ADVANCING VALIDITY IN STEM ASSESSMENT: CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND RESEARCH–PRACTICE COLLABORATION

Nathan, Ndifreke Adolf[1], Joy Dianabasi Eduwem[2] & George, Idara George[3]

[1]Department of Science Education, Akwa Ibom State University, Ikot Akpaden, Mkpat Enim, Nigeria
[2]Department of Psychological Foundations of Education, University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria
[3]Department of Science Education, Akwa Ibom State University, Ikot Akpaden, Mkpat Enim, Nigeria
email: ndynathan@gmail.com

Abstract
This chapter examines the role of Research–Practice Partnerships (RPPs) in enhancing the validity of STEM assessment, emphasizing collaborative approaches that align curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation. Validity is explored through multiple dimensions: content, construct, criterion, and consequential highlighting the importance of assessments that capture both disciplinary knowledge and higher-order competencies. The chapter identifies current challenges, including over-reliance on traditional testing formats, limited teacher assessment literacy, resource constraints, issues of fairness and inclusivity, and misalignment between policy and classroom practice. In response, opportunities for improvement are discussed, such as integrating authentic, project-based, and inquiry-driven assessments, leveraging digital and AI-supported tools, implementing data-driven feedback systems, and investing in continuous teacher professional development. Collaborative frameworks for co-design, iterative refinement, and scaling of assessment tools are presented, with emphasis on the benefits of research–practice collaboration for contextual relevance, usability, and capacity building. Ethical and governance considerations including data privacy, transparency, accountability, and equity are addressed as essential components of responsible assessment practices. Finally, the chapter outlines policy and institutional implications, highlighting strategies for curriculum alignment, quality assurance, and sustaining RPPs. Future research directions focus on empirical validation of AI-enhanced assessments, scalability of collaborative models, and innovations that foster higher-order thinking and STEM identity development. By integrating theory, practice, and ethical governance, the chapter argues that valid and collaborative STEM assessment systems can transform classroom culture, promote equitable learning opportunities, and prepare students for meaningful participation in 21st-century STEM fields.

Keywords: STEM Assessment, Validity, Research–Practice Partnerships, Collaboration, Authentic Assessment, AI-supported Assessment, Equity.

Introduction

STEM assessment in contemporary education has evolved from traditional paper-and-pencil testing toward more integrated, authentic, and performance-based approaches that reflect the interdisciplinary and problem-solving nature of STEM learning. Modern STEM education emphasizes real-world application, sustainability, and innovation, requiring assessment systems that capture not only content knowledge but also skills such as critical thinking, collaboration, and design thinking (Capobianco et al., 2021; Kioupi & Voulvoulis, 2019). However, despite these advancements, many assessment practices remain fragmented or misaligned with curricular intentions, particularly in developing contexts where infrastructural and pedagogical constraints persist (Suprapto et al., 2024; Umoetuk et al., 2025). Recent studies on STEM assessment development highlight the growing concern about teachers' readiness and the need for context-sensitive instruments that reflect sustainable STEM competencies (Sari et al., 2025; Putra et al., 2023).

Central to the effectiveness of any assessment system is the concept of validity ensuring that assessment tools accurately measure the intended learning outcomes and support meaningful educational decisions. Foundational validity frameworks emphasize content, construct, and consequential validity as essential for credible assessment design (Lynn, 1986; Polit et al., 2007). In STEM contexts, this includes aligning tasks with authentic disciplinary practices and higher-order thinking processes (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Nevertheless, achieving such alignment remains challenging due to limited assessment literacy among teachers and weak feedback mechanisms between research and classroom practice (Arlinwibowo et al., 2020; Rahman et al., 2023). These limitations underscore the necessity for closer collaboration between researchers and practitioners. Research–practice collaboration enables the co-design, validation, and continuous refinement of STEM assessments, ensuring contextual relevance, usability, and equity in implementation (Sokhanvar et al., 2021).

Against this background, the purpose of this chapter is to examine how validity in STEM assessment can be strengthened through research–practice collaboration, with particular attention to the challenges and emerging opportunities in contemporary educational systems. The chapter synthesizes theoretical perspectives, empirical studies, and practical insights to propose collaborative strategies for designing and validating meaningful STEM assessments. It is organized into sections that discuss conceptual foundations of validity, collaborative frameworks for assessment design, key challenges and opportunities, ethical considerations, and implications for policy and practice in advancing high-quality STEM learning outcomes.

