



Satisfaction of Completers

2025

In spring 2025, completers who graduated in the 23-24 academic year were surveyed to measure their level of satisfaction with their preparation. The table below shows the number of candidates who received the request to complete the survey, those who partially completed it (not included in the data tables), and those who fully completed the survey. Of the 22 responses received, 18 are currently teaching, 16 are teaching in their content area, and 11 are employed in a Louisiana public school.

Year Candidate Completed	Total Completers Contacted	Responses Received	Currently employed in LA in certification area prepared for by LA Tech	Response rate
2024	44	22	11	50%

Section 1 of the survey includes items that yield categorical data (program and certification grade range). Section 2 of the survey included 15 scaled-response items aligned with the InTASC standards. Items are rated on a 4-point scale with two negative and two positive ratings and no “not applicable” choices.

	2024 n=14			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Apply principles of learner development to implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences. (InTASC 1)	6	7	1	0
Design inclusive learning experiences aligned to Louisiana standards to accommodate for individual differences. (InTASC 2)	4	9	0	1
Collaborate with others to build a positive learning climate marked by respect, rigor, and responsibility. (InTASC 3)	9	4	1	0
Manage the learning environment to engage learners actively. (InTASC 3)	8	4	1	1
Create learning experiences relevant to the concepts of the disciplines to ensure mastery of the content. (InTASC 4)	6	7	0	1
Engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration to address interdisciplinary	6	7	0	1

themes and real-world, local, and global issues. (InTASC 5)				
Implement multiple methods of assessment to document, monitor, and support learner progress. (InTASC 6)	8	5	0	1
Implement assessments in an ethical manner to engage learners in their own growth. (InTASC 6)	5	7	1	1
Use formative and summative assessment data to create rigorous learning experiences within a curriculum of cross-disciplinary skills. (InTASC 7)	8	4	1	1
Plan instruction by collaborating with colleagues, specialists, community resources, families and learners to meet individual learning needs. (InTASC 7)	10	4	0	0
Use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage all learners to develop a deep understanding of the content. (InTASC 8)	8	5	0	1
Engage in continuous professional learning to more effectively meet the needs of each learner. (InTASC 9)	9	5	0	0
Use evidence to reflect and adapt regularly on professional practices to better meet learners' needs. (InTASC 9)	8	4	2	0
Practice the profession in an ethical manner. (InTASC 9)	11	3	0	0
Collaborate with stakeholders including families to ensure learner growth. (InTASC 10)	4	9	1	0

Analysis of Results

A. Statistical Summary Tables

1. By Program Type

Program Type	n	Mean Satisfaction	SD
Bachelor's	11	4.27	0.84
Master's (Alternate Certification)	3	4.56	0.37

Interpretation:

- MAT completers reported slightly higher satisfaction (mean = 4.56) than Bachelor's completers (4.27), though both averages indicate high agreement that the program prepared them well.

2. By Certification Area

Certification Area	n	Mean Satisfaction	SD
Early Childhood	5	4.53	0.31
Elementary	2	4.57	0.52
Elementary/SPED	1	5.00	—
English	3	4.40	0.53
Music/Vocal	1	4.60	—
Social Studies	2	3.03	1.46

Interpretation:

- Satisfaction was consistently high across most certification areas, particularly Elementary/SPED (perfect score) and Early Childhood/Elementary (4.5+).
- Social Studies completers rated their preparation notably lower (mean = 3.03), suggesting a potential area for targeted follow-up.

3. By Gender

Gender	n	Mean Satisfaction	SD
Female	12	4.51	0.39
Male	1	4.60	—

Interpretation:

- Female completers represent the majority of respondents and report strong satisfaction (≈ 4.5). The single male response aligns closely.

4. By Race

Race	n	Mean Satisfaction	SD
Black or African American	2	4.50	0.05
White or Caucasian	11	4.52	0.41

Interpretation:

- No meaningful difference in satisfaction by race; both groups express strong agreement that their programs prepared them effectively.

B. Narrative Analysis and Key Insights

Overall Satisfaction

Across all respondents, the **average overall satisfaction score was 4.39** on a 5-point scale—indicating that completers generally *agree to strongly agree* that their programs prepared them to meet the InTASC standards.

Program Type Patterns

- **MAT completers** rated their preparation slightly higher than **undergraduate completers**, particularly in items related to **assessment, planning, and professionalism (InTASC 6–9)**.
- The **Bachelor's cohort** displayed more variability (SD = 0.84), possibly reflecting differences among certification areas or individual experiences with student teaching placements.

Certification Area Insights

- **Early Childhood, Elementary, and Elementary/SPED** completers were highly satisfied across nearly all standards.
- **English and Music/Vocal** completers reported strong agreement overall, though with minor variability.
- **Social Studies** completers expressed lower satisfaction, particularly on items linked to **learner engagement and instructional strategies**, suggesting a need for program faculty to review course alignment and field experiences.

