

Content Validity via Expert Panel Review

Content Validity references “the degree to which elements of an assessment instrument are relevant to, and representative of, the targeted construct for a particular assessment purpose” (Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995, p. 238). To establish content validity for internally generated assessments, an expert panel review may be employed, with experts evaluating the validity of the instrument through a quantitative approach. Once the statistical result meets or exceeds a cut-off score and no instrument modification occurs, content validity is determined (Tojib & Sugianto, 2006). Expert Panel protocol at WSU adheres to established protocol at North Carolina State University, Charlotte (Hart & Petty, 2017):

- A. **Panel.** A panel of 7 experts at minimum is selected: 3 internal content experts, 3 external experts from P12, and 1 external expert from outside the various certification program areas.
- B. **Documents.** The Accreditation Director shares review documents with the panel digitally. Each panel member receives a letter of intent; course-embedded assessment instructions used by candidates; a copy of the rubric used by instructors for evaluation; and a rating response form with instructions for each panel member to complete. In this digital correspondence, panel members are asked to submit their completed rating response forms to the Accreditation Director within a determined time frame. Document examples are available under *Technology Assignment Validity*.
- C. **Ratings.** Each panel member rates each rubric item’s level of *representativeness* regarding the measurement of the aligned construct; the *importance* of each rubric item’s regarding measurement of the aligned construct; and each rubric item’s level of *clarity*. For each rating, a score of 4 is strongest and a score of 1 weakest. For each item, panel members also have opportunity to provide comments, which are considered by the WSU assessment team if revisions are made.
- D. **Content Validity Index.** All responses are collected by the Director of Accreditation, who then computes a Content Validity Index (CVI), with .80 or higher establishing content validity (Davis, 1992):

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

- E. **Next Steps.** In instances when the CVI falls below .80, revisions are made by the assessment team and steps B-D are repeated. While employing the same panel of experts is desirable throughout the review process, if a panel’s make up changes, the new panel must have the same level of expertise and the previous rounds of review should be explained to any new panel member.

5.2.4

Davis, L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from your panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, 5, 194-197.

Hart, L. & Petty, T. (2017). *Taming the tiger: Developing a valid and reliable assessment system in partnership with faculty*. Paper presented at 2017 Fall CAEPCon, Washington, D.C.

Haynes, S.N., Richard, D.C.S., & Kubany, E.S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 238-247.

Tojib, D. R., & Sugianto, L. (2006). Content validity of instruments in IS research. *JITTA: Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application*, 8(3), 31-56.