



Male Program Assessment for College Excellence (M-PACE): Content Validation Summary

J. Luke Wood, Duane O. Reid Jr., Frank Harris III & Soua Xiong

To cite this article: J. Luke Wood, Duane O. Reid Jr., Frank Harris III & Soua Xiong (2016) Male Program Assessment for College Excellence (M-PACE): Content Validation Summary, Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 40:9, 802-805, DOI: [10.1080/10668926.2015.1107515](https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1107515)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1107515>



Published online: 22 Jan 2016.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 93



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



Citing articles: 1 [View citing articles](#)

EXCHANGE

Male Program Assessment for College Excellence (M-PACE): Content Validation Summary

J. Luke Wood^a, Duane O. Reid Jr.^b, Frank Harris III^c, and Soua Xiong^d

^aCommunity College Leadership, San Diego State University, San Diego, California, USA; ^bAcademic Acceleration for African American Males Program (4A Program), Baltimore City Community College, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; ^cPostsecondary Education, San Diego State University, San Diego, California, USA; ^dHigher Education and Student Affairs, SDSU/CGU Joint Doctoral Program in Education, San Diego State University, San Diego, California, USA

ABSTRACT

This article describes the development and content validation of the Male Program Assessment for College Excellence (M-PACE). The M-PACE is an outcomes based assessment tool designed to assess and improve the effectiveness of programs and initiatives serving men of color in the community college. The instrument was developed to serve as a standardized outcomes assessment tool to determine the efficacy of minority male initiative (MMI) interventions and enhance program models.

Community colleges have long served as the primary pathway into postsecondary education for men of color. However, the ability of community colleges to facilitate positive success outcomes for these men has been called into question, based on deleterious outcomes that demonstrate that only 17% of Black and 15% of Latino men will complete a certificate or degree, or transfer to a 4-year college in 3 years (Wood, Harris, & Xiong, 2014). Greater awareness of outcome disparities has led many community colleges to establish minority male initiatives (MMIs) that provide interventions designed to enhance the success of these men. In 2010, the American Association of Community College's (AACC) launched the Minority Male Initiative Database to catalogue programs and initiatives that serve men of color in community colleges. The establishment of the database was a response to the expansive proliferation of programs serving men of color (Christian, 2010).

Over the past 15 years, MMIs have made little (if any) progress in advancing success for men of color. As noted by Harper (2014), this is partly attributable to interventions that are “flimsy” and “fragmented” (p. 126). In particular, Harper critiqued MMIs as often lacking intentionally designed interventions and assessment to determine the utility of implemented efforts. Similarly, Wood (2011), noted that community college MMIs often lack “predetermined benchmarks, with built-in mechanisms to assess effectiveness” (p. 7). This is a critical concern, given that assessment can serve as a mechanism to demonstrate and improve the effectiveness of employed interventions (Weiss, 1998). This context served as the impetus for the development and content validation of the Male Program Assessment for College Excellence (M-PACE). The M-PACE is an outcomes-based assessment tool designed to assess and improve the effectiveness of programs and initiatives serving men of color in the community college. The instrument was developed to serve as a standardized outcomes assessment tool to determine the efficacy of MMI interventions and enhance program models.

The M-PACE features items and scales that are based on commonly employed affective and performance outcomes utilized by MMIs. The content validity of the M-PACE was examined to determine the extent to which the instrument accurately measures what it is designed to measure (Davis, 1992; Grant & Davis, 1997; Waltz, Strickland, & Lenz, 2005). The instrument was developed

based on a content analysis of funding streams, goals, interventions, and objectives commonly employed by community college MMIs (see Wood, Keflezighi, & Sebahar, *in press*). They identified seven primary affective outcomes (e.g., resilience, self-efficacy, locus of control) and six performance outcomes (e.g., engagement, persistence, transfer) that were most frequently employed by these initiatives. The operationalization of these outcomes and their measurement was also informed by the published research on men of color in community college (Bush & Bush, 2010; Flowers, 2006; Hagedorn, Maxwell, & Hampton, 2001; Harris & Harper, 2008; Vasquez Urias, 2012; Wood & Essien-Wood, 2012; Wood & Harris, 2013; Wood, 2012).

Method

To determine the content validity of the M-PACE, the researchers distributed a full version of the instrument to subject matter experts (SMEs). SMEs were identified based on having a track record of conducting research and evaluation focused on college men, men of color, and initiatives serving these men. SMEs were informed about the purpose of the instrument and asked to rate constructs employed in the instrument that were measured using multiple items. After being prompted with the name and respondent prompts of each construct, SMEs rated the relevance each item to measuring the intended construct on a 4-point scale including not relevant (coded 1), somewhat relevant (coded 2), relevant (coded 3), and highly relevant (coded 4). Eleven SMEs supported the content validation of the M-PACE.

