦ IDOE Annual report ◦ Title II report • TED report on action steps

Source: *TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 12

The committee met in October 2025 and reviewed the data from the Novice Teacher and Employer Survey for AY 24-25. The committee provided recommendations for preparing candidates to teach using technology, and to work with students with disabilities. The Chair followed up with the special education teacher from the committee to discuss ways to integrate instructional opportunities for candidates in regard to understanding and supporting students with special needs. The Department will report on their plan for implementing content from this conversation at the spring committee meeting on April 14, 2026.

2. **79.10(5)** The team did not find evidence (through surveys or interviews) that the unit has a systematic process to collaborate with the content faculty to communicate requirements for candidates. The team requires the unit to create a policy and implement a plan for documented, regular collaborative meetings with content faculty.

Unit Response: The TED engages regularly with content faculty on a variety of topics, including education content, but the Department does not have either agendas or documented minutes for these interactions that would allow the insights and feedback of content faculty to inform program improvement.

In response to this concern, the TED has articulated a policy in the *TED Administrative Handbook* for regular collaborative meetings with content faculty. In addition to regular meetings regarding course needs and scheduling, the Department has recognized a need for content collaboration to ensure that TED faculty understand the trends within the disciplines and for content faculty to understand the trends in education. Program Directors will meet annually with relevant content faculty for their program and talking points and conclusions are submitted by the Program Director to the Department Chair.

Meeting agenda items will include:

- Verifying the availability and content of courses listed on program planners and curriculum exhibits
- Addressing course scheduling needs based on candidate planners

Future work: Annual meetings beginning in **AY 26-27** will be followed up by a summary of the meeting talking points by the Program Director(s). The Department Chair should review the summaries and add them to the Academic Year (AY) Data subfolder in the Assessment folder of the Department shared drive.

Evidence Reviewed: *TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 14 Content Faculty Collaboration

3. **79.10(6)** After interviews and review of handbooks, the team found evidence that the following resource requirements are needed for compliance.

d. The team requires the unit to secure resources for the development of policies and procedures to train the new Clinical Practice Director to support quality clinical experiences for all educator candidates.

Unit Response: During AY 25-26, beginning in November, the Department Chair and Clinical Practice Director (CPD) have conducted weekly meetings to ensure communication and progress on clinical practice responsibilities. The Chair uses the minutes of these meetings to follow up with the CPD regarding questions and to ensure administrative follow-through in providing resources.

Both the Chair and CPD have communicated with other teacher preparation programs regarding effective clinical policies and tools. The Chair has developed the Clinical Practice section of the *TED Administrative Handbook* to document clinical policies and practices to ensure consistent implementation. Because of the logistical nature of the CPD role, the Chair has developed a role checklist that synthesizes the CPD responsibilities by month across the academic year. (Resources provided).

Emmaus covered the cost for the Chair and CPD to attend the IACTE Spring conference and the DE & BOEE Chairs/Deans Workshop to provide additional training, as well as opportunities to interact with other teacher training programs.

e. The team requires the unit to address the need for administrative staff or other solution to support the department chair.

Unit Response: The Department Chair has identified areas of administrative load that could be supported by an administrative assistant. The role and responsibilities of an assistant are described in the *TED Administrative Handbook* and outlined in the role checklist. The need for an assistant has been communicated internally and to local constituencies.

The university has provided additional load and release time to the Chair to enable the development of administrative policies and tools to strengthen the Teacher Education Program. Resources to support administrative work were described above under 79.10(6).

The Department continued work with the unit and the administrative position and the search was underway at the time this report was written.

f. The team found evidence that differentiation was not equitably included across both elementary and secondary programs to address the inclusion of learner differences listed in 79.15(2)a-g. The team requires the program to create and integrate curricular and field opportunities alongside assessment of candidate performance as it relates to differentiation.

Unit Response: The Department has identified several ways to expand the learning opportunities for candidates in relation to differentiation:

- Field trip to an alternative placement school to observe the teaching and learning experience at a school for at-risk students
- Updated the Clinical Practice Framework to include candidate placements in grade-range specific ELL and special education classrooms in the sophomore spring field experience which allows elementary and secondary candidates to observe classrooms that represent the needs of the learners that they will be serving (K-6 or 9-12)
- Added a requirement to specify instructional adaptations as part of weekly lesson planning submissions for student teaching. Student teachers from all programs have included adaptations as part of their weekly planning process using a template. [artifacts provided]

Evidence Reviewed: Weekly lesson plan template; ED 311 Diverse Learners Syllabus; Clinical Practice Framework; Folder with student teacher plan examples

Sources of Information

Interviews with: President, vice president/dean for academic affairs, vice president for administration and finance, vice president for enrollment and marketing, department chair, director of technology services, division chair, assessment director, candidates, unit faculty, library director, faculty, clinical practice director, registrar, program directors

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, advisory committee surveys, content area faculty survey, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Diversity Standard

281—79.11(256) Diversity standard. *The environment and experiences provided for practitioner candidates support candidate growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.11(1) *The institution and unit work to establish a climate that promotes and supports diversity.*

79.11(2) *The institution's and unit's plans, policies, and practices document their efforts in establishing and maintaining a diverse faculty and student body.*

Team Findings – Diversity

Strengths

none

Recommendations

none

Findings/Concerns

none

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Vice president/dean for academic affairs, department chair, program directors

Review of: Institutional Report, program response to the preliminary review, handbooks

Faculty Standard

281—79.12(256) Faculty standard. *Faculty qualifications and performance will facilitate the professional development of practitioner candidates in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.12(1) The unit defines and communicates the roles and requirements for faculty members by position. The unit describes how roles and requirements are determined.

79.12(2) The unit documents the alignment of teaching duties for each faculty member with that member's preparation, knowledge, experiences and skills.

79.12(3) The unit holds faculty members accountable for teaching prowess. This accountability includes evaluation and indicators for continuous improvement.

79.12(4) The unit holds faculty members accountable for professional growth to meet the academic needs of the unit.

79.12(5) Faculty members collaborate with:

a. Colleagues in the unit;

b. Colleagues across the institution;

c. Colleagues in PK-12 schools/agencies/learning settings. Faculty members engage in professional education and maintain ongoing involvement in activities in preschool and elementary, middle or secondary schools. For faculty members engaged in teacher preparation, activities include at least 40 hours of teaching or co-teaching at the appropriate grade level(s) during a period not exceeding five years in duration.

Team Findings - Faculty

Recommendations

1. **79.12(1)** The team found (through the institutional report, survey responses and interviews) roles and requirements for full-time faculty are specified, job descriptions exist for most full-time positions and administrative positions included additional detail provided through the preliminary review response. However, the team recommends the unit consider utilizing a consultant to update these position descriptions, including the role of the administrative assistant, and to clarify how the roles are compensated.

Unit Response: As part of the work of developing an administrative handbook for the Department, the Chair has revised and updated the role descriptions and added a role description for an administrative assistant (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 5, 10). The Chair has also created role checklists as tools to ensure the completion of Department policies (Evidence folder - Role Checklists).

Evidence Reviewed: *TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 5 Roles and responsibilities; p. 10 Chart of Responsibilities; Role Checklist

Findings/Concerns

1. **79.12(2)** The team found evidence (through the institutional report, interviews and program responses to the preliminary review) of a course designed for secondary teachers where the instructor's educational preparation and experiences have been at the K-8 grade level. The program response to the preliminary review stated that plans are to use co-teaching with another faculty member or include guest speakers to provide an increased secondary focus. The team requires the unit to provide evidence of the co-teaching plan including:

- teaching responsibilities for the various class components;
- responsibilities for assigning and grading assignments; and
- an updated copy of the course syllabus.

Unit Response: The course is considered a methods course for secondary, so our administrative handbook requires that the course be taught by an instructor with credentials and experience in high school. When the primary instructor does not meet one or the other of these requirements, guest teachers or co-teachers will be included on the syllabus.

