

Evaluation Summary

Mark Rash | markrash@vt.edu | November 23, 2010

The evaluations were extremely helpful in determining the potential effectiveness of the instructional program. Overall, the results were positive, with strong scores in most areas. Generally the evaluators were pleased with the program using a different approach to training a fairly humdrum subject matter. One evaluator, who is the manager of the Learning Organization, mentioned that it provides a nice way for the learners to explore instead of reading seemingly endless documents that were part of the original new hire training program. Following is a summary of the main areas that were evaluated as opportunities for improvement, along with my resulting responses and actions.

Feedback	Response / Actions Taken
“Do scores correlate to effort/effectiveness? In other words, if I start with a low score by default, will I feel that I’m not doing very well?”	<p>I suppose it’s possible that a learner would have a negative perception of the initial starting scores; however I wanted to avoid using a “point reduction approach” where the scores start high and drop as a result of poor performance.</p> <p>Action Taken: Provided additional information to the learner in the overview screens to explain more about what the scores mean in the game and how they translate to the workplace.</p>
“Might want to rework the performance piece...if I go thru a module I get points added, but part of your design talked about decisions impacting the score good or bad. Would like to see that reflected in the scores.”	<p>Agreed. My preference is to focus on reinforcement by raising scores based on correct performance; however the experience will be more real if the learners can actually make mistakes and see what the consequences could be.</p> <p>Action Taken: Added ability for individual learning object modules to deduct from the corresponding score if the learner isn’t performing well, especially on critical points.</p>
Audio is clear but took a while to get used to the computerized voices	<p>I agree the voices are still clearly synthesized; however Text to Speech technology has come a long way and I think the quality is acceptable. Since the evaluator did not find this distracting from the learning experience, I did not make any revisions.</p>

“May want to more clearly state what the learner will get out of the program”

Agreed. I originally had a list of several objectives included for the learner, but I removed the list because unless they are presented in some creative way, I think they often lose the learners right up front. I should have included something in that regard though, because it is definitely important to inform the learners of the objectives.

Action Taken: Added simplified version of the instructional goal as an objective so the learner knows what they are trying to accomplish, but without being bogged down in the details.

“...would be nice if it tracked where I am in case I close out and come back later”

This is a known issue because the program is running outside of a Learning Management System. Since I knew it would not be running within an LMS, I did not build bookmarking or SCORM capabilities into the program.

I have not taken action on this at this time, but once the program is destined for the LMS, I will need to add SCORM variables and functions so that the LMS can track the learner’s progress.

I did take action on a somewhat related topic, however:

Action Taken: Enabled tracking of the introductory screens (the screens that appear before the virtual store game begins) so that the learner can go back to a previous screen and return without repeating sections. I did this by disabling the Next button until the learner has completed the current screen.

“More clear directions are needed to explain how the game ends.”

Agreed. The learner should know right off exactly what it takes to complete the program.

Action Taken: Added text and narrator speech to clarify that the game ends once the learner achieves the performance goals.