Conceptualizing Validity in STEM Assessment

Validity is a foundational principle in educational assessment, referring to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations and uses of test scores for intended purposes. In STEM education, validity is multidimensional, involving content validity, construct validity, criterion-related validity, and consequential validity. Content validity concerns the extent to which assessment tasks adequately represent the intended curriculum and disciplinary knowledge, while construct validity focuses on whether the instrument truly measures the targeted cognitive and practical competencies (Lynn, 1986; Polit et al., 2007). Criterion-related validity examines the relationship between assessment outcomes and external benchmarks, such as future academic performance or professional skills. Consequential validity, increasingly emphasized in contemporary assessment discourse, considers the broader impact of assessment practices on learners' motivation, equity, and instructional decision-making. In STEM contexts, recent validation studies highlight the need for context-sensitive tools that reflect interdisciplinary competencies and sustainability-oriented learning outcomes (Sari et al., 2025; Fajriati et al., 2025).

A critical aspect of validity in STEM assessment is the alignment between STEM competencies, curriculum goals, and assessment practices. Effective STEM education integrates science, technology, engineering, and mathematics around real-world problem solving; therefore, assessments must mirror these integrative and applied learning goals (George & Abasi, 2025). Frameworks such as Understanding by Design emphasize backward alignment, where learning objectives, instructional activities, and assessments are coherently structured to ensure meaningful learning evidence (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). However, research indicates that misalignment often persists in classroom practice, with assessments focusing on discrete knowledge rather than interdisciplinary competence and innovation skills (Arlinwibowo et al., 2020; Suprapto et al., 2024). Addressing this gap requires collaborative design processes that involve both researchers and practitioners in ensuring coherence across curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation.

In response to these concerns, there has been growing emphasis on authentic and performance-based assessments in STEM learning. Authentic assessment tasks simulate real-life challenges, requiring learners to apply knowledge in designing solutions, conducting investigations, or creating technological products. Such approaches align with problem-based and inquiry-driven STEM pedagogies that foster deep understanding and transferable skills (Eden, et al., 2023; Capobianco et al., 2021). Performance-based tasks such as laboratory investigations, engineering design projects, and digital simulations provide richer evidence of student competence than traditional objective tests. They also support formative assessment practices that provide continuous feedback and guide instructional improvement (Brookhart, 2010).

Despite these advances, assessing higher-order thinking and practical skills remains a significant challenge. Skills such as critical thinking, creativity, systems thinking, and collaborative problem solving are inherently complex and context-dependent, making them difficult to measure reliably and consistently (Krieglstein et al., 2023; Sokhanvar et al., 2021). Practical STEM skills, including experimental design and technological innovation, often require extended time, specialized resources, and sophisticated scoring rubrics, which may not be readily available in many educational settings (Rahman et al., 2023; Suprapto, 2016). Furthermore, ensuring fairness and consistency in scoring performance-based tasks poses additional methodological and logistical challenges. These issues underscore the need for ongoing research–practice collaboration to develop valid, reliable, and equitable assessment models that capture the full breadth of STEM learning outcomes.

The Role of Research–Practice Collaboration in Assessment

Overview of Research–Practice Partnerships (RPPs) in Education

Research–Practice Partnerships (RPPs) have emerged as a powerful collaborative model for improving educational assessment by linking scholarly expertise with classroom realities. RPPs are long-term, mutually beneficial partnerships between researchers and practitioners aimed at addressing persistent problems of practice through joint inquiry and evidence-based innovation. Within STEM education, such partnerships are particularly valuable because assessment must capture complex, interdisciplinary competencies that cannot be fully understood through isolated research or practice alone. Studies on STEM education reform emphasize that collaboration between teacher educators, researchers, and practitioners strengthens innovation, enhances pedagogical quality, and supports socially relevant STEM learning (Capobianco et al., 2021; Udofia et al., 2017). In developing contexts, research–practice collaboration also promotes inclusive and contextually relevant pedagogy (Umoetuk et al., 2025).

Co-Design of Assessments between Researchers and Practitioners

A central function of RPPs in assessment is the co-design of assessment tools by researchers and classroom practitioners. Rather than imposing externally developed instruments, collaborative teams jointly design, pilot, and refine assessments that align with curriculum goals and classroom realities. This approach enhances content and construct validity because teachers contribute contextual knowledge about learners' needs and local conditions, while researchers ensure methodological rigor and theoretical grounding. Evidence from STEM assessment studies shows that collaborative design improves teachers' readiness to implement valid and sustainable assessment practices (Sari et al., 2025; Putra et al., 2023). In addition, teacher involvement strengthens assessment literacy and supports the use of assessment data for instructional improvement (Rahman et al., 2023).

