

VIRTUAL SIMULATION IN NURSING, PHYSICAL THERAPY AND PHARMACY EDUCATION: STAKEHOLDER WEBINAR

May 17, 2013 Webinar Synopsis

During the first part of the webinar, we provided an overview of activities and results from Phase I feasibility study (slides 1-6). Marge Zielke, PhD, associate professor and associate director of the Institute for Interactive Arts and Engineering at the University of Texas at Dallas, was introduced. She joined Lynn Dierker from HMA as a contractor, and Susan Scherer, PhD and the faculty advisory group from Regis University as the feasibility study project team.

Earlier in the study, we heard from national simulation experts that Colorado's effort and approach is perceived as distinct and invaluable (slide 7). Based on the background research and stakeholder feedback during Phase I of the study, a working draft of a vision and mission statement for a potential Center was formulated to foster continued development (slide 8). The Colorado Health Foundation reacted very positively to this formulation and the Phase I findings, and released funds to proceed with Phase II goals and activities (slides 9 and 10).

Phase II activities include developing the organizational and content design criteria that will serve as a foundation for launching the Center with one or more pilots and gaming scenarios.

- Webinar participants reviewed input previously provided during the Phase I interviews and stakeholder meeting (slide 11), then were asked to comment on **content priorities** for developing simulation scenarios and games (slide 12). Based on top of mind input during the webinar, participants re-affirmed that pediatrics, obstetrics and psychiatry/mental health are three priority areas for developing gaming simulations to expand and strengthen student clinical experiences. Safety and quality were emphasized as considerations for prioritizing which gaming scenarios to develop. However, participants also re-emphasized that efforts should be made to leverage behavioral based learning scenarios combined with clinical and to strive for composability - variability as well as other cross cutting competency development e.g. inter-professional team skills.
- Webinar participants were then asked to review and comment on a list of **organizational criteria** and potential activities that would *add to the value proposition of a center* (slides 13 and 14). Several points were emphasized and suggestions made to strengthen and clarify the criteria, including making sure to include all the points that came out of the earlier Phase I stakeholder meeting e.g. faculty supports, opportunities for research (Note: these revisions were made to the slide deck that will be posted).
- In response to the questions on slide 14, participants offered several suggestions for how membership in a center might be structured e.g. annual fee, per student cost, pro-rating fees based on number of students and level of participation. It was emphasized that criteria related to governance, by-laws, and ownership of resources (Center versus individual institutions, grandfathering products etc.) need to be carefully considered.

The Project team is pressing forward with Phase II research and additional modeling. This includes developing an inventory of potential virtual simulation and gaming products, and a construct for considering how the comparative costs and benefits of a center will be viewed by potential member institutions.

Next steps – your input

Your assistance is needed as part of our ongoing stakeholder engagement in Phase II analysis and modeling development. In follow up to our webinar discussion we appreciate you responding to this email at your earliest convenience with input to any or all of the following:

1. Who within your institution and program are the most appropriate persons from whom to solicit input about formal participation in the modeling and startup of the Center? What timing and processes need to be considered?
2. What suggestions and considerations can you offer regarding how members could contribute to the Center in terms of time, resources? For example, what kinds of structures guide faculty release time? Are there provisions for how and under what circumstances faculty training occurs? When and how faculty participate in research?
3. What are other potential ways to ensure that schools can participate and contribute to a Center based on their distinct assets, size, needs etc.?
4. Do you have additional thoughts about priorities for content development for gaming scenarios?
5. Are you aware of or using simulation products that should be considered as part of the inventory of simulation products for initial center pilots?

Thank you for your interest and enthusiasm for this work!