



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

---

Establishing validity includes gathering evidence to demonstrate that assessment content fairly and adequately represents a defined domain of knowledge or performance. This document provides guidance for collection of evidence to document the adequate technical quality of rubrics used to evaluate candidates in the Cato College of Education (CCOED) at UNC Charlotte.

### Definition of Validity

The American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education define validity as “the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores for proposed uses of tests” (2014, p. 11). Validation is the process of accumulating evidence that supports the inferences that are made of candidate responses for specified assessment uses. While there are several types of evidence commonly used to support the validity of assessments, this document focuses on content-related validity.

Content-related evidence refers to the extent to which (1) a candidate’s responses to a given assessment reflect that student’s knowledge of the content area that is of interest and (2) the assessment instrument adequately samples the content domain. Content-related evidence should also be considered when developing scoring rubrics. A well-designed scoring rubric cannot correct for a poorly-designed assessment instrument, so selection of the tasks/activities should be examined to ensure it is aligned with the purpose and professional standards in the field of study.

The American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education (2014) provided standards for considering content-oriented evidence.

#### Standard 1.11 Content-Oriented Evidence

“When the rationale for test score interpretation for a given use rest in part on the appropriateness of test content, the procedures followed in specifying and generating test content should be described and justified with reference to the intended population to be tested and the construct the test is intended to measure or the domain it is intended to represent. If the definition of the content sampled incorporates criteria such as importance, frequency, or criticality, these criteria should also be clearly explained and justified (p. 26).”

### Plan for Collecting and Interpreting Evidence for New/Revised Rubric Use

The following section describes evidence needed to document the technical quality of new/revised rubrics. Note that additional evidence will be needed in the future to further document the quality of UNC Charlotte’s candidate assessments, including inter-rater reliability.

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

---

To establish content-validity for internally-developed assessments/rubrics, a panel of experts will be used. While there are some limitations of content validity studies using expert panels (e.g., bias), this approach is accepted by CAEP. As noted by Rubio, Berg-Weger, Tebb, Lee and Rauch (2003):

“Using a panel of experts provides constructive feedback about the quality of the measure and objective criteria with which to evaluate each item...A content validity study can provide information on the representativeness and clarity of each item and a preliminary analysis of factorial validity. In addition, the expert panel offers concrete suggestions for improving the measure (p. 95).”

### Protocol for Faculty

1. **Identify a panel of experts and credentials for their selection.** The review panel should include a mixture of IHE faculty content experts and P12 school/community practitioner experts. Minimal credentials for each expert should be established by consensus from program faculty; credentials should bear up to reasonable external scrutiny (Davis, 1992).

The number of panel experts should include *at a minimum*:

- a. *At least 3* content experts from the program/department in the Cato College of Education at UNC Charlotte;
- b. *At least 1* external content expert from outside the program/department. This person could be from UNC Charlotte or from another IHE, as long as the requisite content expertise is established; and
- c. *At least 3* practitioner experts from the field.

TOTAL NUMBER OF EXPERTS: *At least 7*

2. **Email the response form and instructions to each member of the panel.** For each internally-developed assessment/rubric, the CCOED Office of Assessment and Accreditation (OAA) has created an accompanying electronic response form in Qualtrics that panel members are asked to use to rate items that appear on the rubric.
  - a. Response form item details are below:
    - i. For each item, the overarching construct that the item purports to measure is identified and operationally defined.
    - ii. The item is written as it appears on the assessment.
    - iii. Experts should rate the item’s level of representativeness in measuring the aligned overarching construct on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the most representative. Space is provided for experts to comment on the item or suggest revisions.
    - iv. Experts should rate the importance of the item in measure the aligned overarching construct, on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the most essential. Space is provided for experts to comment on the item or suggest revisions.
    - v. Experts should rate the item’s level of clarity on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the clearest. Space is provided for experts to comment on the item or suggest revisions.
  - b. The email to each member of the panel should include:
    - i. An explanation of the purpose of the study and the reason the expert was selected.
    - ii. A copy of the instructions for completing the response form (provided by OAA).
    - iii. A copy of the assessment instructions provided to candidates (OAA can provide this if you do not have access; email [bradleysmith@charlotte.edu](mailto:bradleysmith@charlotte.edu) and [bllewis@charlotte.edu](mailto:bllewis@charlotte.edu) to request a copy before emailing the panel members.)

- iv. A copy of the rubric used to evaluate the assessment (OAA can provide this if you do not have access; email [bradleysmith@charlotte.edu](mailto:bradleysmith@charlotte.edu) and [bllewis@charlotte.edu](mailto:bllewis@charlotte.edu) to request a copy before emailing the panel members).
  - v. The link to the response form in Qualtrics.
  - vi. The deadline for response form completion.
3. **Collect the data in Qualtrics.** Once all content validity results are submitted in Qualtrics, OAA will generate a Content Validity Index (CVI). This index will be calculated based on recommendations by Rubio et. al. (2003), Davis (1992), and Lynn (1986):

$$\frac{\text{The number of experts who rated the item as 3 or 4}}{\text{The number of total experts}}$$

A CVI score of .80 or higher will be considered acceptable.

### References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Davis, L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from your panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research, 5*, 194-197.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A qualitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology, 28*, 563-575.
- Lynn, M. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research, 35*, 382-385.
- Rubio, D.M., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research, 27*(2), 94-104.