**Establishing Content Validity – Rubric/Assessment Response Form**

Name of Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Position: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS: This measure is designed to evaluate the content validity of (insert title of assessment) . Please rate each item as follows:

* Please rate the level of representativeness of item in measuring the aligned overarching construct on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the most representative. Space is provided for you to comment on the item or suggest revisions.
* Please rate the importance of the item in measuring the aligned overarching construct on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the most essential. Space is provided for you to comment on the item or suggest revisions.
* Please rate the level of clarity for each item on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the clearest. Space is provided for you to comment on the item or suggest revisions.

These rows will change depending on your program rubric … these rows will be different for each rubric used

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overarching construct (i.e., “big idea to measure”)**  This row **doesn’t change** – same for all rubrics | **Operational Definition** | **Item measuring overarching construct**  (Uses the exact wording as appears on the assessment rubric). | **Representativeness of item in measuring the overarching construct**   * 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 | **Importance of item in measuring the overarching construct**   * 1 = item is not necessary to measure the construct * 2 = item provides some information but is not essential to measure the construct * 3 = item is useful but not essential to measure the construct * 4 = item is essential to measure the construct | **Clarity of item**   * 1 = item is not clear * 2 = item needs major revisions to be clear * 3 = item needs minor revisions to be clear * 4 = item is clear | **Comments:** |
| **Construct 1:**  (fill in the blank) – *the construct “Content Knowledge” is used for this example.* | | | | | | |
| Content Knowledge  (Example) | Knowledge about actual subject matter that is to be learned or taught (Example) | K2a: Demonstrates knowledge of content (Example) | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |  |
| Content Knowledge | Knowledge about actual subject matter that is to be learned or taught | K2b: Implements interdisciplinary approaches and multiple perspectives for teaching content | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |  |
| Content Knowledge | Knowledge about actual subject matter that is to be learned or taught | K2c: Demonstrates awareness of literacy instruction across all content areas | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |  |
| Content Knowledge | Knowledge about actual subject matter that is to be learned or taught | K2d: Makes content relevant for all learners | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |  |
| **To the reviewer:** What additional items would you recommend including to measure the construct? If you have no suggestions, please enter “none.”  (This row would be inserted after each group of items aligned with an identified overarching construct). | | | | | | |
| **To the reviewer:** What additional items would you recommend deleting? If you have no suggestions, please enter “none.”  (This row would be inserted after each group of items aligned with an identified overarching construct). | | | | | | |
| **To the reviewer:** Please provide any additional information you believe may be useful in assessing the identified construct with this instrument. If you have no suggestions, please enter “none.”  (This row would be inserted after each group of items aligned with an identified overarching construct). | | | | | | |
| Construct 2: (fill in the blank) – *the construct “Learning Environments” is used for this example.* | | | | | | |
| Learning Environment (Example) | The diverse physical locations, contexts, and cultures in which students learn. (Example) | Etc. – form would go on to list all items, etc. | Etc. | Etc. | Etc. | Etc. |

Start with a new competency for next group of items

These three (3) open-ended response rows are inserted after each group of items aligned with an identified overarching competency
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Content Validity Protocol using the Lawshe Method

Content Validity determines the extent to which an assessment represents all facets of a given construct: The assessment instrument should answer the following questions:

* Does the indicator measures what it was designed to measure?
* Do the constructs include the concept, attribute, or variable that are the target of measurement?
* Does the instrument estimate how much a measure represents every single element of a construct?
* Does the instrument assess constructs or domains?
* Does the instrument assess the body of knowledge surveyed?
* What degree does the content of the indicator reflect the content domain of interest?

The process of determining if an assessment is valid begins with gathering evidence to determine how accurately an assessment addresses various aspects of the specific construct question and adequately represents a defined domain of knowledge or performance. In other words, do the questions assess the constructs or are the responses by the person answering questions influenced by other factors. The purpose of content validity protocol is to guide the collection of evidence to document the adequate technical quality of rubrics, surveys, etc. that are being used to determine the validity of assessments to evaluate Program Learning Outcomes in the College of Education at Fort Hays State University.

How does a committee establish **Content Validity** for an initial EPP created assessment?

To establish Content Validity for EPP created assessments/rubrics, a panel of experts identifies the essential constructs for the assessment/rubric. Although there are other methods for establishing content validity, the College of Education will use the Lawshe Seminal research method as approved by CAEP. The Lawshe method requires a Content Evaluation Panel (e.g., subject-matter experts) to provide feedback on how well each question measures the construct in question. The Content Evaluation Panel will identify the overlap between the construct and the performance domain. Their feedback will be analyzed, and informed decisions will be made about the effectiveness of each question.