Iterative Inquiry Cycles for Improving Assessment Quality

Another defining feature of research–practice collaboration is the use of iterative inquiry cycles to continuously improve assessment quality. These cycles typically involve stages of design, implementation, data collection, reflection, and revision, allowing assessment tools to evolve in response to classroom evidence. Iterative processes align with formative assessment principles, where ongoing feedback informs both teaching and assessment refinement (Brookhart, 2010). Research indicates that such cycles enhance the reliability and usability of assessment tools, particularly for complex STEM competencies that require continuous calibration and validation (Sokhanvar et al., 2021). In technology-enhanced environments, iterative collaboration also supports the integration of digital and AI-based assessment systems that require ongoing testing and adjustment (Kartiasih et al., 2023).

Benefits of Collaboration for Contextual Relevance and Usability

Research–practice collaboration offers multiple benefits for STEM assessment. First, it enhances contextual relevance by ensuring that assessments reflect learners' cultural, social, and technological realities rather than abstract standards. Second, it improves usability, as teachers are more likely to adopt tools that they helped design and that align with their instructional practices. Third, collaboration fosters capacity building by strengthening teachers' assessment literacy and confidence in implementing innovative approaches (Eden et al., 2023). Finally, RPPs support evidence-informed decision-making, enabling schools and policymakers to rely on locally generated data to guide curriculum and assessment reforms. Collectively, these benefits position research–practice collaboration as a critical strategy for advancing valid, equitable, and sustainable STEM assessment systems in contemporary education.

Current Challenges in Validating STEM Assessments

Over-Reliance on Traditional Testing Formats

One of the most persistent barriers to valid STEM assessment is the continued dependence on traditional testing formats such as multiple-choice and short-answer examinations. While these formats are efficient for large-scale testing, they often fail to capture the interdisciplinary, inquiry-driven, and problem-solving nature of STEM learning. Research indicates that such approaches prioritize factual recall over higher-order thinking, thereby limiting the validity of inferences about students' real competencies (Arlinwibowo et al., 2020; Suprapto et al., 2024). Moreover, traditional tests rarely assess design thinking, experimentation, or collaborative skills, which are central to contemporary STEM education (Capobianco et al., 2021). This mismatch undermines both construct and consequential validity, as students may perform well on tests without demonstrating authentic STEM capabilities.

Limited Teacher Assessment Literacy and Professional Support

Another significant challenge is the limited assessment literacy among STEM teachers and the inadequate professional support systems available to them. Many educators lack the training required to design valid, reliable, and authentic assessments aligned with STEM competencies. Studies show that teachers often struggle with developing appropriate rubrics, interpreting assessment data, and aligning assessment tasks with intended learning outcomes (Rahman et al., 2023; Sari et al., 2025). In contexts where professional development opportunities are scarce, this gap becomes more pronounced, affecting both the quality and consistency of assessment practices. Research by Eden et al., (2023); Umoetuk et al., (2025) on teacher capacity building highlights that targeted training and collaborative professional development are essential for improving assessment competence and confidence.

Resource Constraints and Infrastructural Limitations

Valid STEM assessment frequently requires access to laboratories, digital tools, project materials, and time for extended inquiry-based tasks. However, many schools—particularly in developing regions—face resource constraints that limit their ability to implement authentic and performance-based assessments. Inadequate infrastructure, limited access to technology, and large class sizes make it difficult to administer and score complex tasks effectively (Akpan et al., 2025; Kartiasih et al., 2023). These limitations not only restrict the range of assessment strategies available but also reduce opportunities for students to demonstrate practical and applied competencies, thereby affecting the overall validity of assessment outcomes.

Issues of Fairness, Bias, and Inclusivity in Assessment

Ensuring fairness and inclusivity remains a critical concern in STEM assessment validation. Assessment tools may inadvertently privilege certain groups of learners due to cultural bias, language barriers, or unequal access to learning resources. Such biases can distort measurement outcomes and lead to inequitable educational decisions (Sokhanvar et al., 2021; Martinez, 2022). Furthermore, disparities in digital access and technological familiarity can affect student performance in technology-enhanced assessments, particularly in underserved communities (Pandey & Pandey, 2023). Addressing these issues requires deliberate attention to inclusive design, equitable access, and culturally responsive assessment practices.

