



How NCTQ scores the Rigor Standard

[Standard and indicator](#)

Data used to score this standard

To evaluate the undergraduate teacher preparation programs (generally including elementary, secondary and special education programs) within an institution of higher education on the Rigor Standard, we use the following sources of data:

- To identify students' majors and honors status: commencement brochures and graduation lists from spring graduation ceremonies
- To distinguish between single and double majors: course catalogs and websites.
- To gather information about the institutional home of teacher preparation programs: course catalogs and websites.

Who analyzes the data

A [general analyst](#) evaluates data for each institution using a detailed scoring protocol from which this methodology is abstracted. For a randomly selected sample of 10 percent of institutions, a second analyst repeats the analysis. Any scoring discrepancies are resolved using NCTQ's standard protocol for scoring differences, described in the "scoring processes" section of the *Teacher Prep Review's* [general methodology](#).

Scope of analysis

To determine the rigor of teacher preparation programs compared with all undergraduate academic disciplines on the same campus, this analysis compares the proportion of undergraduate teacher candidates earning honors (generally Latin honors such as *cum laude*, *magna cum laude* or *summa cum laude*) relative to the proportion of all undergraduates earning honors at that institution, all at spring graduation.¹ Because these honors are determined by grade point average (GPA), we call the difference between these the "GPA differential." (We note that this differential is identical to what is termed the "honors differential" in the main body of the report.) This standard does not compare the proportion of teacher candidates earning honors to any single, absolute value that is defined as acceptable or optimal. Although the data source does include information about individual students, all data are publicly available and are aggregated to the program level so that no individual's identity is revealed. A score on this standard applies to all undergraduate teacher preparation programs in an institution.

When possible, all non-spring graduating students are removed from the analysis because their grades and levels of honors might systematically differ from students graduating in the spring in some unidentifiable way. Analysts also omit any teacher candidates whose certification would require post-baccalaureate coursework. Students with multiple majors are counted once per major because each major's coursework can have a significant impact on GPAs used to determine honors designations.

¹ The comparison is between teacher candidates and all graduating undergraduate students, inclusive of teacher candidates.

Data Source

Our primary data source comprises spring commencement brochures or graduation lists (from 2010-2013) that meet the following criteria: 1) undergraduate students are identified as graduating from a teacher preparation program, department of education, or similar entity, and 2) honors designations based on GPA are identified for individual students.

If a key piece of information is missing and cannot be obtained after the institution is contacted by NCTQ staff, the institution is removed from the sample.² Any institution with fewer than 20 graduating teacher candidates is automatically removed from the sample to ensure that its programs' performance cannot be attributed to any individual candidates.³

We note that commencement brochures often have to be printed prior to the end of the semester so that they are ready for commencement ceremonies. They frequently contain a caveat that the information contained within their pages is not final and does not constitute proof of graduating. As a result of early printing, the indications of Latin honors are frequently based on students' GPAs prior to the final semester. We do not consider this factor to be a methodological problem because it is true for all graduating students in the analysis. Furthermore, the last semester for most teacher candidates is the student teaching experience, which is often graded as a Pass/Fail course with the Pass translated by institutions as an "A" grade. If anything, including the last semester in GPA calculations might actually increase the GPA differential for teacher preparation programs.

How documents are evaluated for the analysis of honors differences

Categorization of teacher candidates and all other graduating students

Teacher preparation programs can be housed in a wide range of organizational structures. For example, secondary education teacher candidates' majors may be housed within either the education college or the liberal arts college. In roughly half of the institutions analyzed, commencement brochures clearly identify all teacher candidates (we refer to this as providing "precise data"). In others, a combination of less detailed information in the commencement brochure and differing structures of the teacher preparation program result in our analysis relying on "less precise data."⁴

To accommodate these variations, NCTQ developed two approaches to evaluate institutions. When institutions' commencement brochures offer less precise data, we base the evaluation on those students graduating from the education department (or a comparable entity). This approach is generally necessary when the commencement brochure does not identify individual student majors or when some types of teacher candidate (most commonly secondary education candidates) are not labeled as such.

Scoring with precise data

When precise data are available, teacher candidates are coded as elementary education, special education, core secondary education (e.g., English education), or non-core education (e.g., art education, physical education) and (with the exclusion of non-core teacher candidates) broadly grouped as "teacher candidates." Majors that are housed in the College of Education but are not teacher preparation majors (such as education policy) are coded as "education college non-teacher candidates" and are not included in the "teacher candidates" category. All students with majors unrelated to teacher preparation or the education school in general are coded as "other students." The GPA differential calculation is based on the group of students labeled as "teacher candidates."