Protocol

The EPP will determine content validity using the Lawshe method. Content validity refers to the appropriateness of the content of an instrument. In other words, do the measures (questions, observation logs, etc.) accurately assess what we want to know? The expert judgment I not statistics) is the primary method used to determine content validity. The process of review and ratings establishes it by subject matter experts or stakeholders. The Lawshe proposed that each of the subject matter experts (SMEs) raters on the judging panel respond to the following questions for each item:

1. Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential
2. Useful, but not essential
3. Not necessary to the performance of the construct.

Please follow directions to complete the Content Validity Index (CVI) and Content Validity Ratio (CVR). This is a two-step process.

Step 1:

1. Determine the body of knowledge for construct measure. Complete the initial assessment/rubric review form. For each assessment/rubric used to evaluate candidate performance in the program. Make sure that all constructs measured in the identified assessment/rubric.
2. Identify a Content Evaluation Panel and credentials for this selection. The Content Evaluation Panel should be a combination of all stakeholders to include the College of Education faculty (i.e., content experts) and P-12 school or community practitioners (lay experts). Each panel expert should have minimum credentials established by program faculty.
   1. At least **one content expert** from the program/department in the College of Education.
   2. At least **one external content expert** from outside the program/department. This person can be from FHSU or another college or university as long as the requisite content expertise established; and
   3. At least **one practitioner expert** from the field

Total Number of Subject-matter Experts on the panel: **A minimum of seven (3)**

1. **Create the response form**: For each EPP created an assessment, there should be an accompanying **response form** that Content Panel members use to rate items that appear on the rubric/instrument. Program faculty work collaboratively to develop the response form needed for each rubric/instrument used in the program to evaluate the candidate’s performance.

The Content Evaluation Panel (subject-matter experts) Per the Lawshe method

1. Each panel member is given the list of indicators or items independently.
2. For each item, the primary construct that the item purpose measure should be identified and defined
3. Each item should be written as it appears on the rubric/instrument
4. Each panelist rates items on a scale of 1-3 with one (1) being the most essential, two (2) useful but not essential or three (3) not necessary. The form should have space for each item to provide feedback on the item with suggested corrections or revisions.

**For example:**

3 = Essential

2 = Useful but not essential

3 = Not essential

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Constructs** | Essential  Total members responded to construct | Useful but not essential  Total | Not essential  Total |
| Ability to create lessons | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Accepts Criticism (Merged into Response to Feedback) | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Assessment Skills | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Reflective Educator | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Response to Feedback | 10 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Content Panel Experts (Example)**  **Name and Tile of Content Panel Experts.** |  |  |  |
| Nienkamp, Paul, Associate Professor, Co-Chair |  |  |  |
| Stramel, Janet, Associate Professor, Co-Chair |  |  |  |
| Henderson, Shawn--FHSU |  |  |  |
| Smith, Sara, USD 469 |  |  |  |
| Jones, Elodie--FHSU |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The frequency of “essential” ratings is the basis for the decisions.

1. Create an assessment packet for each Content Evaluation panel member. The packet should include the following:
   1. A letter explaining the purpose of the assessment/rubric, the reason the experts were selected, a description of the measure and its scoring, and an explanation of the response form.
   2. A copy of the assessment/rubric instructions
   3. A copy of the form used to evaluate the assessment/rubric
   4. The response form aligned with the assessment/rubric for the panel member to rate each item.
2. Initiate the Evaluation of assessment/rubric
   1. Set a deadline for the panel to return the response forms to the assessment contact person.
3. Collecting Data: Once response data for each EPP created assessment/rubric have been collected from the panel members, that information will be submitted to the COE assessment contact person. Copies of all forms and scores will be submitted via email and placed in an EPP assessment share file or Tk20 designated file. The file will be assessable by program coordinators.
4. Content Validity results Submitted: The COE assessment contact person will generate a Content Validity Index (CVI) and Content Validity Ratio (CVR). The index will be calculated based on recommendations by Rubio et al. (2003), Davis (1992), and Lynn (1986).
5. The assessment contact person will use the CVR = (ne – n/2)/(n/2.
   1. Ne = number of panelists indicating “essential.”
   2. N = total number of panelists
   3. Step 1: How many panelists say it is essential? (20 – n/2) (n/2)
   4. Step 2: How many total panelists = n =36