

TSU EPP — ALUMNI SATISFACTION SURVEY DISAGGREGATED ANALYSIS

CAEP Standard R5.3 (Stakeholder Involvement) & CAEP Accountability Measure #2 (Stakeholder Satisfaction) | Survey Window: 2022–2025 | Administered: Spring 2026

I. PURPOSE AND CAEP ALIGNMENT

This analysis presents disaggregated alumni satisfaction data in direct response to the EPP's obligations under **CAEP Standard R5.3** — which requires systematic involvement of external stakeholders (including alumni) in program evaluation and continuous improvement — and **CAEP Accountability Measure #2**, which establishes alumni satisfaction as a verifiable indicator of program effectiveness. Alumni represent a critical external stakeholder voice: they provide ground-level evidence of how well program preparation translates to classroom practice. The data below reflect 11 complete survey responses (and 2 partial) collected between March and April 2026 from graduates of the 2022–23, 2023–24, and 2024–25 cohorts.

II. RESPONDENT PROFILE

Attribute	Distribution	Attribute	Distribution
Total Responses	n=11 complete; 2 partial	Graduation Cohort	2022–23: 18% 2023–24: 55% 2024–25: 27%
Employment Status	100% employed in P-12; 91% in licensure area	Teaching Assignment	EC/Elem: 55% Sped: 18% Middle: 18% Sec: 9%
Gender	Female: 82% (n=9) Male: 18% (n=2)	Geographic Placement	100% Tennessee; 8 distinct districts
Race/Ethnicity	Black, Non-Hispanic: 55% (n=6) White, Non-Hispanic: 45% (n=5)	Years of Experience	1st Yr: 9% 2nd Yr: 45% 3rd Yr: 27% 4+ Yrs: 18%

III. DISAGGREGATED SATISFACTION BY COMPETENCY SECTION

All 27 Likert items used a 5-point scale (5 = Strongly Agree; 1 = Strongly Disagree). Section and overall means are calculated across all respondents with complete item responses.

Competency Section (# items)	Section Mean	% Strongly Agree (5)	% Somewhat Agree (4)	% ≤ Neither (≤3)
Section 1 — Instructional Preparation (6 items)	4.56	64%	30%	6%
Section 2 — Commitment to All Students (6 items)	4.79	82%	15%	3%
Section 3 — Professional Practice (6 items)	4.82	83%	15%	2%
Section 4 — Facilitating Student Learning (5 items)	4.78	78%	22%	0%
Section 5 — Overall Program Experience (4 items)	4.86	86%	14%	0%
P-12 Student Impact (1 item)	4.73	73%	27%	NaN%

★ Items 7, 10, 25, and 26 achieved a section mean of 5.00 — all respondents Strongly Agreed. ▲ Items 4, 5, and 11 represent the three lowest-rated individual items and are priority areas for program review.

IV. ITEM-LEVEL ANALYSIS — STRENGTHS AND PRIORITY AREAS

Lowest-Rated Items (Priority Areas)	Mean	Highest-Rated Items (Program Strengths)	Mean
4. Assessing student learning / data-informed instruction ▲	4.36	25. Would recommend program ★	5.00
5. Classroom management skills ▲	4.36	10. High expectations for all learners ★	5.00
11. Addressing social-emotional needs of students ▲	4.45	7. Commitment to success of all students ★	5.00
3. Strong content knowledge	4.55	26. Clinical experiences were valuable ★	4.91
6. Technology integration	4.64	23. Positive and productive learning environment	4.91

Note: All items with means below 4.50 are concentrated in Section 1 (Instructional Preparation) and Section 2 (Commitment to All Students), particularly around data-informed instruction (4.36), classroom management (4.36), and social-emotional needs preparation (4.45). These findings should inform targeted curriculum review at the next program assessment cycle.

V. COMPARATIVE PREPARATION ANALYSIS

Response Category	% of Respondents	CAEP Implication
Much better prepared than peers	55% (n=6)	Strong competitive positioning; corroborates overall sat. data
Somewhat better prepared than peers	18% (n=2)	73% combined rate above peer programs is an AM#2 asset
About the same as peers	18% (n=2)	Consistent with strong but not differentiated preparation
Unable to compare / No response	9% (n=1)	Recommend comparative framing be added to future survey items

VI. QUALITATIVE THEMES — OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

Program Strengths Cited by Alumni: The most frequently cited strengths centered on (1) **quality and availability of clinical/field experiences**, including student teaching and teacher-of-record placements, which multiple respondents identified as the single most valuable program component; (2) **faculty mentorship and authentic representation of the profession** — respondents noted that professors shared real classroom experiences and provided honest perspectives on the demands of teaching; and (3) **preparation for serving diverse learners**, especially ESL and special education populations.

Areas for Improvement Identified by Alumni: Alumni most frequently recommended stronger preparation in (1) **classroom management and behavioral strategies** for diverse behavioral needs; (2) **special education processes (IEP/504 development and meeting protocols)**, with one respondent noting feeling unprepared for their first IEP meeting; (3) **emotional and psychological aspects of teaching**, including coping with difficult situations; and (4) **geographic accessibility of program delivery**, with one respondent from outside the Nashville metro noting the distance as a barrier. These themes align directly with the minor and major stipulations identified in the February 2026 CAEP review.

VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR R5.3 AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

For CAEP Standard R5.3: These alumni data serve as direct evidence of external stakeholder involvement in the EPP's quality assurance cycle. To strengthen R5.3 compliance, the EPP should formally document the mechanism by which these findings are reviewed by the EPP Advisory Board and should record how specific alumni-identified themes (e.g., classroom management, IEP preparation) inform measurable program revisions. Minutes from advisory board sessions in which this data is presented will serve as verifiable evidence of the feedback loop required under R5.3.

For CAEP Accountability Measure #2: An overall section mean of 4.76/5.0 and a 73% "better than peers" comparative satisfaction rate represent substantive evidence of alumni satisfaction. However, with n=11 complete responses, response rate is the EPP's most significant limitation for this measure. For the Spring 2026 administration, the EPP should pursue a minimum target of n=25 complete responses and stratify outreach by graduation cohort and program area to ensure all SAPs are represented in the alumni satisfaction evidence base.

Survey administered April 2026. Data are self-reported. All personally identifiable information excluded from this analysis.