Misalignment between Policy, Curriculum, and Classroom Practice

A final challenge lies in the misalignment between educational policy directives, curriculum frameworks, and classroom assessment practices. While many national and institutional policies advocate for competency-based and STEM-integrated learning, these reforms are not always reflected in assessment systems at the classroom level. Teachers often face pressure to prepare students for standardized examinations that emphasize content recall, thereby discouraging the use of innovative assessment methods (De Coninck et al., 2019; Kerimoğlu & Altun, 2024). This disconnect weakens the coherence of the educational system and limits the effectiveness of reforms aimed at promoting meaningful STEM learning. Bridging this gap requires coordinated efforts among policymakers, curriculum developers, researchers, and practitioners to ensure alignment across all levels of the education system.

Opportunities for Enhancing Validity in STEM Assessment

Emerging approaches in STEM assessment offer significant opportunities for strengthening validity by aligning evaluation with real-world competencies and inquiry processes. The integration of authentic, project-based, and inquiry-driven assessments enables learners to demonstrate problem-solving, collaboration, and design thinking in contextually meaningful ways (Sokhanvar et al., 2021). These approaches reflect the principles of authentic assessment and constructivist learning theory advanced by scholars such as Grant Wiggins and Jean Piaget, which emphasize deep understanding and application over rote recall. Furthermore, digital and AI-supported assessment tools including adaptive testing systems, simulations, and automated feedback platforms provide scalable means of capturing complex learning outcomes while supporting differentiated instruction.

In addition, data-driven feedback systems and learning analytics enable continuous monitoring of learner progress and inform instructional decision-making. These tools support formative assessment practices that enhance both teaching effectiveness and student achievement. However, the successful implementation of these innovations requires sustained professional development and capacity building for teachers, alongside strong policy and institutional support. Strategic investments in teacher training, infrastructure, and ethical guidelines for AI use are essential to ensure that assessment practices remain valid, equitable, and contextually relevant across diverse STEM learning environments.

Collaborative Models for Validating STEM Assessment

1. **Co-Design and Co-Evaluation Frameworks**: Collaborative validation of STEM assessments is strengthened through structured co-design frameworks that bring together researchers, teachers, curriculum developers, and policymakers. Such frameworks, commonly associated with Research–Practice Partnerships (RPPs), enable stakeholders to jointly define learning outcomes, design assessment instruments, and evaluate their effectiveness. The work of William R. Penuel highlights how co-design processes improve both the technical quality and classroom usability of assessments by grounding them in authentic teaching contexts.
2. **Case Illustrations of Research–Practice Collaboration**: Evidence from collaborative initiatives demonstrates that partnerships between universities and schools can lead to the development of contextually valid and scalable STEM assessment tools. For instance, RPP-driven assessment reforms in science education have shown improvements in alignment with curriculum standards and increased teacher engagement in assessment design. These models emphasize iterative piloting, feedback, and refinement cycles that ensure assessments remain responsive to classroom realities and student needs.
3. **Mechanisms for Iterative Refinement and Scaling**: Effective collaborative models rely on iterative inquiry cycles design, enactment, analysis, and revision to continually enhance assessment validity. Drawing on improvement science approaches associated with Anthony S. Bryk, these cycles support the systematic testing of assessment innovations across multiple contexts. Scaling validated tools requires the development of adaptable frameworks, digital repositories, and policy support structures that facilitate broader adoption while maintaining contextual sensitivity.
4. **Professional Learning Communities and Networks**: Professional learning communities (PLCs) and educator networks play a vital role in sustaining collaborative assessment validation efforts. These communities provide platforms for sharing best practices, interpreting assessment data, and co-developing innovative assessment strategies. By fostering peer learning and reflective practice, PLCs contribute to building teacher assessment literacy and ensuring that validated STEM assessment practices are effectively implemented and continuously improved within diverse educational settings.

Ethical and Governance Considerations

Ethical and governance issues are critical in STEM assessment, particularly as digital and AI-enhanced tools become more prevalent. Data privacy and protection are central concerns, requiring strict measures to safeguard student information and ensure compliance with ethical standards (Kartiasih et al., 2023; Akpan et al., 2025). In AI-supported assessments, transparency and fairness are essential to prevent algorithmic bias and to maintain trust in assessment outcomes (Sokhanvar et al., 2021). Collaborative validation processes further demand accountability and shared responsibility, ensuring that both researchers and practitioners actively oversee assessment design, implementation, and interpretation (Eden et al., 2023; Umoetuk et al., 2025). Additionally, Fajriati et al., 2025; Suprapto et al., (2024) noted that equitable access and inclusion must guide STEM assessment practices so that all learners, regardless of socio-economic or technological constraints, can demonstrate their competencies.

