

CASE Evaluation Criteria

Note on Evaluation:

The components of each criterion are not prioritized; however, if an individual evaluator chooses to give more weight to a particular component they are free to do so. For example, a solution may only address 3 of 5 components, but if those components are judged by the evaluator to be the most important and/or the solution addresses each thoroughly then the evaluator is free to award a higher score.

Criteria	Description	Points
Scientific Support	<p>Why will the solution work? How will it accurately measure performance?</p> <hr/> <p>This category provides support for the solution concept, design and procedures to be employed within. Points will be awarded for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background - Sound theoretical and/or empirical (verifiable by observation and experience) support for the approach. 2. Validity - The degree to which the solution measures what it is designed to measure. For example, how is credibility defined and assessed? 3. Replicability - Whether the solution is written in such a way that it could be given to other researchers and implemented in the same way. 4. Generalization - The ability to generalize the solution’s methods, and ideally the results, to new populations, settings, credibility assessment techniques or technologies, etc. 5. Ground Truth - The true state of credibility is objectively determined. Credibility is not determined by feelings, opinions or assumptions, but by objective ground truth. <p>A score of 0-6 would address 0-1 aspects, a score of 7-12 between 1-2, a score of 13-18 2-3, a score of 19-24 between 3-4 and a score of 25-30 between 4-5. As with all categories, if an individual evaluator chooses to give more weight to a particular component they are free to do so.</p>	30
Realism	<p>How does the solution reflect real world situations and circumstances?</p> <hr/> <p>The goal of credibility assessment research is often transitioning techniques or technologies to real-world applications. As such, this category seeks to address how well the solution reflects the real world conditions to which it will ultimately apply. Points will be awarded for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Psychological Realism - The motivators, consequences, and incentives implemented in the solution are reflective of the real world and personally meaningful to participants. 2. Physical Realism - The physical conditions within which the solution takes place are consistent with how credibility would be assessed in the real world. This may include physical or virtual location, different mediums for communicating, as well as the makeup of the social or cultural environment. 	30

	<p>3. Practicality - How feasible the solution's implementation is in a real-world scenario. This may include, but is not necessarily limited to: equipment and/or specialized facility costs, the time and labor required to execute the solution and access to additional resources necessary to implement solution procedures.</p> <p>A score of 0-10 would address 0-1 aspects, a score of 11-20 between 1-2, and a score of 21-30 2-3. As with all categories, if an individual evaluator chooses to give more weight to a particular component they are free to do so.</p>	
Novelty	<p>Is the solution unique? Does it involve creative/clever ideas? How is it different from pre-existing solutions?</p> <p>The solutions put forth should be sufficiently different from the existing class of standard mock crime solutions. Points will be awarded for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procedure - Innovative methods to expose participants to event(s), experience(s), content/message(s) that will be at the core of why someone or something is or is not credible. 2. Motivation - Enabling the choice of events, experiences, content/messages so that behaviors are chosen by an individual, rather than directed by a researcher. 3. Enhanced Realism - Clever ways to enhance psychological realism, while maintaining physical realism. 4. Technology - Creative uses of innovative technologies (e.g. social media, augmented reality, etc.). 5. Objective Measurement - Methods to establish objective ground truth (e.g. unobtrusive recording, biological samples, etc.). <p>A score of 0-6 would address 0-1 aspects, a score of 7-12 between 1-2, a score of 13-18 2-3, a score of 19-24 between 3-4 and a score of 25-30 between 4-5. As with all categories, if an individual evaluator chooses to give more weight to a particular component they are free to do so.</p>	30
Participant Considerations	<p>Is the solution safe for the human participants? Does it adhere to ethical principles and guidelines?</p> <p>All solutions must have the potential to comply with the relevant federal regulations providing protections for human subjects. Submitted solutions should take participant considerations into account and provide enough detail to illustrate that the experiment is safe and ethical for human subjects. Points will be awarded for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beneficence - A solution that maintains the safety of participants, as well as avoids causing immediate or long term harm (physical or psychological). It maximizes benefit to the participant, while minimizing harm. 2. Respect For Persons - The autonomy (power to make one's own choices) and rights of a participant are not compromised. 3. Justice - The solution does not unfairly select or treat participants. 4. Investment - How much personal impact would there be on participants? For example, how much of their time and resources would participation require? <p>A score of 0-2 would address 0-1 aspects, a score of 3-5 between 1-2, a score of 6-8 between 2-3 and a score of 9-10 between 3-4. As with all categories, if an individual evaluator chooses to give more weight to a particular component they are free to do so.</p>	10
Overall Score	Sum of the constituent components	100