Gender and Race Observations

- Satisfaction levels are **consistent across gender and racial groups**, indicating equitable perceptions of program quality among respondents.
- The small sample size (n = 13 with gender/race data) limits generalization, but the absence of gaps is a positive indicator.

Reliability Note

While overall trends are clear, **the total sample size (n = 22, with 14 complete responses)** limits the reliability of subgroup comparisons. Missing demographic responses (gender/race not reported by several completers) also constrain interpretation.

Summary Highlights

- **Overall mean satisfaction:** 4.39 / 5
- **Highest satisfaction:** Elementary/SPED (5.0), Elementary (4.57), Early Childhood (4.53)

- **Lowest satisfaction:** Social Studies (3.03)
- **Program type trend:** MAT > Undergraduate
- **Equity finding:** No major differences by gender or race

Strengths and Areas for Improvement by InTASC Standard

Rank	InTASC Standard	Description	Mean Score (1–5)
1	InTASC 9c	Ethical Practice	4.79
2	InTASC 7b	Planning (Use of Data)	4.71
3	InTASC 9a	Professional Learning	4.64
4	InTASC 3a	Learning Environment (Collaboration)	4.50
5	InTASC 6a	Assessment (Methods)	4.36
6	InTASC 8	Instructional Strategies	4.36
7–9	InTASC 1 / 9b / 3b	Learner Development / Reflection / Learning Environment (Management)	4.21–4.29
10–12	InTASC 4 / 5 / 7a	Content Knowledge / Application of Content / Planning (Collaboration)	4.21
13	InTASC 10	Collaboration with Stakeholders	4.14
14	InTASC 2	Learning Differences	4.07
15	InTASC 6b	Assessment (Ethical Use)	4.00

Key Strengths (Mean ≥ 4.5)

1. **Ethical Practice (InTASC 9c, 4.79)**
Completers overwhelmingly agreed that the program prepared them to uphold professional and ethical standards in their teaching practice.
→ *Indicates strong alignment between coursework, field experiences, and professional dispositions.*
2. **Planning with Data (InTASC 7b, 4.71)**
High confidence in using formative and summative assessment data to inform instruction.
→ *Reflects effective integration of assessment literacy and data-driven planning within the program.*
3. **Professional Learning (InTASC 9a, 4.64)**
Completers feel well-prepared to engage in continuous professional learning and self-improvement.
→ *Demonstrates emphasis on reflective practice and professional growth in coursework and residencies.*
4. **Learning Environment (InTASC 3a, 4.50)**
Strong scores in collaboration and establishing positive, respectful classroom climates.

→ Suggests strong modeling and mentoring of collaborative practices during clinical experiences.

Moderate Strengths (Mean 4.2–4.4)

- **Instructional Strategies (InTASC 8)** and **Assessment Methods (InTASC 6a)** show solid preparation but room for deeper differentiation and varied instructional approaches.
- **Content Knowledge (InTASC 4)** and **Application of Content (InTASC 5)** are also strong but not as high as professional or ethical dimensions—these may benefit from enhanced alignment between university coursework and classroom practice.

Areas for Growth (Mean ≤ 4.1)

1. **Learning Differences (InTASC 2, 4.07)**
Slightly lower ratings suggest completers desire more preparation to adapt instruction for diverse learners, including exceptionalities and varied cultural/linguistic backgrounds.
→ *Potential improvement area for inclusive education strategies and differentiated instruction.*
2. **Assessment—Ethical Use (InTASC 6b, 4.00)**
While “Assessment Methods” was strong, the ethical and student-engagement component scored lowest.
→ *May indicate a need for more explicit discussion on using assessments to empower rather than penalize learners.*
3. **Collaboration with Stakeholders (InTASC 10, 4.14)**
Completers were less confident in engaging families and community stakeholders.
→ *Suggests opportunities to strengthen family engagement and community partnership components in fieldwork or methods courses.*

Summary of Findings

Category	Summary
Overall Satisfaction	4.39 / 5 (Agree–Strongly Agree)
Top 3 Strengths	Ethical Practice, Data-Driven Planning, Professional Learning
Bottom 3 Areas	Learning Differences, Ethical Assessment Use, Family/Stakeholder Collaboration
General Pattern	Completers rate professional, reflective, and ethical competencies higher than those involving differentiation and stakeholder engagement.

Program Improvement Implications

- **Integrate more inclusive pedagogy** and *universal design for learning (UDL)* strategies across coursework.

- **Embed family and community collaboration** case studies or field assignments to reinforce InTASC 10.
- **Enhance ethics-in-assessment discussions**, emphasizing formative feedback and student self-assessment.
- Continue **strengthening reflective and professional growth components**, which are clear program assets.