Because the course will often include candidates pursuing different secondary endorsements, the ongoing design of the course will continue to include collaboration between the teacher candidate and their cooperating teacher for the concurrent field placement, ensuring that candidates are mentored by someone with certification and experience in their endorsed area in addition to the guidance of the primary instructor and any invited guests.

Evidence Reviewed: Syllabus for particular course showing plans for collaboration with guest teachers.

2. **79.12(2)** The team found (through curriculum vitae review) that an adjunct's experience for a content area is with sixth grade alongside experience teaching seventh and eighth grade, but not in the curricular area. The experience in K-8 does not qualify faculty to teach a 5-12 content endorsement coursework. The unit is required to shift the responsibility to a faculty member with the appropriate preparation and experience. Otherwise, the current faculty may complete a

methods class at a 5-12 level and document additional experiences in 5-12 to teach secondary level endorsements.

Unit Response: During Fall 2025, the 5-12 content course invited a high school content teacher to serve as a guest speaker to provide input on high school content-specific instruction. The guest teacher provided instruction through a video call for one week of the semester.

The Department documented the guest teacher's qualifications in the faculty assignment spreadsheet and the university paid the guest teacher a stipend for serving as an adjunct (Faculty Assignments 25-26; Addendum). The course syllabus was updated to reflect the role of the guest teacher (Syllabus).

The Secondary Program Director has worked with the adjunct faculty for the content area course to develop a plan for engaging in professional development in both the content and methods, completing recency hours in high school history instruction, and participating in training on the InTASC assessment system and rater training for using the common rubrics (Professional Development Plan).

Evidence Reviewed: Faculty Assignments 25-26; Addendum; Syllabus; Professional Development Plan

3. **79.12(4)** While the dean indicated regular meetings with faculty members, the team found inconsistent evidence of regular or formal evaluation of faculty performance (through interviews, institutional report and surveys). The team requires the unit to develop and implement a plan for regular, formal and documented evaluations of faculty and adjuncts.

Unit Response: The Department has developed a formal evaluation policy for both full-time and adjunct faculty (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 19). Although the university has a faculty review policy, the TED recognizes the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that evaluation is consistent and contributes to faculty development. In addition to collecting and reviewing faculty professional development materials and 40-hour recency evidence, the Chair will conduct faculty observations and reviews for faculty teaching courses in **Spring 2026**.

Evidence Reviewed: *TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 19 Evaluation

4. **79.12(5)c** The team requires documented policies and procedures to onboard, assess and communicate the 40-hour requirement to all faculty members, including adjuncts, who oversee methods instruction and university supervisors who oversee student teaching.

Unit Response: The *TED Administrative Handbook* describes the Department policy for communicating and documenting compliance with the 40-hour requirement for all methods and supervising faculty (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 21). As part of program improvement for AY 25-26, the Department Chair will collect faculty documentation of progress toward meeting the recency requirement using the 40-hour reporting form (Reporting Form). The form is sent to all full-time and adjunct faculty who teach methods courses or supervise student teaching. This is a duty planned for the new administrative assistant as depicted on the administrative assistant checklist.

For adjunct supervisors, the Clinical Practice Director tracks and documents the evaluator's credentials and experience as part of coordinating the student teaching placement.

Beginning in Spring 2026, the CPD documents supervisor completion of the 40-hour requirement through the placement supervisor survey and maintains records on the Supervisor spreadsheet (Placement Supervisor Survey; Clinical Placement spreadsheet).

Evidence Reviewed: *TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 21 Recency Requirement; Google Reporting Form “40-hour Recency”; Placement Supervisor Survey; Clinical Placement spreadsheet; Administrative Assistant Checklist

Sources of Information

Interviews with: President, vice president/dean for academic affairs, vice president for administration and finance, vice president for enrollment and marketing, department chair, director of technology services, assessment director, external advisory committee, candidates, unit faculty, library director, faculty, clinical practice director, registrar, program directors, alumni

Review of: Institutional Report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Assessment Standard

281—79.13(256) *Assessment system and unit evaluation standard. The unit's system of assessment will appropriately monitor individual candidate performance and use that data in concert with other information to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.13(1) *The unit has a clearly defined, cohesive system of assessment that includes both individual candidate assessment and comprehensive unit assessment.*

79.13(2) *The assessment system is based on unit standards.*

79.13(3) *The unit tracks and communicates the following criteria for candidates:*

- a. *Entrance into the program.*
- b. *Continuation in the program with clearly defined checkpoints/gates.*
- c. *Admission to clinical experiences (for teacher education, this includes specific criteria for admission to student teaching).*
- d. *Program completion.*

79.13(4) *Individual candidate assessment includes all of the following:*

- a. *Measures used for candidate assessment are fair, reliable and valid.*
- b. *Candidates are assessed on their demonstration/attainment of unit standards.*
- c. *Multiple measures are used for assessment of the candidate on each unit standard.*
- d. *Candidates are assessed on unit standards at different developmental stages.*
- e. *Candidates within designated endorsement areas, as determined on the department website (educate.iowa.gov), complete the foundations of reading assessment.*
- f. *Candidates are provided with formative feedback and opportunities to utilize the feedback to reflect upon and guide their development and growth toward attainment of unit standards.*

79.13(5) *The unit will document regular reviews, evaluation and revision to the system of assessment.*

- a. *The collection, aggregation, analysis and evaluation of assessment data described in this subrule will take place on a regular cycle.*
- b. *Comprehensive unit assessment includes all of the following:*
 - 1) *Individual candidate assessment data on unit standards, as described in subrule 79.13(4), are analyzed.*
 - 2) *Preparation programs will annually report assessment data from the Foundations of Reading assessment, as described in subrule 79.13(4), and services provided for candidates to the department. Analysis of aggregated state data will be utilized to determine Iowa's average passage rate.*
 - 3) *The aggregated assessment data are analyzed to evaluate programs.*
 - 4) *Findings from the evaluation of aggregated assessment data are shared with stakeholders and utilized for program improvement decisions.*

79.13 (6) *The unit shall conduct a survey of graduates and the graduates' employers to ensure that the graduates are well prepared and use the data for program improvement.*

Initial Team Findings - Assessment

Recommendations

1. **79.13(256)** The team found evidence lacking (through institutional report, faculty interviews and student handbook) on how candidates who may not meet unit standards are identified and supported. The team recommends a formalized process for faculty to report and respond to concerns about a candidate's academic progression or dispositions for documentation and communication of candidate growth or lack thereof toward meeting unit standards.

Unit Response: The TED has developed a formal policy for faculty concerns regarding candidate academic and personal needs and articulated it in the *TED Administrative Handbook* (p. 30). Concerns are brought to the attention of the candidate's Program Director. The policy outlines when a meeting should be conducted with the candidate to explicitly address any concerns and provide support for personal and academic growth.

2. **79.13(1)** Based on the review of the institutional report, program overview and faculty interviews, the team found the institution is not using data from the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE). The team recommends the unit evaluate the purpose of the CBASE assessment and, if the assessment is to be continued, determine how to use the scores (e.g., remediation, retesting, restricting admission) for candidates who score below a certain threshold.

Unit Response: Based on the feedback from the reviewing team and faculty discussion, the Department has decided to discontinue the administration of the CBASE assessment.

3. **79.13(4d)** Based on the review of the institutional report, program documents, faculty interviews, Assessment System Walkthrough and student files, the team found little evidence that candidates are assessed using multiple measures at different developmental stages aligned with the unit's standard assessment (InTASC Standards). The team recommends incorporating multiple feedback opportunities on unit standards prior to student teaching.

Unit Response: In addition to the assessments collected in core courses, the Department has revised the dispositional assessment and begun to revise clinical assessments to also measure proficiency and provide feedback to candidates in relation to the InTASC standards. The distribution of measures across candidate development is represented in the assessment system timeline.