Scoring with precise data uses a three-part scale. To fully meet the standard, institutions must have a GPA differential below 10 percentage points. The institutions that do not meet the standard are those with a GPA differential of 20 points or more.

² We collected 316 commencement brochures that we could not evaluate due to missing information.

³ We collected 120 commencement brochures that we could not evaluate because fewer than 20 teacher candidates could be identified in each brochure.

⁴ This distinction does not mean that any of the data are inaccurate, just that the institutions with "less precise data" offer information at a broader level and lack some of the distinctions about students' majors and certifications that the commencement brochures for institutions with "precise data" offer.

Score	Interpretation	GPA differential
4	Meets the standard	<10 percentage points
2	Partly meets the standard	≥10 percentage points <20 percentage points
0	Does not meet the standard	≥20 percentage points

Scoring with less precise data

When commencement brochures offer less precise data, candidates are coded according to more general categories. These categories are based on the most specific available “unit of analysis” in which candidates can be grouped, such as an education department, education college, or education-specific degree.

Scoring with less precise data uses a two-part scale in which institutions that have less than a 15 percentage point GPA differential meet the standard.

Score	Interpretation	GPA differential
Pass	Meets the standard	<15 percentage points
Fail	Does not meet the standard	≥15 percentage points

Graphics below depict representative institutional structures and commencement brochure formats and the approaches to analysis used for each.

Comparison of effects of two different analysis approaches

To compare how these two approaches may affect an institution’s score, we looked at a subsample of 50 institutions for which precise data are available. This test determined how much the institutions’ GPA differentials would vary if we proceeded as if only less precise data were available. Thus, we recoded the data for each institution as if we could not identify individual teacher candidates, and instead categorized them based on their departments or other available data. Using a chi-square test, we found the similarity in our final results was highly statistically significant ($p < 0.001$): Almost all institutions (10 of 12) that did not meet the standard when coded using precise data also did not meet the standard when analyzed using less precise data, and all programs that met the standard when coded based on precise data also met the standard when categorized based on less precise data. Most institutions (13 of 17) that partly met the standard when coded on precise data met the standard when coded with less precise data; the remainder did not meet the standard. (As explained above, there is no score of “partly meets the standard” for the institutions rated with less precise data.)

In summary, compared to their ratings with precise data, institutions tended to score the same or better when rated with less precise data. Based on these results, we conclude that the ratings based on less precise data may actually be quite conservative in their estimates of disparities in teacher candidates' grades.

Coding of graduating students receiving honors

Graduating students are coded as having received honors at graduation based primarily on Latin honors, but any honors designations based on cumulative GPA or being within the top specified percent of the graduating class is accepted. Honors designations based on criteria other than GPA or derivatives of GPA (e.g., honors for taking honors courses, writing a thesis, or entering into an honors society) are not considered. No distinctions are made among different levels of honors.

Differences between analyses for Rigor Standard evaluations and *Easy A's* report findings

Although both the analysis for the Rigor Standard described here and the analysis of grading for the report *Training Our Future Teachers: Easy A's and What's Behind Them* are similar and use the same data source, several features of their methodologies differ. Specifically, the *Easy A's* report applies a single two-part rating scale with a 10 percentage point GPA differential cut score for all institutions, while the Rigor Standard applies two different rating scales:

- A two-part rating scale using a 15 percentage point GPA differential cut score for institutions for which less precise data are available.
- A three-part scale using 10 and 20 percentage point GPA differential cut scores for institutions for which precise data are available.

These differences stem from the differing purposes of the two documents. The *Easy A's* report applies a more exacting—and, we believe, eminently justified—cut score to distinguish between institutions whose teacher candidates do and do not have disproportionately higher grades. Because these data are reported in the aggregate rather than singling out individual institutions, using this more stringent cut score fairly represents the state of the teacher preparation field.

However, we recognize that commencement brochures' honors data serves as a proxy for students' GPAs, and so using this data source to rate individual institutions requires suitable caution. To accommodate this limitation, when we have precise data available, we use a three-part rating system so that institutions that have a moderate GPA differential (between 10 and 20 points) do not fail outright, but rather earn a score of "partly meets the standard." When we have less precise data available, we go a step further to create a two-part rating scale with a more generous threshold for meeting the standard. We believe that these two accommodations represent the suitable caution warranted by the limitations of data source available.