Implications for STEM Teaching and Learning

Valid STEM assessments have profound implications for teaching and learning. They enhance student engagement and achievement by providing tasks that are relevant, challenging, and aligned with real-world STEM practices (Capobianco et al., 2021; Sari et al., 2025). Assessments that capture authentic, higher-order thinking tasks support problem-solving, critical reasoning, and creativity, equipping students with competencies essential for STEM careers (Brookhart, 2010). Furthermore, Umoetuk et al (2025); Eden et al (2023) found that thoughtfully designed assessments contribute to STEM identity development and career readiness by allowing learners to experience success in authentic, inquiry-driven contexts. Ultimately, integrating valid and collaborative assessment practices (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005; Putra et al., 2023) can transform classroom culture, shifting the focus from rote memorization toward reflective, evidence-informed learning and continuous improvement.

Policy and Institutional Implications

Ensuring valid and equitable STEM assessment requires coordinated policy and institutional support. Curriculum planners and policymakers should prioritize the integration of authentic, inquiry-based, and competency-focused assessment practices into national and local curricula (Capobianco et al., 2021; Sari et al., 2025). Policies should incentivize research–practice collaboration, providing funding, infrastructure, and professional development opportunities that enable teachers and researchers to co-design and iteratively refine assessment tools (Umoetuk et al., 2025; Eden et al., 2023). Institutional frameworks, such as professional learning communities and interdepartmental research units, can sustain collaborative efforts by formalizing processes for co-design, data sharing, and reflective practice.

Additionally, Brookhart (2010); Wiggins & McTighe (2005) observed that quality assurance mechanisms including standardized guidelines, rubric calibration, and periodic review are critical to maintaining reliability, fairness, and validity in STEM assessment practices.

Future Directions and Research Agenda

Emerging trends in STEM assessment point toward AI-enhanced tools, adaptive learning platforms, and digital simulations that provide real-time feedback and support personalized learning pathways (Kartiasih et al., 2023; Akpan et al., 2025). Future research should explore empirical validation of these tools, including studies on their reliability, fairness, and impact on higher-order thinking skills. There is also a need to investigate the (Brookhart, 2010) particularly in contexts with resource constraints, to ensure that innovations can be effectively implemented across diverse educational settings (Putra et al., 2023; Sokhanvar et al., 2021). Additionally, longitudinal research on the integration of formative assessment, authentic performance tasks, and AI-supported feedback can provide critical insights for policy, teacher training, and student learning outcomes.

Conclusion

This chapter highlights the centrality of validity and collaboration in advancing STEM assessment. It underscores how integrating authentic, project-based, and inquiry-driven tasks developed through research–practice partnerships can enhance alignment between curriculum goals and real-world STEM competencies. When ethical, equity, and infrastructural considerations, collaborative approaches are addressed the will not only improve assessment quality but also foster meaningful learning, higher-order thinking, and STEM identity development. Recommended strategies, including AI integration and iterative co-design processes, offer pathways for scalable, sustainable, and equitable assessment systems. Ultimately, advancing STEM assessment validity through collaboration ensures that learners are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for 21st-century challenges.

References

Akpan, O. A., Atabang, A. A., & Udofia, S. E. (2025). *Online learning platforms and bridging of digital knowledge gab among postgraduate student in Akwa Ibom State*. International Journals of Education Framework (IJEFA), 43, 43–56.

Ardwiyanti, D., Prasetyo, Z. K., & Wilujeng, I. (2021). STEM research trends in Indonesia: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Science Education Research*, 5(1), 38–45

Arlinwibowo, J., Retnawati, H., & Kartowagiran, B. (2020). The types of STEM education implementation in Indonesia. *Journal of Xi'an University of Architecture & Technology*, *XII* (VIII), 606–613. https://www.xajzkjdx.cn/gallery/65-aug2020.pdf

Brookhart, S. (2010) How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking in Your Classroom. ASCD, Alexandria

Capobianco, B. M., Parker, C., Laurier, A., & Rankin, J. (2021). The STEM road Map for grade 3-5. *Integrated STEM education*. Routledge.