Evidence Reviewed: Candidate Assessment System timeline

Findings/Concerns

1. **79.13(1)** The team found limited evidence (through the institutional report, program responses and assessment system walkthrough) that the unit has a clearly defined, cohesive system of assessment. The team requires that the unit defines a cohesive system for the assessment of individuals and the unit, which includes documentation of a clear timeline, process, communications and actions.

Unit Response: The Department added the role of Assessment Coordinator in Fall 2025 (Role Description, *TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 6). The Chair currently serves in this role. The Coordinator has worked with TED faculty to add and refine processes and tools to ensure effective implementation of the unit and candidate assessment cycles. Implementation of some tools and processes has happened in the present academic year and some are scheduled to be revised and implemented in AY 26-27.

The Coordinator has developed the following systems and tools that communicate and support faculty implementation of TED assessment practices:

TED Assessment Blueprint – The Blueprint is a visual map that provides an overview of how the Department standards, tools, processes, personnel, and records interact as a cohesive system for both candidate and program evaluation and improvement (Assessment Blueprint). The Blueprint was developed to answer the following guiding questions in relation to program assessment:

- *What:* The blueprint lists the **standards and frameworks** that guide the assessment process for evaluating candidate progress and program completion and evaluating program effectiveness.
- *How:* It shows the categories of **tools and processes** that enable the unit to measure specific outcomes.
- *When/Who:* The Blueprint lists the system tools that have been developed to ensure that the assessment processes are accomplished in a timely and effective manner.
- *Where:* It outlines the filing and data storage tools and processes that allow stakeholders to retrieve data when needed to inform decision making.
- *Wherefore:* The Blueprint identifies the forms of reports used to communicate **candidate progress** and **program improvement**. It also identifies how consistent review of data and data systems are part of the assessment process.

A color-coded version of the Blueprint provides an overview of the Department's current and ongoing refinement work in assessment as a result of the accreditation process. Black text indicates assessment tools and practices in the Blueprint that were already in place before the accreditation self-study. Blue text indicates elements that have been added or refined by the Department since Spring 2025. Green text indicates elements that will be finished and implemented **by AY 26-27** (Annotated Blueprint with timeline indicated).

TED Assessment Timeline – The timeline is a chronology of the assessment system. It serves as a detailed map of the Department assessment tasks arranged by month, the person(s) responsible to collect and review the data, and how the data is used (Assessment Timeline).

TED Faculty Role checklists – The role checklists show individual faculty assessment responsibilities by month, integrated with other responsibilities associated with their respective roles (Evidence folder - Faculty role checklists).

The university has identified assessment as an area for institutional improvement and has created and filled an administrative position for assessment, the Associate Dean of Accreditation, Assessment, and Institutional Research. In reviewing, refining, and implementing the TED Assessment Blueprint, the Department will benefit from the insight and suggestions of an internal consultant with assessment expertise.

Evidence Reviewed: Role Description, *TED Administrative Handbook*; Assessment Blueprint showing tools, timelines, and roles responsible for candidate and program assessment; Assessment Timeline showing monthly duties necessary for data collection and analysis; Evidence folder - Faculty role checklists

2. 79.13(4a) From the institutional report, program response to the preliminary review and faculty interviews the team found limited evidence on processes demonstrating that measures used for candidate assessment are reliable and valid. The program recognized a need for inter-rater reliability practices to occur. The unit is required to develop and execute a plan for ensuring the assessments are fair, reliable and valid.

Unit Response: The Department faculty have collaborated to use feedback from the site visit team and examples and ideas from other institutions to begin to revise the assessment tools and processes used to evaluate both individual candidates and the program.

Rubric revisions – Faculty assessment work in Fall 2025 included revising the InTASC Know-Grow-Show developmental rubrics and scoring processes so that the language is more consistent and less subjective.

The university provided stipends for faculty to meet in Spring 2026 to continue working on the assessment system. The faculty met for two days to compare the current InTASC descriptors in department scoring tools against the InTASC learning progressions and revise the program criteria to reflect the language from the InTASC document. The revised criteria will be validated through peer review during Summer 2026 and all tasks and scoring tools will be revised in alignment with the validated criteria for implementation in AY 26-27.

The following sections describe both the revisions made during AY 25-26 and the ongoing revisions that will be in place for AY 26-27.

- The *Know* rubric was rewritten as an analytic rubric with multiple criteria and more specific descriptors within each category. Faculty met to cross-score student artifacts using the Know rubric in December 2025. Qualitative comparisons of faculty scoring showed surface level correlation. Future evaluation of the rubric will also include quantitative comparisons of faculty responses. Anecdotal evidence of candidates' response to the implementation of the Know rubric has been that they view it as being easier to use to evaluate their own work in relation to the task and the standards.
- The *Grow* rubric was originally one common rubric used to evaluate candidate artifacts at a broad level. The TED faculty created separate rubrics for each of the InTASC standards and included criteria that reflected the criteria used in the Student Teaching Performance assessment. The rubrics will be updated with the revised InTASC criteria for implementation in AY 26-27.
- In addition to the Grow rubrics, faculty identified the need to review the assignment tasks for each standard and make sure that there is agreement among the faculty regarding how well the artifact assesses the competencies of the standard. The university is providing stipends for faculty to revise course assignments based on the revised InTASC standards and rubrics (Summer 2026). Collaborative validation of Grow assessment tasks will also be part of the TED assessment work in AY 26-27.
- The *Show* stage includes both the Student Teaching Performance Assessment (STPA; administered twice during ST) and the Student Teaching portfolio artifacts and evaluation rubrics.

- The STPA uses a rating scale to evaluate candidate performance in relation to each standard. The tool was revised by adding specific descriptors to each level of the rating scale to help more cooperating teachers better evaluate the developmental level of the candidate in relation to the InTASC competencies. This revised rating scale was implemented for student teaching placements in 2026, both spring and fall. The rubric will be further refined with the updated InTASC criteria for use in Spring 2027.
- The Show stage portfolio artifacts and scoring guides were also evaluated for whether they actually measure the distinctive competencies of the InTASC standards with which they are aligned. Tasks and rubrics for standards 2, 3, 4 and 5 were identified as not being clearly aligned with the standard. The artifact directions were revised to better match the teaching practices for each standard. The scoring checklist for each artifact was revised to include criteria that align with the competencies of the standard. These revised tasks and scoring checklists were implemented during student teaching in Spring 2026. The CPD and Chair will revise the tasks and scoring guides using the updated InTASC criteria for implementation in AY 26-27.
- *Clinical practice tasks* – The TED is in the process of developing observation and reflection prompts for clinical placement tasks that align with each standard, using the revised InTASC criteria. Implementation of the finished clinical reflection tasks and rubric will begin Fall 2026.
- *Rubric alignment* - The Department framework tools show how the assessment tools work together as a cohesive, developmental assessment system. Each level of the framework measures candidate teaching skill at a different level when integrated in the rubrics, using language to reflect developmental differences across degrees of proficiency (i.e., what “proficient” means for the Grow stage in contrast to the Know stage). It also shows how the different levels align with the language of the InTASC standards.
- In the framework, the Know stage measures candidate ability to understand and recognize evidence of the standard in different contexts. The Grow stage measures candidate ability to begin to apply the standard to artifacts and in teaching practice. The Show stage measures candidate proficiency in integrating the standards into their own practice during student teaching.

Faculty tools and training – The TED has developed and begun to implement processes and tools to increase the reliability of rater evaluations. The following processes were developed or implemented during Fall 2025:

- *Know-Grow-Show evaluation protocol* specifying how each developmental tool should be administered and evaluated and how the data should be stored and reported to the Assessment Coordinator (Evaluation Protocol).
- *Inter-rater reliability workshop* to cross-score and compare faculty evaluations of the Know stage rubric (Workshop Agenda).

Additional processes are in development to increase faculty consistency in using the assessment tools:

- *Training videos* will be developed in **Summer 2026** to provide explicit guidance on administering and scoring the InTASC assessments. These videos will also be part of the training process for adjunct faculty teaching core courses (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 41).