Both content validity index (CVI) and scale-level index (S-CVI) scores were calculated for each construct. The CVI score was used for individual items and reflected the proportion of valid items. *Inadequate item* scores of 1 and 2 were recoded as 0, and *satisfactory item* scores of 3 and 4 recoded as 1. The CVI was then calculated by dividing the total inadequate scores by the total satisfactory scores (Lynn, 1986; Waltz et al., 2005). Lynn (1986) noted that CVI scores should be at .78 or higher, though Lawshe (1975) employed a score of .59 or higher as an acceptable threshold. S-CVI scores were also employed, and they represent the average CVI scores for a given construct. Acceptable S-CVI scores of .90 or above are considered optimal (Polit, Beck, & Owen, 2007), though Davis (1992) noted that scores of .80 are acceptable. Using these score thresholds, the M-PACE's content validity was assessed. Lower CVI and S-CVI scores were interpreted as moderate validity while higher scores were interpreted as strong validity. Scores lower than .59 for CVI scores and .80 for S-CVI scores were interpreted as demonstrating weak validity.

Results

Twelve constructs comprised of 52 individual items were assessed. These items were comprised of two performance outcomes (e.g., faculty-student engagement, service use) and 10 affective outcomes. Affective outcomes included: sense of belonging with faculty, academic self-efficacy, locus of control, positive racial regard, personal self-confidence, self-esteem, academic resilience, social justice orientation, collaborative leadership, and socioemotional intelligence. The definitions for these constructs appear in Table 1.

Mean scores for construct items, CVI scores, and S-CVI scores appear in Table 2. The lowest mean ranges for item scores were for collaborative leadership and socioemotional intelligence. Both constructs had item means as low as 3.30. In contrast, mean scores for positive racial regard, personal self-confidence, self-esteem, and social justice orientation ranged from 3.70 and above. As noted, CVI scores were assessed on a scale from .59 to .78 and above, representing moderate and strong CVI scores. The lowest CVI score ranges were socioemotional intelligence, with scores from .70 to 1.00. Thus, items in the construct met the threshold of moderate content validity but did not meet the standards for strong validity. The CVI scores for this construct were noticeable lower than those for other constructs, with all others exceeding the .78 threshold. Thus, CVI scores for all other constructs demonstrated strong content validity. In terms of S-CVI scores, scores were assessed on a scale from .80 to .90 and above,

Table 1. Constructs and operational definitions employed in the Male Program Assessment for College Excellence (M-PACE).

Construct	Total Items	Operational Definitions
Faculty Student Engagement	4	The degree to which students are engaged with faculty members on campus
Service Use	6	The degree to which students use student support services
Faculty Belonging	4	Students perceptions of belonging on the campus environment
Academic Self-Efficacy	4	The degree of confidence students have in their academic abilities
Locus of Control	4	The perceived degree of control students have over their academic futures
Positive Racial Regard	4	The extent to which students positively regard other individuals who share their same racial/ethnic heritage
Personal Self-Confidence	4	The degree to which students have confidence in themselves and their abilities (nonacademic)
Self-Esteem	4	Students subjective assessment of their personal worth
Academic Resilience	4	Students perceived ability to overcome obstacles and persist in the face of challenges
Social Justice Orientation	4	The degree of commitment students have in advocating for better life opportunities for their community
Collaborative Leadership	4	The extent to which students ascribe to a leadership style that employed collaboration
Socioemotional Intelligence	6	Students self-appraisal of their ability to recognize the emotions of themselves and others

Table 2. M-PACE Content Validity Index (CVI) and Scale-Level Index (S-CVI) Scores.

Construct	Total Items	Mean Ranges	CVI Range	S-CVI
Faculty Belonging	4	3.56–3.89	.89–1.00	0.97
Faculty Student Engagement	4	3.60–3.80	1.00	1.00
Academic Self-Efficacy	4	3.40–3.90	.80–1.00	0.93
Locus of Control	4	3.50–3.70	1.00	1.00
Service Use	6	3.60–3.70	.90–1.00	0.97
Positive Racial Regard	4	3.70–3.90	.90–1.00	0.98
Personal Self-Confidence	4	3.70–4.00	.90–1.00	0.95
Self-Esteem	4	3.70–4.00	.90–1.00	0.98
Academic Resilience	4	3.60–3.90	1.00	1.00
Social Justice Orientation	4	3.70–3.80	1.00	1.00
Collaborative Leadership	4	3.30–3.50	0.90	0.90
Socioemotional Intelligence	6	3.30–3.60	.70–1.00	0.87

representing moderate and strong scores. All scores exceeded the .80 threshold, with only one S-CVI falling below the .90 marker. Specifically, the S-CVI for socioemotional intelligence was .87. Some items have illustrated perfect S-CVI scores, this included construct measures for faculty-student engagement, locus of control, academic resilience, and social justice orientation. In all, the M-PACE scales, with the exception of socioemotional intelligence, showed strong content validity.