Dare, E. A., Keratithamkul, K., Hiwatig, B. M., & Li, F. (2021). Beyond content: The role of stem disciplines, real-world problems, 21st century skills, and stem careers within science teachers' conceptions of integrated stem education. *Education Sciences*, *11*(11), Article 737. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11110737

De Coninck, K, Valcke, M., Ophalvens, I. & Vanderiinde, R. (2019). *Bridging the theory-practice gap in teacher education: The design and construction of simulation-based learning environments: Theorien, Modelle und empirische Befunde*, In book: Koharenz in der Lehtrrbuildung. pp. 263-280

Eden, M. I., Tofi, M., Umoetuk, E. U. & Akpan, U. C. (2023). Comparative effect of polya and target-task problem-solving teaching strategies on students' achievement in Electrolysis, *Prestige Journal of Education,* 6 (2), 43-54

Fajriati, L., Alhusni, H. Z., & Lintangesukmanjaya, R. T. (2025). A comprehensive analysis of STEAM learning implementation to foster critical thinking skills for equitable and quality physics education in high schools. *Journal of Current Studies on SDGs,* 1, 33.

George, I. G. & Abasi, A. U. (2025). Problem-solving instructional strategy and mathematics students' performance in integration calculus in Mkpat Enin Local Government Area, Akwa Ibom State. *Inter-Disciplinary Journal of Science Education (IJ-SED), 6* (1)

Kartiasih, F., Ramahani, A., & Oktaviani, R. (2023). "Is there a synergy between ICT and the informal sector?" *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 11(2), 2241771.

Kerimoğlu, E., & Altun, S. (2024). *Backward design in pre-service teacher education to enhance curriculum knowledge*. Journal of Teaching and Learning, *18*(2), 128–149. https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v18i2.8625.

Kioupi, V., & Voulvoulis, N. (2019). "Education for Sustainable Development: A Systemic Framework for Connecting the SDGs to Educational Outcomes." *Sustainability*, 11(21), 6104

Krieglstein, F., Beege, M., Rey, G. D., Sanchez-Stockhammer, C., & Schneider, S. (2023). Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Questionnaire to Measure Different Types of Cognitive Load. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35, 1, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09738-0

Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research*, *35*(6), 382–385. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017.

Martinez, B. (2022). Challenges and opportunities in multi-modal sensing studies: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, *25*(1), 112–126.

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*(4), 459–467. doi.org

Putra, A. P., Suyidno, S., Utami, N. H., Fahmi, F. & Prahani, B. K. (2023). Step-by-step guide to calculating Content Validity Index (CVI) for single constructs using Excel. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, *7*(4), 1717–1726. https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/step-by-step-guide-to-calculating-content-validity-index-cvi-for-single-constructs-using-excel/.

Rahman, M. S., Suyidno, S. Miriam, S. & Husain, S., Penelit, J. (2023). Development and validation of an instrument to measure research and publishing ethics. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *21*(3), 445–460. link.springr.com

Sari, Y. M., Milla, Y. I., Fiangga, S., Roqobih, F. D., Rosyidi, A. H., & Shahrill, M. (2025). STEM challenges in assessment scale: A content validity study for prospective teachers' readiness in sustainable STEM education. *Web of Conferences*, *640*, Article 02008. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202564002008

Sokhanvar, Z., Salehi, K., & Sokhanvar, F. (2021). Advantages of authentic assessment for improving the learning experience and employability skills of higher education students: A systematic literature review. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *70*, 101030. doi.org

Suprapto, N. (2016). Students' attitudes towards STEM education: Voices from Indonesian junior high schools. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, *13*(Special Issue), 75–87. https://www.tused.org/index.php/tused/article/view/624

Suprapto, N., Rizki, I. A., Lintangesukmanjaya, R. T., & Sya'roni, I. (2024). Wind, solar and water-powered renewable energy prototypes for STEM education purposes. *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education*, *22*(3), 256–261.

Udofia, S. E., & Sambo, D. D. (2021). Examination dishonesty among senior secondary school science teachers as perceived by SS3 students, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Journal of Resourcefulness and Distinction (JORESDIS), 18*(1), 35–48.

Udofia, S. E., Sambo, D. D., & Udonqwo, A. M. (2017). Driving social innovation in education: The roles of science, technology, engineering and mathematics teacher educators. S*TAN 60th Anniversary Conference Proceedings* (pp. 115–121).

Umoetuk, N. M., Udoh, N. M., & Eden, M. I. (2025). *Education, pedagogy and culture in Africa: Advancing inclusive and contextually relevant teaching*. Amino Kano Academic Scholars Association *Multidisciplinary Journal, 1*, 209–228.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). Understanding by design (Expanded 2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)