- Inter-rater reliability work has been added as an ongoing responsibility for all full-time faculty and is scheduled on the Department Assessment Timeline and the faculty role checklists (Assessment Timeline; Folder - Role Checklists).

Multiple measures – The Department has revised the Candidate Assessment System (CAS) overview to show integration of additional assessment measures aligned with the InTASC standards (Revised CAS Timeline).

- *Teachability-Ownership-Professionalism (TOP) dispositional assessment* – Candidates complete the TOP assessment when they apply for program admittance and again when they apply for student teaching. The TOP assessment has been revised to show how the competencies assessed align with the competencies for InTASC 9 and 10 in relation to professionalism and leadership (Revised TOP Assessment).
- *Clinical lesson evaluation* – The Clinical Evaluation Form is used to provide feedback to candidates on lesson delivery. It is used in Practicum 1 and 2 and in Student Teaching. The TED faculty revised this form in Fall 2025 to provide observers with specific InTASC criteria to look for during candidate lessons. This tool is being used for Spring 2026 Practicum 2 and student teaching observations (Revised Clinical Evaluation Form).
- *Clinical reflection and rubric* – The TED has integrated the InTASC standards into the Clinical Practice Framework and assigned at least one standard to each clinical placement experience. The Department has developed reflection tasks and prompts to measure candidate proficiency in connecting the InTASC standards with classroom experiences (Clinical Column). A scoring rubric has also been developed to guide evaluation and feedback on candidate reflections (Clinical Rubric). Both the reflection prompts and rubric are in process. TED assessment work for **Fall 2026** will include reviewing and revising these tools for clinical placements beginning in **Spring 2027**.

Evidence Reviewed: Know Analytic Rubric; Revised Student Teaching Performance Assessment; Folder - Revised Show Assignments; Development Comparison Chart; Competency Comparison Chart; Evaluation Protocol; Workshop Agenda; *TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 41; Assessment Timeline; Folder - Role Checklists; Revised CAS Timeline; Revised TOP Assessment; Revised Clinical Evaluation Form; Candidate Assessment System Competency Comparison Chart Clinical Column; Clinical Rubric

3. 79.13(4&5b) The team found limited evidence (through the institutional report, program responses, faculty interviews and assessment system walkthrough) that the unit aggregates assessment data to effectively evaluate the program. The team found evidence that the unit has a plan to systematize program data, however the software is limited in its capability in data aggregation and analysis in a way that supports decision making at the individual candidate and unit levels. The team requires development of a process or system to aggregate and analyze data that includes multiple measures for assessment at different developmental stages and that allows for communication with stakeholders.

Unit Response: The Assessment Coordinator has developed the following tools and processes to aggregate and report on unit data to stakeholders. All tools are in use, but some will be implemented more fully in the next academic year.

Candidate data spreadsheet – The Assessment Coordinator has developed a spreadsheet to record both individual candidate scores for the Know, Grow, and Show stage of the InTASC measures and also the aggregated scores to report to the institution at the end of the academic year (InTASC Data tab). The spreadsheet has a tab for student teaching performance assessment data. The example shows part of this spreadsheet with individual

student scores for InTASC 6-10, as well as the average of the scores for each of the standards (Student Teaching data). Finally, the spreadsheet has a tab to record and analyze the quantitative and qualitative data from the Novice Teacher and Employer survey (Survey data). By aggregating the quantitative data from the scored tasks and analyzing the qualitative data for themes, the program will be able to find data that can guide program evaluation and action planning.

TED AY Assessment Report – Beginning in **Spring 2026**, the Assessment Coordinator will present program data to stakeholders in the form of a cohesive report (Report Template). The Assessment Coordinator will transfer data from the program spreadsheet to the report. The report will be shared with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the TED faculty, both full-time and adjunct. It will also be shared with the Advisory Committee for feedback that can result in program improvement.

Evidence Reviewed: InTASC Data tab, Student teaching data; survey data from survey of novice educators and their supervisors, Report Template

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Department chair, assessment director, candidates, unit faculty, faculty, clinical practice director, program directors

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, assessment system overview

Teacher Preparation Clinical Practice Standard

281—79.14(256) *Teacher preparation clinical practice standard. The unit and its school partners shall provide field experiences and student teaching opportunities that assist candidates in becoming successful teachers in accordance with the following provisions.*

79.14(1) *The unit ensures that clinical experiences occurring in all locations are in high-quality instructional programs for PK-12 students in a state-approved school or educational facility and are well-sequenced, supervised by appropriately qualified personnel, monitored by the unit and integrated into the unit standards. These expectations are shared with teacher candidates, college/university supervisors and cooperating teachers.*

79.14(2) *Cooperating teachers and college/university supervisors share responsibility for evaluating the teacher candidates' achievement of unit standards. Clinical experiences are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program.*

79.14(3) *Teacher candidates experience clinical practices in multiple settings that include diverse groups and diverse learning needs.*

79.14(4) *Teacher candidates admitted to a teacher preparation program must complete a minimum of 80 hours of pre-student teaching field experiences, with at least 10 hours occurring prior to acceptance into the program.*

79.14(5) *Pre-student teaching field experiences support learning in context and include all of the following:*

- a. *High-quality instructional programs for students in a state-approved school or educational facility.*
- b. *Opportunities for teacher candidates to observe and be observed by others and to engage in discussion and reflection on clinical practice, planning, instruction and assessment.*

79.14(6) *The unit is responsible for ensuring that the student teaching experience for initial licensure:*

- a. *Shall be a minimum of 14 weeks in duration during the teacher candidate's final year of the teacher preparation program.*
- b. *Takes place in the classroom of a cooperating teacher who is appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade-level endorsement for which the teacher candidate is being prepared.*
- c. *Includes prescribed minimum expectations and responsibilities, including ethical behavior, for the teacher candidate.*
- d. *Involves the teacher candidate in communication and interaction with parents or guardians of students in the teacher candidate's classroom.*
- e. *Requires the teacher candidate to become knowledgeable about the Iowa teaching standards and to experience a mock evaluation, which shall not be used as an assessment tool by the unit, performed by the cooperating teacher or a person who holds an Iowa evaluator license.*
- f. *Requires collaborative involvement of the teacher candidate, cooperating teacher and college/ university supervisor in candidate growth. This collaborative involvement includes biweekly supervisor observations with feedback.*
- g. *Requires the teacher candidate to bear primary responsibility for planning, instruction and assessment within the classroom for a minimum of two weeks (ten school days).*
- h. *Includes a written evaluation procedure, after which the completed evaluation form is included in the teacher candidate's permanent record.*

79.14(7) *The unit annually offers one or more workshops for cooperating teachers to define the objectives of the student teaching experience, review the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher and provide the cooperating teacher other information and assistance the unit deems necessary. The duration of the workshop will be equivalent to one day.*

79.14(8) *The institution enters into a written contract with the cooperating school or district providing clinical experiences, including field experiences and student teaching.*

79.14(9) *For teacher candidates with prior experience as a substitute teacher or a paraeducator, the terms of Iowa Code section 256.16(1)“c” apply. The unit will record evidence of prior experiences accepted under this subrule toward the student teaching experience.*

Team Findings – Teacher Preparation Clinical Practice

Commendations/Strengths

- The team commends the unit for the addition of a clinical practices director to assist in the management and implementation of clinical experiences.

Recommendations

1. 79.14(3): The team finds through review of the institutional report, preliminary review response, program opening presentation, syllabi, and interviews with department chair, unit faculty, and clinical practices director that the field experience opportunities provided to candidates may not provide multiple and varied clinical experiences for all candidates. The team recommends that the unit develop a process and expand the tracking system recently begun to monitor and document diversity of field experience placements.

Unit Response: The Clinical Practice Director (CPD) has developed processes to integrate current physical records with the individual candidate digital tracker and to implement the tracker to guide the assignment of field placements (Tracker Template). For candidates whose initial placements were completed before the tracker was used, the CPD consults their physical file and uses field studies logs from placements to update their tracker and identify what experiences have been had and what the candidate needs.

