The launch of the Best Evidence in Medical Education (BEME) Guides in 1999 reflected a growing desire for evidence-based practice. Many interventions have been developed to generate capacity for educational research among clinical educators, but no comprehensive synthesis has been conducted. The purpose of our systematic review is to identify the effectiveness of interventions to build capacity for educational scholarship among clinical educators.

RESULTS

• While all studies include clinical educators, many studies had mixed groups that also included participants from basic science and administration.
• 12 studies reported changes in participant perception (surveys, interviews).
• 3 studies report changes in knowledge or skills.
• 23 studies report changes in participant behaviour (CV analysis, publications/posters, grants, networking analysis).
• Study designs include 5 pre-post, 20 post only, 5 report combination of post only and pre-post.
• All studies but 1 (a TSP study) report positive results.

DISCUSSION

• The majority of studies in this area were uncontrolled pre-post or post test only designs.
• None had an external comparison group.
• The weak designs prevent inferences about causation or association
  • Unable to rule out confounding of results simply by increased experience or time
  • While all authors reported positive conclusions, comparison between interventions was not possible
• Strongest designs (pre-post) were for the following interventions: medical education masters/fellowship, teaching scholars program, and faculty development.
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For the background section, the table below shows the distribution of studies by intervention type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Type</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education Fellowship or Masters</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Scholars Program</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education Writing Group</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education Scholarship, Award or Grants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Medical Education Initiative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education Research Groups/Academies/Offices</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Intervention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flowchart of Systematic Review Process

Records identified through database searching (n = 14,199)

Records screened (n = 14,599)

Records after duplicates removed (n = 1,599)

Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 241)

Studies included in qualitative synthesis (n = 30)

Records excluded (n = 14,358)

Additional records identified through conference proceedings (5), reference lists (4), and personal communication (2)

Records after duplicates removed (n = 6,599)