



## Establishing Content Validity for Internally-Developed Assessments/Rubrics

---

### Directions for Expert Reviewers

First, thank you for your time and expertise! Establishing content validity for internally-developed assessments is integral to our [CAEP](#) accreditation. We sincerely appreciate your time and willingness to participate as we cannot move forward without the assistance of our expert panel partners. If you have questions as you complete the task, please don't hesitate to reach out to the UNC Charlotte faculty member who requested your participation or the Cato College of Education's Director of Assessment and Accreditation, Dr. Brad Smith ([bradleysmith@charlotte.edu](mailto:bradleysmith@charlotte.edu)).

Two phases are included in this work: (1) reviewing the materials and (2) completing the review in Qualtrics. While we want your feedback to be thorough, we do not anticipate this taking great amounts of time. We've tried to make the review/feedback process as straightforward and painless as possible.

### Reviewing the Materials

The following materials will be provided to you. Please review each before completing the review.

1. An explanation of purpose/timeline and why you were selected (likely in the body of an email)
2. A copy of the assessment instructions provided to candidates
3. A copy of the rubric used to evaluate the assessment
4. A link to the response form in Qualtrics

### Completing the Review in Qualtrics

The primary objective of this process is to establish content validity for each rubric. As an expert reviewer, your feedback ratings on the response form help to determine the rubric's validity. For clarification, we are using the term "validity" to determine to what extent the rubric measures what we (as the authors of the rubric) claim it does. Your task is to rate the extent to which each item on the rubric measures the key construct it is intended to measure. The key construct, or overarching idea, should be identified on your response form along with an operational definition of the key construct, so you know exactly how UNC Charlotte faculty are using the term.

You are rating on a scale of 1-4 *with 4 being the highest rating*:

- How representative the item is of the key construct
- How important the item is in measuring the key construct
- How clear the item is

For example, the 1-4 scale for representativeness is as follows:

- 1 = Item is not representative
- 2 = Item needs major revisions to be representative

3 = Item needs minor revisions to be representative

4 = Item is representative

Each key construct may have one or multiple items to measure it, and part of your feedback includes open ended responses. In your open ended responses, consider questions such as:

- Are there enough items to measure the key construct?
- Are there too many?
- What else would you like to share with us about measuring this item?

### **Final Considerations**

You will be provided copies of original student assignment and the accompanying rubric. These materials are for your information only and to aid you in providing feedback. Keep in mind that you are not assessing the assignment itself, but rather how well the rubric measures what it is intended to measure. Other data quality measures (e.g., inter-rater reliability) will be assessed at a later date.

Thank you again for your time and willingness to assist us in the important accreditation work! If you have questions at any point during the process, please contact the UNC Charlotte faculty member who requested your participation or the Cato College of Education's Director of Assessment and Accreditation, Dr. Brad Smith ([bradleysmith@charlotte.edu](mailto:bradleysmith@charlotte.edu)).