(Access to candidate digital files and trackers will be made available to reviewers, if needed.)

For candidates whose first placements were during AY 25-26, all placement data is recorded in the tracker and labeled by whether it is private or public, Title I, and the location, teacher, and grade level. The CPD makes initial placements (during freshman year) based on the candidate's program and grade level (e.g., 5-12 ELA), if available. Later placements are guided by the records in the tracker.

Information regarding the diversity of placements for candidates who transfer into the program and have had supervised K-12 placements through another teacher licensure program is obtained through correspondence with the school and interviews with the candidate regarding grade level, school, and content area observed (Clinical Placement form - Redacted).

Evidence Reviewed: Tracker Template; Clinical Placement form - Redacted

2. 79.14(4) Through review of the institutional report, preliminary review response, syllabi and student records, the team finds evidence that pre-student teaching field experiences do not consistently align to the content and grade level for which students are being prepared. It is recommended that the unit develop and implement policy and procedures to ensure each student meets the pre-student teaching field experience requirements, including alignment of some of the pre-student teaching experiences with the content and grade level for which candidates are being prepared.

Unit Response: The Department has revised the clinical placement framework to make more explicit the field requirements for candidate experiences leading up to student teaching (Clinical Practice Framework). For example, the field placement usually completed in the fall of the sophomore year specifies that the placement should be in both the grade level and content area that the candidate is pursuing. This is specified again for both of the 1-credit teaching practicums completed before student teaching.

The CPD uses the candidate digital tracker to record both the hours and the nature of the placements for all candidate field placements (Tracker Template). The tracker has been revised to add a space that is designated for tracking the content area focus of the placement, in addition to grade and school characteristics.

Evidence Reviewed: Tracker Template; Clinical Placement Framework

3. 79.14(6)d The team finds through review of the institutional report, preliminary review response, and the student teaching handbook and interviews with students, the department chair, and the clinical practices director that communication with parents or guardians in the student teaching placement is expected during the 4-week full time teaching responsibilities of the 16-week placement. The team recommends that the unit plans and implements coursework or other intentional activity that ensures and documents interaction with parents or guardians occurs during the student teaching semester.

Unit Response: Interaction with parents or guardians is an expectation for student teaching. The CPD covers this topic explicitly during the cooperating teacher orientation workshop before the placement begins (Workshop Agenda). Candidates have a chance to discuss parent interactions with one another and the CPD in the student teaching seminar, and they send a parent communication as a requirement for their professional portfolio (ED 499 Syllabus).

Evidence Reviewed: Workshop Agenda; ED 499 Syllabus

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.14(1) Through review of the institutional report, preliminary review response, student records, and interviews with the department chair and clinical practices director, the team did not find evidence of process and documentation to ensure that supervisors of student teaching are appropriately qualified. The unit is required to develop and implement policy and procedures to ensure supervisors are appropriately qualified, including:

a. how the unit partners with University of Dubuque for those students earning a special education endorsement.

Unit Response: The Department worked with the University of Dubuque to revise the wording of the articulation agreement between the programs to specify that, in addition to the provisions already in place for participating in special education courses and related field work, the University of Dubuque also undertakes to find and supervise qualified student teaching placements for Emmaus candidates seeking a special education endorsement.

Evidence Reviewed: Updated agreement between The University of Dubuque and Emmaus University, addendum regarding Instructional Strategist program

b. a process to check and record qualifications of supervisors for in- and out-of-state placements.

Unit Response: The Clinical Placement Director (CPD) has worked with the Chair to develop a policy for determining and documenting the qualifications of supervising teachers and evaluators (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 45-46). For AY 25-26, the CPD has researched and documented supervisor qualifications through email, direct conversations with teachers, and through accessing licensure databases.

Program Improvement: As part of program improvement, the Assessment Coordinator and CPD developed a survey to use to collect and document information regarding supervisor credentials. When making a placement, the CPD will send out the supervisor credential form

to ascertain the following for any cooperating teacher or placement evaluator (Placement Supervisor Survey):

- Licensure content area, grade level, status
- Experience (years, content area, grade levels)
- 40-hours of recency (content, grade level); this concept is explained on the form for those who are not familiar with this term

Responses to the form are collected in the CT qualifications spreadsheet (Clinical Placement Spreadsheet). The spreadsheet for teacher qualifications is kept in the clinical folder of the shared drive.

Evidence Reviewed: Supervisor Qualifications section of the *TED Administrative Handbook*; Placement Supervisor Survey; Clinical Placement Spreadsheet

2. 79.14(3) After review of field experience and practicum requirements, the team requires the unit to embed InTASC standards within observation and assessment tools to show alignment of unit and program standards throughout the program.

Unit Response: The TED faculty worked together to revise the Clinical Practice Observation Form so that it is integrated with the InTASC standards. This form is used by cooperating teachers and university faculty and supervisors to provide feedback on candidate teaching across the clinical program placements.

The Assessment Coordinator updated the InTASC assessment alignment (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 31-32) to map out clinical placement assessments for each standard. The alignment is represented in the table by field studies courses in blue text.

Future work: The CPD and other program faculty have begun creating tasks and rubrics to evaluate clinical reflections that are integrated with the InTASC standards. Reflection tasks are aligned with the concepts in the standards by providing prompts for both observation and reflection that require candidates to consider the application of the standard in a classroom setting (Prompt Alignment Table - Draft). The Department has also begun to develop a rubric to evaluate candidate growth in understanding of the InTASC standards as reflected in their clinical reflection responses (Clinical Rubric draft).

The TED recognizes that more discussion and work is needed for these tools to be valid and reliable for different clinical placements and for candidates at different developmental levels. The Assessment Coordinator and CPD will oversee the refinement and evaluation of the tools during the **26-27 Academic Year**.

Documents Reviewed: Clinical Evaluation Form; InTASC Assessment Alignment Table in *TED Administrative Handbook*; Prompt Alignment Table - Draft; Clinical Rubric draft

3. 79.14(4) Through the review of candidates' records and syllabi, it is evident that candidates have not always met the minimum number of hours required to be completed in each clinical experience course. The unit is required to ensure that candidates' record shows completion of field experience hours and requirements as defined in course syllabi. Additionally, the unit is required to provide the number and evidence of hours completed and transferred from prior experiences when they waive pre-student teaching clinical requirements from other classes and that total completed experiences add up to 80 hours.

Unit Response: The CPD has developed a process for using the digital tracker to maintain records of candidate completed hours. Program gateway applications require evidence of completed clinical hours. Candidates need 10 hours to be admitted to the Teacher

Education Program. They need 80 hours to be admitted to student teaching. Both the program application and the student teaching application have been updated to explicitly include these requirements (Program Application; Student Teaching Application). TED faculty verify these numbers when making the decision to admit a candidate to the TEP or to student teaching.

The Department has developed a policy for accepting transfer credits to meet the field studies requirements (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 45). Candidates are asked to provide evidence regarding the number of hours and type of placement, in addition to a transcript showing college credit, if applicable. If the course description does not specify the hours associated with the credits, correspondence from the transfer school is used to verify the hours completed. Evidence for completed hours is kept in the candidate digital file and is noted on their program tracker.

Documents Reviewed: Program Application; Student Teaching Application; Supervisor Qualifications in *TED Administrative Handbook*

4. 79.14(6)b Through review of the Institutional Report, preliminary review response, student records and interviews with the department chair and clinical practices director, the team did not find evidence that a process is in place to ensure that cooperating teachers are appropriately licensed for clinical experiences. The team requires the unit to develop and implement a well-defined process to review and document that teachers are appropriately licensed in the subject area and grade-level endorsement for which the candidate is being prepared. The unit is required to check each cooperating teacher with the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners (BOEE) for appropriate licensure for placements in Iowa. For placements in other states, the unit is required to check the state's licensure system and ensure the teacher holds a standard teaching license that required completion of a teacher education program. For international placements, the unit is required to obtain and examine and document the licensure required in the international placement.

