

**Proposal PI: \*\*\*CONFIDENTIAL\*\*\***

**Evaluator: KM Smith, PhD**

*(Note: Evaluator's name is not revealed to proposal respondents)*

**Criteria for Grant Selection**

**Score**

**Innovation (10 points)**

9

Evaluator Comments:

Your proposal represents a research or development project that is innovative and introduces a novel approach to child abuse (CA) training. There are a few projects investigating mobile apps for medical professional's reference when determining whether abuse has occurred and a brief review of the literature revealed researchers are investigating and employing "checklists" for medical personnel as a CA training tool, as opposed to simulations. However, Bell and Kozlowski (2002) examined simulation-based training with "adaptive guidance". Their study provided diagnostic feedback and personalized study and practice recommendations based on trainees' performance improvement across practice sessions.

**Reference**

Bell, B. S., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2002a). Adaptive guidance: Enhancing self-regulation, knowledge, and performance in technology-based training. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 267- 307

**Enhancing learning (10 points)**

10

Evaluator Comments:

Your proposal has the potential to improve teaching and learning through an online innovation. I noticed the program as currently offered on a hard drive and, in the future, will implement it online. A simulation that is specific for health care workers has the potential for long-term impact in teaching and learning. Today's health care climate calls for more online training, if this simulation is developed, it will be of great interest to the field of online learning.

It would be helpful to consider, (if you have not already), learners requisite knowledge, through employing a "pre-test" to guide users decision tree. This "pre-test" would determine a path that aligns with where "individual" learners are coming "from" and how that "individual" will accomplish the simulations learning outcomes. Simulations often do not take into consideration "learning styles" and generally compartmentalize design models. Regarding personalized simulations, developers may benefit from a model that guides learners based on unique learning characteristics identified prior to decision-making scenarios.

**Alignment with Themes of Personalization and Student Retention (10 points)**

10

Evaluator Comments:

Your proposal addresses personalization. The simulation is designed in a manner that it relies on the user individual decision-making. Additionally, your proposal represents innovation that has the potential for long-term impact to thematic foci of innovation in teaching and learning.

**R&D team is well prepared to execute the project (5 points)**

3

Evaluator Comments:

The narrative provides a high-level example of how the program. Your team seems to be very qualified, however, the proposal does not outline specific skills required to employ the project. The team members appear diverse in profession and professional affiliation.

**Applicability (5 points)**

4

Evaluator Comments:

Your project has the potential for a beneficial impact beyond CA identification. I envision this could also be useful in any industry that requires critical analysis and “just-in-time” decision-making. Another aspect to personalized simulations is the opportunity for gamification. Learner’s social interaction during simulations builds a sense of community in online learning and has been found to increase engagement and retention.

You may want to review Moreno and Mayer (2005) study that examined the effects of guidance in an agent-based multimedia game. In their study, the guidance was in the form of explanatory feedback, which explained to students why a particular answer to a problem is correct. Their results indicated that guidance did not enhance knowledge retention, but did lead to increased transferability.

**References**

Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (2005). Role of guidance, reflection, and interactivity in an agent-based multimedia game. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1, 117-128.

**Cost effectiveness (7 points)**

7

Evaluator Comments:

The budget is available and provides a sufficient amount of detail. You were thorough in itemizing how your team intends to apply the funds. Your proposal seems exploratory in nature and you stated that the team is also seeking funds from other resources. As exploratory in nature, yes, the requested funds are reasonable.

**Feasibility (5 points)****3**

Evaluator Comments:

In my opinion, the timeline appears tight. For example, according to Table 1, in one month your team will be able to develop the pilot testing interview questions, evaluation measures, and complete all training modules. I am not privy of precisely what those processes entail for this project, but in the grand scheme of project management, those are essential milestones and to allot 1 month for completion seems overly optimistic. Lastly, in your Table 1 timeline, it would be helpful to identify the team member responsible for each task.

**Research/Evaluation Plan (10 points)****7**

Evaluator Comments:

In reviewing your proposals research questions:

*Research Question #1: Is the CSI-CAST a realistic CA assessment and training tool for medical and nursing students?*

This research question is very broad. You used the term “realistic”. Realistic is subjective. I would recommend a narrow approach when formulating research question #1. Additionally, I am recommending you explicitly state how your research questions are linked to the proposals objectives, methods, outcomes, and dissemination plan.

Your proposal describes how your team will assess the impact of implementing the tool as, “*Interactive post-training simulated assessments will provide an evaluation of learning and trigger additional online learning modules as needed*”. A post-training assessment is appropriate. However, It would be helpful to outline how the post-simulation assessment is linked to the project goals, objectives, or purpose.

**Potential to generate subsequent research and funding (5 points)****4**

Evaluator Comments:

Your proposal is exploratory. You implied that future simulations will be implemented online and future scenarios will be developed for learners of various concentrations. If this project is successfully employed, the ability to operate online and scenario variability in scenarios is critical to its long-term existence. It would have been useful to review your perspective on future projections of this project or integration with projects focused on a similar concept.

I would be interested in knowing what will happen to the program once the grant ends. Your proposal stated that your team contemplates receiving additional funding from other sources to expand the program; however, a brief synopsis of your continuation plan beyond the grant period would be a great benefit. Additionally, cost projections for operating and maintaining the software would provide a comprehensive outlook on the reality of future operation and success.

**Dissemination Plan (3 points)**

3

Evaluator Comments:

The dissemination plan seems to be appropriate in notifying interested parties of the project. As a pilot project, the iterative approach will allow your team to fine-tune the intricacies of the software. Eventually, you plan to present this project for federal funding and journal publication, which will encourage peer review and a variety of perspectives to further enhance your product.

I would suggest including your plans for virtual dissemination (e.g. websites, social media, etc.). Your team may want to consider the opportunity to market your product by offering trainings, workshops, and seminars related to simulation-based learning and the technology used in developing your product. Some form of public outreach may benefit awareness. Public outreach can include social service agencies, behavioral research facilities, or public meeting relate to CA.