

SECTION 1B: TYPE OF PUBLICATION

- Book Official publication Thesis Editorial Interview
 Journal article Report Comment Guideline Lecture
 Other _____

SECTION 2: STUDY CHARACTERISTICS

Intervention (ie portfolio)

6 Type of portfolio. The portfolio was:

- electronic combination of electronic/paper
 paper unclear

7 Reflection (i.e self-appraisal). Reflection on performance/experience by the students was:

- required combination
 voluntary not required unclear

8 Reflection (i.e self-appraisal). Reflection on performance/experience by the students was:

- private (student use only) combination
 for sharing (with students/staff) unclear

9 Duration. Students completed the portfolio over:

- > 1 academic year approx. 1 academic year
 approx. 1 semester < 1 semester (*state length*) _____

10 Completion. Completion of the portfolio was:

- a. Compulsory Yes No Unclear
 b. Supervised by staff Yes No Unclear

11 Content choice. Content for the portfolio was:

- Prescribed by staff Mixture
 Freely chosen by student Unclear

12 Content types. The portfolio included:

- a. Learning journal/diary Yes No Unclear
 b. Clinical case reports Yes No Unclear
 c. Assignments Yes No Unclear
 d. Other (please describe) _____

13 Assessment. Assessment of the portfolio was:

- not done summative
 formative combination of both unclear

Study population

14 Subjects (i.e. students involved in the study*)

Profession: _____

Group	Course	Description	Year	Number Recruited	Not Reported	Number Completed	Not Reported	Percent Completed	Not Reported
Intervention/ test group									
Comparison (1) (if applicable)									
Comparison (2) (if applicable)									

* Note: this is the number of students in the study (test and control for comparative studies), rather than the number responding to a questionnaire or other evaluation tool. Response rate to a questionnaire is a quality indicator relating to completeness of data.

Setting and duration

15 **Setting:**

- non-clinical/classroom-based
 combination
 clinical setting (including 1ry and 2ry care, community)
 unclear

16 **Study dates and duration (e.g. 1999-2001 usually different from year of publication)** _____

17 **Country of study** _____

Study design

18 **Research design: non-comparative studies:**

NB: use these definitions to categorise the research, even if the author uses a different name to describe their study

Type	Definition	Possibly	Yes
Audit	Verification of the legality, fidelity, efficiency or feasibility of procedures, operations, transactions or expenditures, often by an independent person or agency.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Action research	A cyclical enquiry process that involves diagnosing a problem situation, planning action steps and implementing and evaluating outcomes. Involves self-reflection by practitioners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Case study/ series	A detailed analysis of a person or group, especially as a model of medical, psychological or social phenomena. An instructive example. Single or multiple cases, presents and represents reality, can be inferential, can include participants and non-participants.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ethnographic	First hand observation of people in their natural contexts. Can be used to establish current practice as a guide to future investigation. Unstructured approach to data gathering – rather than testing a hypothesis, key features evolve through ongoing analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross-sectional	Examination of the relationship between outcomes and other variables of interest (including interventions) as they exist in a relevant population at one particular time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19 **Research design: comparative studies**

Experimental studies: Comparative studies in which the use of different interventions is allocated by the researcher

Type	Definition	Possibly	Yes
Randomised controlled trial	Random allocation of participants to intervention or control groups, with follow up to examine differences in outcomes between the two groups.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Experimental study without randomisation	The allocation of participants to different intervention groups is managed by the researcher, but is not randomised. Allocations are not concealed from those involved in the study.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Observation studies with control group: Comparative studies in which the use of different interventions among participants is not allocated by the researcher (it is merely observed)

Type	Definition	Possibly	Yes
Cohort study	Follow-up of participants who have received an intervention (that is not allocated by the researcher) to examine the differences in outcomes compared to a control group	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Case-control	Comparison of intervention rates between participants with the outcome (cases) and those without the outcome (controls)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Observation studies without control group

Type	Definition	Possibly	Yes
Before and after	Comparison of outcomes in study participants before and after an intervention and those without the outcome (controls)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

20 **Research design: other (please describe)**

21 **Data sources/collection methods** (select all that apply; if in doubt describe and flag for further discussion)

- Exam results: assessment of the portfolio itself Exam results: clinical examinations (e.g. OSCE)
 Exam results: written papers (e.g. MCQ) Simulation/role play
 Other _____

Student/staff opinions

- Interview Questionnaire
 Focus group Self-assessment
 Observation Unsolicited feedback (e.g. postings to student web discussion, email correspondence)
 Other _____

Miscellaneous

- Patient/client outcomes Opinion of author
 Other _____

SECTION 3: QUALITY ASSESSMENT

22 **Quality checklist: all studies** (note 'Data' includes both qualitative and quantitative data)

Quality indicator	Detail	Yes	No	Unclear
Research question	Is the research question or hypothesis clearly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Study subjects	Is the subject group appropriate for the study being carried out (number, characteristics, selection, and homogeneity)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
'Data' collection methods	Are the methods used (qualitative or quantitative) reliable and valid for the research question and context?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Completeness of 'data'	Applies to both qualitative and quantitative studies. Have subjects dropped out? Is the attrition rate less than 50%? For questionnaire based studies, is the response rate acceptable (60% or above?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Control for confounding	Have multiple factors/variables been removed or accounted for where possible?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Analysis of results	Are the statistical or other methods of results analysis used appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conclusions	Is it clear that the data justify the conclusions drawn?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reproducibility	Could the study be repeated by other researchers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prospective	Does the study look forwards in time (prospective) rather than retrospective?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Peer review	Has the paper been peer reviewed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ethical issues	Were all relevant ethical issues addressed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Triangulation	Were results supported by data from more than one source?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments _____

23 **Quality checklist: additional criteria for qualitative studies**

Quality indicator	Detail	Yes	No	Unclear
Researcher perspective/bias	Do the researchers discuss their own perspectives and potential biases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questioning techniques	Do the researchers discuss how questions were phrased and probed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participant agenda	Was there appropriate opportunity for participants to raise their own agenda?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Negative cases	If the authors are proposing a theory, have they shown how negative cases fit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments _____

26 Level of impact (modified Kirkpatrick scale)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1a	Participation	learners' views on the learning experience (e.g post questionnaire)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2a	Modification of attitudes/ perceptions	change in attitudes or perceptions between participant groups towards the intervention (e.g. difference between pre and post questionnaire attitudes)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2b	Modification of knowledge or skills	e.g. difference between performance in pre-post tests
<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Behavioural change	the transfer of learning to the workplace (clinical setting) OR willingness of learners to apply new knowledge or skills
<input type="checkbox"/> 4a	Change in organisational practice	wider changes in the organisation/delivery of care, attributable to the educational programme
<input type="checkbox"/> 4b	Benefit to patient/clients	improvement in the health and wellbeing of patients/clients as a direct result of the educational programme

**27 Useful quotations etc. which may inform discussion section of final report
(highlight text in the article and indicate page here, no need to write out).**