Unit Response: The CPD has worked with the Chair to develop a policy for determining and documenting the qualifications of supervising teachers and evaluators (*TED Administrative Handbook*, pg. 44). Emmaus is grateful for input from colleagues at other institutions regarding this process.

When making a placement, the CPD sends out the Placement Supervisor form (Placement Supervisor Survey) to request and verify the following for any cooperating teacher or placement evaluator:

- Licensure content area, grade level, status
- Experience (years, content area, grade levels)
- 40-hours of recency (content, grade level); this concept is explained on the form for those who are not familiar with this term

Responses to the form are collected in the CT qualifications spreadsheet. The spreadsheet for teacher qualifications is kept in the clinical folder of the shared drive (Clinical Placements).

Note: International placements were made before the Department developed the form to collect information regarding teacher credentials. In these cases, the acting CPD requested evidence of teacher qualifications and experience via email. Evidence of teacher qualifications were added to the candidate digital file, as well as to the Department cooperating teacher files (International example).

Documents Reviewed: Placement Supervisor Survey; Spreadsheet that tracks CT Qualifications for Clinical Placements; Qualifications in *TED Administrative Handbook*; Email showing how international placements are analyzed for CT qualifications

5. 79.14(6)f The team did not find evidence that student teachers consistently receive biweekly supervisor observations with feedback (through review of the institutional report, student records, student teaching handbook). The student teaching handbook documents that eight observations during the student teaching semester are expected with feedback provided within twenty-four hours. Observations occur on an inconsistent schedule, rather than biweekly and evidence of observations was not consistently available. Additionally, there was inconsistent evidence of whether feedback conferences occur. The team requires the unit to establish and implement procedures to ensure supervisor observations occur on a biweekly basis and documented feedback is provided in a timely manner. The unit is required to develop and implement a process to ensure these expectations are consistently met.

Unit Response: The CPD has developed a process to ensure that bi-weekly observations are documented as required. The purpose and importance of the observations and debrief is emphasized in the student teaching handbook and during the evaluator orientation process before the placement begins. If the department hires an adjunct supervisor who is not able to attend the orientation, the CPD meets with them to conduct this training.

During student teaching, the CPD monitors the collection of bi-weekly evaluation forms. Evaluation forms are uploaded to the candidate's digital file.

Sometimes unforeseen circumstances arise that prevent a supervisor from performing an observation. If an observation is missed, the CPD will follow up with the supervisor to get the next placement scheduled. The CPD will work with the candidate to video a comparable lesson and to have the video evaluated by both the cooperating teacher and a full-time TED faculty member from the appropriate program so that the candidate receives timely feedback. If more than one observation is missed, the CPD will secure a qualified supervisor to finish the evaluations for the placement.

Documents Reviewed: *TED Administrative Handbook* p. 21 showing the procedures for training of adjunct supervisors; *TED Administrative Handbook* p. 33 showing the student teaching evaluations as an artifact collected in the Candidate Digital Program Tracker

6. 79.14(7) The team did not find evidence (through the institutional report, preliminary report responses, interviews, artifacts (e.g., email correspondence, preview video for cooperating teachers, handbooks) that the cooperating teacher workshop and communication offered by the unit is equivalent to one day. The team requires the unit to develop and implement one or more cooperating teacher workshops and communications that are the equivalent of one day.

Unit Response: For the spring semester, the Department conducted 1.5 hour synchronous, video-call based orientation workshops for cooperating teachers and supervisors. In addition to the meeting, cooperating teachers watched a video overview and read the student teaching handbook prior to attending the synchronous session (Workshop Plan). The CPD has followed-up on this initial training with a series of monthly newsletters, which provide reminders and guidance that are specific to the placement. For example, the February newsletter provides guidance for CTs in completing the mid-point evaluation forms, guidance for scheduling, and a reminder and guidance for completing W-9s for those receiving a stipend from the university (Student Teaching Newsletter).

Documents Reviewed: Student Teaching Newsletter; Workshop Plan

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Department chair, director of technology services, assessment director, candidates, unit faculty, clinical practice director

Review of: Institutional report, program response to the preliminary review, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation

Teacher Candidate Knowledge Skills and Dispositions Standard

281—79.15(256) *Teacher candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions standard. Teacher candidates are to demonstrate the content, pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn in accordance with the following provisions:*

79.15(1) *Each teacher candidate demonstrates the acquisition of a core of liberal arts knowledge, including English composition, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences and humanities.*

79.15(2) *Each teacher candidate receives dedicated coursework and demonstrates competency related to the study of human relations, cultural competency and diverse learners, such that the candidate is prepared to work with students from diverse groups as defined in rule 281—79.2(256). The unit shall provide evidence that teacher candidates develop the ability to identify and meet the needs of all learners, including:*

- a. *Students from diverse ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.*
- b. *Students with disabilities. This will include preparation in developing and implementing individualized education programs and behavioral intervention plans, preparation for educating individuals in the least restrictive environment and identifying that environment, and strategies that address difficult and violent student behavior and improve academic engagement and achievement.*
- c. *Students who are struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia.*
- d. *Students who are gifted and talented.*
- e. *English learners.*
- f. *Students who may be at risk of not succeeding in school. This preparation will include classroom management addressing high-risk behaviors, including behaviors related to substance use disorder.*

79.15(3) *Literacy instruction and practical application include all of the following:*

- a. *All teacher candidates demonstrate competency in literacy, including reading theory, knowledge, and evidence-based reading strategies and approaches, and integrating literacy instruction into content areas. The teacher candidate demonstrates competency in responsive teaching and making appropriate accommodations for students who struggle with literacy. Demonstrated competency shall address the needs of all students, including students with disabilities; students who are at risk of academic failure; students who have been identified as gifted and talented or English learners; and students with dyslexia, whether or not such students have been identified as children requiring special education under Iowa Code chapter 256B. Literacy curriculum shall include evidence-based reading instruction, determined by research, including those practices identified within the statewide literacy plan, and institutions ensuring the preparation shall not include instruction or practical application on teaching foundational reading that incorporates the three-cueing system.*
- b. *Each teacher candidate in specified endorsement areas listed on the department website (educate.iowa.gov), determined by the department, demonstrates competency in direct and explicit strategies and systematic and sequential approaches to teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and text comprehension. Literacy instruction and practical application shall include evidence-based reading instruction and shall not include instruction or practical application on teaching foundational reading that incorporates the three-cueing system.*

79.15(4) *Each teacher candidate demonstrates competency in all of the following professional core curricula:*

- a. **Learner development.** *The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across*

the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

- b. **Learning differences.** The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.*
- c. **Learning environments.** The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.*
- d. **Content knowledge.** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) being taught and creates learning experiences directly related to the Iowa core that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to ensure mastery of the content.*
- e. **Application of content.** The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.*
- f. **Assessment.** The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress and to guide the teacher's and learners' decision-making.*
- g. **Planning for instruction.** The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of the learners and the community context.*
- h. **Instructional strategies.** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.*
- i. **Professional learning and ethical practice.** The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate the teacher's practice, particularly the effects of the teacher's choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals and the community) and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.*
- j. **Leadership and collaboration.** The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.*
- k. **Technology.** The teacher candidate effectively integrates technology into instruction to support student learning.*
- l. **Methods of teaching.** The teacher candidate understands and uses methods of teaching that have an emphasis on the subject and grade-level endorsement desired*

79.15(5) *Each teacher candidate must complete a 30-semester-hour teaching major that minimally includes the requirements for at least one of the basic endorsement areas, special education teaching endorsements or secondary level occupational endorsements. Additionally, each elementary teacher candidate must also complete a field of specialization in a single discipline or a formal interdisciplinary program of at least 12 semester hours. Each teacher candidate is to meet all requirements established by the BOEE for any endorsement for which the teacher candidate is recommended.*

Team Findings - Teacher Candidate Knowledge Skills and Dispositions

Commendations/Strengths

- The team found the program's focus on ELL and the Bridge English as a Second Language Program experiences provided for teacher candidates to be a strength and an asset to preparing future teachers as they work with English learners and should be commended.
- The team found the unit has dedicated significant resources to revising and updating the literacy curriculum using the Iowa Literacy Educator Preparation Workbook.