Due to these differences, aggregate of findings in the *Easy A's* report and aggregate ratings from the Rigor Standard are largely but not perfectly aligned.

Representative institutional types and approach to analysis used for each


Figures 1-7 depict how we can identify all candidates with elementary, secondary, or special education majors or certifications. The units of analysis in each figure are shown in yellow.

Scenario 1: Precise data, all teaching majors are within the department of education

All teaching majors are identified as such in the commencement brochure and are housed within a Department of Teacher Education in the College of Education.

Explanation: The unit of analysis for calculation of the GPA differential is based on all candidates (and only those candidates) who major in elementary, secondary, or special education.

Fig. 1 All teaching majors are within the department of education




Scenario 2: Precise data, teaching majors are in multiple colleges within the institution

Some core teaching majors are housed in the College of Education and other candidates are housed in the college that contains their content major. All teaching candidates are identified as such in the commencement brochure.

Explanation: The GPA differential calculation is based on all candidates with elementary and special education majors and candidates obtaining secondary certification in core objects.

Fig. 2 Teaching majors are in multiple colleges within the institution




Scenario 3: Less precise data, department of teacher education within the education college

Some teacher candidates are housed in a department within the College of Education and others are housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. Students are grouped by department in the commencement brochure but majors are not identified.

Explanation: Because the institution houses education majors within the Department of Teacher Education and because we can be reasonably confident that the students in that department are teacher candidates, we use the

Department of Teacher Education as the unit of analysis for the GPA differential calculation. Consequently, the calculation of the GPA differential does not include consideration of any graduating candidates with secondary education certification. If any non-teacher preparation majors (e.g., education policy) are also housed within the Department of Teacher Education, the students with those majors are included in the calculation of the GPA differential.

Fig. 3 Teacher education department within the education college




Scenario 4: Less precise data, college of education

Teacher preparation majors are housed in the College of Education and Human Development. The commencement brochure groups students according to college and does not label majors.

Explanation: The clearest grouping of teacher candidates is in the College of Education and Human Development, and so this becomes the unit of analysis for the GPA differential. The calculation includes both teaching and non-teaching majors housed in that college, and excludes candidates obtaining teaching certifications whose majors are housed in other departments.

Fig. 4 Education college




Scenario 5: Less precise data, multiple departments within the college of education

Teacher preparation majors are housed both within multiple departments in the College of Education and outside of the College of Education. Although students' departments are labeled in the commencement brochure, students' majors are not.

Explanation: The unit of analysis for the GPA differential includes students in those departments within the College of Education that house teacher preparation programs (as here, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Department of Counseling and Special Education), but excludes students graduating from departments that do not house any core teacher preparation programs (the Department of Health Sciences).

Fig. 5 Multiple departments within the education college




Scenario 6: Less precise data, B.S. in Education

Students are grouped by degree type in the commencement brochure. Teacher candidates have earned a Bachelor of Science in Education (B.S.Ed.) leading to certification in elementary education, middle grades education, and special education, and may be housed in several different departments. In this figure, teacher candidates earning a B.S.Ed. degree for elementary and special education are housed in the College of Education, while teacher candidates earning a B.S. Ed. for middle grades education are housed with their respective content departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. Teacher candidates seeking secondary certification earn a content area major with a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree with a minor in education and are not identified as education graduates in the commencement brochure.

Explanation: The unit of analysis for the GPA differential is the teacher candidates receiving a B.S.Ed. degree, which is the most common degree granted to students earning teaching certifications.

Fig. 6 Bachelor of Science in Education



Scenario 7: Less precise data, teacher certification

Students' names are displayed in one list in the commencement brochure. Students who have earned a teaching certification are identified either in the commencement brochure with a symbol or in a separate list. Teacher candidates major in any number of subject areas which are not identified in the commencement brochure, and earn teaching certifications in elementary, secondary, or special education, but the type is not specified.

Explanation: The unit of analysis for the GPA differential includes all candidates who have earned a teaching certification. Since majors are not identified, this includes both core (elementary, secondary and special education) and non-core teaching candidates (e.g., art education and physical education majors).

Fig. 7 Teacher Certification