Implications

Results from the examination of the M-PACE indicated that the instrument has strong content validity. The exception to this was items specific to measuring socioemotional intelligence. These items demonstrated moderate content validity. Given that the instrument is intended for use by programs and initiatives serving men of color, the researchers believe that revisions to the socioemotional intelligence block are necessary. Qualitative feedback from SMEs indicated that the scale included questions that spanned three concepts: understanding one's own emotions, the ability to read others' emotions, and the ability to regulate one's own emotions. As a result, the socioemotional intelligence block was removed from the instrument. The feedback provided by SMEs will be used to avoid conflating socioemotional intelligence with emotional regulation. Thus, future iterations of the instrument will refine the measurement, subjecting this block to an additional round of feedback with SMEs.

Given that the instrument was designed based on common interventions and outcomes employed by MMIs, it is recommended that institutions using the instrument remove items and constructs that fall outside the scope of their program's outcomes. Similarly, some programs may have targeted outcomes that are not included in the instrument; thus, these programs should add additional items and blocks that enable them to measure objectives that are not included in the M-PACE. In general, customization of the instrument will be needed by programs to ensure that the most appropriate items and scales appear in their iteration of the instrument.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the instrument has demonstrated strong content validity. As such, it is recommended that programs and initiatives serving men of color, particularly in community college settings, consider employing the instrument as an outcomes assessment tool. This tool can better enable MMI leaders to determine the efficacy of their efforts and to advance program revisions that can better enable success for college men of color.

References

- Bush, E. C., & Bush, L. (2010). Calling out the elephant: An examination of African American male achievement in the community colleges. *Journal of African American Males in Education*, 1(1), 40–62.
- Christian, K. (2010). *AACC Launches minority male student success database*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/newsevents/News/articles/Pages/012220101.aspx> May 12, 2011
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from your panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, 5, 194–197. doi:10.1016/S0897-1897(05)80008-4
- Flowers, L. A. (2006). Effects of attending a 2-year institution on African American males' academic and social integration in the first year of college. *Teachers College Record*, 108(2), 267–286. doi:10.1111/tcre.2006.108.issue-2
- Grant, J. S., & Davis, L. T. (1997). Selection and use of content experts in instrument development. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 20, 269–274. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(199706)20:3<269:AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G
- Hagedorn, S. L., Maxwell, W., & Hampton, P. (2001). Correlates of retention for African-American males in the community college. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 3(3), 243–263. doi:10.2190/MJ6A-TFAC-MRPG-XDKL
- Harper, S. R. (2014). (Re)setting the agenda for college men of color: Lessons learned from a 15-year movement to improve Black male student success. In R. A. Williams (Ed.), *Men of color in higher education: New foundations for developing models for success* (pp. 116–143). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Harris III, F., & Harper, S. R. (2008). Masculinities go to community college: Understanding male identity socialization and gender role conflict. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 142, 25–35.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563–575. doi:10.1111/peps.1975.28.issue-4
- Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research*, 35, 382–385. doi:10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017
- Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Owen, S. V. (2007). Is the CVI an acceptable indicator of content validity? Appraisal and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 30, 459–467. doi:10.1002/(ISSN)1098-240X
- Vasquez Urias, M. (2012). The impact of institutional characteristics on Latino male graduation rates in community colleges. *Annals of the Next Generation*, 3, 1–12.
- Waltz, C. F., Strickland, O. L., & Lenz, E. R. (2005). *Measurement in nursing and health research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wood, J. L. (2011, August 5). Developing successful Black male initiatives. *Community College Daily*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccdaily.com/Pages/Opinions/Developing-successful-Black-male-programs-and-initiatives.aspx>
- Wood, J. L. (2012). Leaving the 2-year college: Predictors of Black male collegian departure. *The Journal of Black Studies*, 43(3), 303–326. doi:10.1177/0021934711424490
- Wood, J. L., & Essien-Wood, I. R. (2012). Capital identity projection: Understanding the psychosocial effects of capitalism on Black male community college students. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 33(5), 984–995. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2012.06.001
- Wood, J. L., Harris, F., III., & Xiong, S. (2014). Advancing the success of men of color in the community college: Special issue on the community college survey of men. *Journal of Progressive Policy and Practice*, 2(2), 129–133.
- Wood, J. L., & Harris III, F. (2013). Community college survey of men: An initial validation of the instrument's non-cognitive outcomes construct. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37(4), 333–338. doi:10.1080/10668926.2012.754733
- Wood, J. L., Keflezighi, F., & Sebahar, L. (in press). An analysis of programs serving men of color in the community college: An examination of funding streams, interventions, and objectives. *Research & Practice in Assessment*.