Recommendations

1. 79.15(2)c The team found (through the institutional report, program responses, course syllabi) that the program dedicates coursework for dyslexia training. However, it is recommended that the program add additional content to focus on supporting students struggling with literacy, including those with dyslexia, specifically at the secondary level.

Unit Response: The TED has identified several ways to expand candidate understanding of students with a range of literacy needs, including students with dyslexia. Curriculum work to support candidates in learning about and planning for student needs in literacy include:

- Refining elementary education literacy coursework to better align with the Iowa Literacy Workbook (literacy alignment table), including meeting the needs of students who struggle with literacy.
- Expanding the secondary content-area literacy course from 2 credits to 3 credits and increasing the content and assignments addressing literacy needs (ED 420 Syllabus).
- Refining the tiered task assignment for both the elementary and secondary design courses to include specific adaptations for students who struggle with literacy (ED 330 Elementary Syllabus; ED 332 Secondary Syllabus).

Documents Reviewed: Literacy alignment table; ED 420 Syllabus; ED 330 Elementary Syllabus; ED 332 Secondary Syllabus

2. 79.15(2) b, c, d, f The team found (through program responses, course syllabi, student work samples and student interviews) that the content and experiences of supporting students with disabilities, those who are struggling with literacy, gifted and talented and at-risk are introduced and covered within the coursework. It is recommended to have teacher candidates explicitly state accommodations/modifications for these students within lesson planning to demonstrate the ability to meet the needs of these populations.

Unit Response: This recommendation also aligns with feedback from the TED external Advisory Committee regarding support for candidates in differentiating instruction. Based on this feedback, the Department has updated the requirements for the design and differentiation courses to include explicit adaptations in lesson plans (ED 330/332 Lesson adaptations assignment). The CPD has also revised the student teaching weekly lesson plan template to include a space for specifying adaptations for students in the placement (weekly lesson plan template). Student teachers in all programs (K-12 ESL, Elementary, and Secondary) have used the updated template to consistently indicate the adaptations planned for each week (Folder - Student teaching weekly plans).

Documents Reviewed: Folder - Student teaching weekly plans; weekly lesson plan template; ED 330/332 Lesson adaptations assignment

3. 79.15(4) j The team recognizes that the program identified family collaboration as a gap for the secondary education program as mentioned in the preliminary review response. It is recommended that the secondary education program embeds additional focus or experience to meet the family collaboration requirement.

Unit Response: The Secondary Program has developed assignments to provide candidates with opportunities to practice family communications. During ED 395 Practicum 1, secondary candidates send a home communication about their teaching during the weeklong teaching practicum (Practicum syllabus).

Documents Reviewed: Practicum syllabus

4. 79.15(4c) Through interviews and review of placement data, the team found candidates are placed in different settings but there is limited intentionality about exposing candidates to diverse populations of students. The team recommends a policy that guides the field placement coordinator to select settings for each candidate that include a range of differing populations.

Unit Response: The Clinical Practice Director (CPD) and Chair have revised the clinical practice framework to specify the types of placements expected for field studies to ensure that candidates experience diverse placements and populations. The department has also developed a protocol for the CPD to use in evaluating placements according to candidate endorsement areas and needs.

In addition to these accountability tools, the department administrative handbook will be revised (Summer 2026) to include a robust narrative of the placement decisions for the framework to ensure sustainability of placement diversity and equity.

Placement types that all candidates experience include:

- Public
- Private
- Title I
- Grade specific (based on endorsed range)
- Content specific (based on endorsement)
- ELL classroom (K-6 or 5-12)
- Special education classroom (K-6 or 5-12)

Findings/Concerns

1. 79.15(2)f Although the team found evidence of the ability to identify and meet the needs of at-risk students, no evidence was noted regarding behaviors related to substance use disorder. The unit is required to provide a plan to embed this competency within the syllabi and how the content will be delivered to all teacher candidates before the time of graduation.

Unit Response: The TED faculty who co-taught ED 311 Teaching Diverse learners added at-risk behaviors and substance use disorder to the syllabus and presented the content in Fall 2025 (Syllabus - ED 311 Teaching Diverse Learners).

All three of the seniors who did not have this content when they were in the course were invited to attend the class and field trip related to at-risk students. The seniors were not able to attend the field trip, but they all attended the class session on substance use disorder (email communication; content slides).

Documents Reviewed: Syllabus - ED 311 Teaching Diverse Learners; email communication; content slides

2. 79.15(3) a-b The team commends the program for being one of ten institutions to complete a peer review of the literacy workbook as a component of the site visit. The team requires the unit to address the requirement set as “not met” in the workbook to meet the standards, as specified in Chapter 79, including: content area literacy. Also, phonics, phonemic awareness, text comprehension and vocabulary need revision related to how candidates are assessed.

Unit Response: The Elementary Education program has completed the requirements specified in the Emmaus Literacy Workbook Alignment document with the exception of one course assignment that will be updated as part of the program literacy work during the summer (due June 30, 2026). The updates to the courses are described in the alignment document. The program will continue to refine and update all literacy curriculum materials through participation in the Literacy Summit and completion of the summit competency work (June, 2026) and through participation in the IRRC Reading summit (June, 2026).

Documents Reviewed: Literacy Workbook Alignment; various literacy syllabi and assignments; Emmaus Literacy Workbook site visit follow-up document

3. 79.15(5) The team did not find evidence (through student records, email documents, interview) of alignment for substituted courses with approved curriculum exhibits for each endorsement. The team requires that the unit create an appropriate process for accepting the coursework, ensuring that the transferred courses are appropriately aligned to the curriculum that was submitted to, and approved by the BOEE.

Unit Response: The Department has articulated a policy (*TED Administrative Handbook*, p. 51) for verifying the fit of transfer credits that are accepted for courses listed on the approved curriculum exhibits. Program Directors review the course number, title, and description, if available, for compatibility with course requirements for the program curriculum exhibits. Consideration is given both to the fit between course numbers and content and also to any evidence that the course directly addresses the competencies listed in the curriculum exhibit.

Transfer credit must be approved by the Department Chair. Accepted courses and the date of approval are noted on the candidate’s advising checklist (Exhibit Checklists).

The university academic catalog specifies that transfer credit from other institutions is granted based on “demonstrated quality, comparability, appropriateness, and applicability to those of Emmaus” (p. 23).

Because of this expectation, the practice of the registrar’s office is to verify transfer credit for program-specific coursework with the respective departments. Current practice in relation to teacher education is for the registrar to contact the chair directly for approval of transfer credit. However, to ensure accountability in this area (i.e., in the event that a future registrar seeks confirmation from a different member of the TED faculty), the *TED Administrative Handbook* requires that transfer credit for teacher education course requirements be approved by the Chair.

Evidence Reviewed: *TED Administrative Handbook* p. 51 transfer credit policy; University Catalog, p. 23 Credits and Advanced Standing

4. 79.15(5) The team did not find evidence that all courses on the K-12 ELL Endorsement exhibit are listed on the Emmaus plan of study resulting in some graduates having incomplete coursework. The unit is required to submit a transcript analysis for all ELL graduates from the past seven years and offer courses, at the expense of the institution, to graduates with a deficit. The unit is also required to present

a detailed analysis that shows how all four-year plan of study documents are aligned to the submitted and approved BOEE exhibits and create endorsement checklists for use by advisors.

Unit Response: The unit was asked to provide both a transcript audit and a curriculum audit. These are addressed separately.

1. ELL graduate audit. The ESL Program Director conducted a transcript analysis for all ELL graduates from the past seven years. The Chair and Program Director developed a protocol for the audit and a recording spreadsheet (Audit process).

The audit spreadsheet for the ESL program audit shows the courses that meet the competencies for the K-12 curriculum exhibit (Course reference tab) and has a tab to show the course completion for the graduates. All graduates were found to have completed coursework that addressed all of the competencies for the K-12 ESL Curriculum exhibit (Redacted audit sheets).

The ESL Program Director has developed separate plans of study for the K-12 ESL program that each fully address all the courses listed on the K-12 ESL Curriculum Exhibit - one planner built on the K-8 Professional Core (K-12 ESL Planner/K-8 emphasis) and one built on the 5-12 Professional Core (K-12 ESL Planner/5-12 emphasis). Candidates choose one track and use the appropriate exhibit checklist to make sure that they meet all the competencies for both the professional core and the K-12 ESL exhibit (Exhibit checklists).

2. TED Planner audit. The Department conducted a program audit for all plans of study that it oversees. Audits were conducted to check all professional core courses and all exhibit courses and credits.

Professional core courses: The K-8 and 5-12 Core pages in the spreadsheet show the alignment between the competencies and courses, copied from the approved BOEE curriculum exhibits (BOEE Curriculum Exhibit folder). The Department assigned shorthand code for each competency area (first column on the “core” tabs) and developed a separate tab for each Professional Core area (K-8 and 5-12), showing the list of courses from the exhibit and the competencies addressed. The Department conducted an audit of all current 4-year planners by comparing each planner to the list of professional core courses (5-12 Core audit; K-8 Core audit).

Endorsements: For each endorsement, the Department created a separate tab in the audit spreadsheet and copied the list of courses and requirements from the curriculum exhibit. Each 4-year planner was compared against the list of courses and credits and documented on the audit spreadsheet (Folder - Planners; Folder - Audits).

Advising checklists: TED created checklists for each endorsement. Each checklist has a column showing the professional core requirements and a column showing the specific endorsement requirements (Exhibit checklists).

Advisors will use the checklists in combination with the 4-year plans of study. Planners provide direction regarding sequence and timing for courses. The checklists ensure that candidates complete all requirements for all endorsements that they pursue.

Ongoing improvement: The checklists were created after the beginning of the spring semester. The Assessment Coordinator and Program Directors will add the correct checklists to candidate digital folders and update them during the spring advising window (finished by April 15, 2026). The process for updating the checklists during advising has been added to the Department assessment timeline (Assessment Timeline). The Assessment Coordinator and CPD will review Candidate checklists as part of file check at the end of the academic year.

Evidence Reviewed: Audit process; ELL K-12 Curriculum Exhibit Sheet and Course reference tab; Redacted audit sheets with student names removed but complete analysis on course completion; K-12 ESL Emmaus Course Planners for both K-8 and 5-12 emphasis; *Assessment Timeline* listing responsibilities and data analysis elements; Exhibit Sheets for 5-12 core and K-8 core; Plan of Study and Audit sheet for each area

Department Response:

Thank you for the thorough work in this. Please tell how the practicum experiences are handled for ESL endorsement.

Response from Emmaus:

The ESL practicum is embedded in ESL 430 Teaching English language learners in K-12. Candidates experience a full-week placement in which they observe and teach in a local ESL classroom. This placement is in either an elementary or secondary classroom.

- For **K-12 ESL majors**, the placement is in addition to student teaching in both elementary and secondary ESL classrooms, so the selection of grade range depends on their area of interest.
- For **elementary majors**, the ESL 430 placement is in an elementary ESL classroom. They do a split student teaching experience with 8 weeks in a K-6 elementary classroom and 8 weeks in a secondary ESL classroom.
- For **secondary majors**, the ESL 430 placement is in a secondary ESL classroom. They do a split student teaching experience with 8 weeks in a 5-12 classroom in their content endorsement area and 8 weeks in an elementary ESL classroom.

Evidence Reviewed: Syllabus ESL 430 Teaching English language learners in K-12

Sources of Information

Interviews with: Department chair, candidates, unit faculty, faculty, clinical practice director, registrar, student teachers, teacher education candidates

Review of: Institutional Report, program response to the preliminary review, curriculum exhibit sheets, Plan of Study, student records, surveys, course syllabi, handbooks, program opening presentation, student work sample assignments, literacy workbook, email documents

Emmaus University State Accreditation Review

Presented to the Iowa State Board of Education
August 13, 2026



Department of Education

Accreditation Cycle and Emmaus University Review

Seven-Year Accreditation Cycle

Program review of compliance with Iowa Administrative Code chapter 281- 79

Program

- Teacher
- Endorsements Offered:
 - K-6 Teacher Elementary Classroom
 - K-8 Music, Reading, Social Studies
 - 5-12 English Language Arts, Mathematics, Psychology, World History
 - K-12 English Language Learner

Review

- 21 experts engaged in the review
- 33 survey responses analyzed
- 228 course syllabi
- 19 interviews
- 4 classroom interviews

Iowa State Board of Education Recommendation

Recommendation

Conditional approval of Emmaus University’s educator preparation program

Three Standards Met	Three Standards Require Additional Monitoring
Governance & Resources	Faculty
Diversity	Assessment
Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions	Teacher Clinical Practice

Governance Standard: Met

Recommendations

- Strengthen conceptual framework
- Budget transparency for planning
- Appeal process revision
- Staffing and resources to support response to review

Resolved Findings/Concerns

- Resources for administrative support
- Resources for clinical practice support
- Advisory Committee process
- Expanded collaboration across colleges (insufficiently documented)

Faculty Standard: Not Met

Recommendation

- Updated Administrative Handbook to add formal position descriptions

Findings/Concerns

- Two individuals teaching secondary with experience in K-8
 - Resolved by including secondary collaboration and co-teaching
 - Resolved by planning to complete professional development and 40 hours in secondary
- Insufficient evaluation of faculty
 - Now have a unit-based policy

Assessment Standard: Not Met

Recommendations

- Devised formal policy for candidate support
- Removed CBASE assessment
- Adapted disposition and clinical assessments across program

Findings/Concerns

- Assessment system revised, needs time for implementation
- Strengthened reliability and validity through new scoring tools
- Plan for aggregation of student data, needs time for implementation

Teacher Preparation Clinical Practice: Not Met

Recommendations

- System to track multiple and varied placements devised
- Purposeful alignment of pre-student teaching experiences
- Intentional documentation of interaction with guardians

Teacher Preparation Clinical Practice Continued

Findings/Concerns

1. Developed policies to ensure appropriate qualification of supervisors and coordination with University of Dubuque
 - Need to review future supervisor placements
2. Aligned clinical rubrics to InTASC standards
 - Need time to see how these are deployed
3. Clinical Practice Director devised system for tracking clinical hours and a policy for accepting transfer field experiences
 - Need to verify tracking system is working

Teacher Preparation Clinical Practice Continued

Findings/Concerns Continued

4. Devised policy to ensure cooperating teachers (CT) are appropriately licensed to match candidate and that student teachers must have a CT
 - Need to follow-up to ensure alignment of CT credentials
5. Developed process for ensuring consistent documentation of bi-weekly observations
 - Follow-up on use of process
6. CT workshop not equivalent to one-day

Teacher Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions: Met

Strengths

- Focus on experiences with students who are ELL
- Used Literacy Workbook as a tool to update literacy curriculum

Recommendations

- Added more secondary level content for those struggling with literacy
- Updated lesson plans to explicitly include adaptations
- Updated policy to ensure placement variety

Teacher Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions Continued

Findings/Concerns

- Provided curriculum and transcript audit to address that not all ELL candidates took approved curriculum
- Updated content related to substance use disorder
- Addressed literacy content changes needed
- Created policy for verification of transfer courses

Iowa State Board of Education Recommendation

Recommendation

Conditional approval for reaccreditation of the Teacher Preparation programs at Emmaus University

Continued Monitoring

- August, December, March and June follow-up
- Report to State Board in spring 2027
- Then return to the State Board for possible full approval fall 2027

Questions

Educator Quality Team