

APPENDIX 1: SYSTEMATIC REVIEW CODING SHEET

Can workplace-based assessment be used to identify and remediate poor performance among postgraduate medical trainees?

1. Administrative

Reference Number _____

Date: _____

Reviewer AB

RG

TH

Citation type:

Journal article

Non-peer review article

Official publication

Book

Thesis

Other

Citation information

Title:

Author(s):

Publication:

Year:

Volume:

Issue:

Pages:

Search Method

Electronic search

Grey Literature

Other _____

2. Evaluation

a) *Aim of study:* Stated Not available

Aim/objectives:

b) *Conceptual framework:* Stated Not available

Conceptual/theoretical framework used:
--

c) *Research Design*

Experimental Design

Randomised controlled trial

Pre-test/Post-test

Single group, no comparison

Single group, repeated measures

Observational Study

Case study/case series

Cross-sectional study

Cohort study

Qualitative Study

Grounded theory study

Phenomenological

Phenomenographic study

Ethnographic

Critical discourse analysis

Narrative inquiry

Mixed Methods Study

Additional design comments/notes:

d) *Data collection methods* (tick all that apply)

Interview

Focus Group

Observation

Questionnaire/survey

Trainee records/assessments

3. Study Context

Country/training jurisdiction:

Setting: Clinical setting Simulated setting Other (describe)

Population

Trainee discipline (e.g. general medicine, ophthalmology)

Year in Training (e.g. FY2)

Mode of recruitment (e.g. convenience or randomised sample; email invitation)

If targeted group (e.g. poorly performing) how was this group identified?

Sample size:

Unit of analysis (if relevant):

Any additional contextual/descriptive data:

5. Methodological Quality (modified BEME Quality Indicators Buckley et al, 2009)

QUALITY INDICATOR		YES/NO/ NOT APPLICABLE (N/A)
Research Question	Is the research question or hypothesis clearly stated?	
Study Subjects	Is the subject group appropriate for the study being carried out?	
Data Collection Methods	Are the methods used appropriate for the research question and context?	
Completeness of data	Attrition rates/acceptable questionnaire response rates?	
Risk of bias assessment	Is a statement of author positionality and a risk of bias assessment included?	
Analysis of results	Are the statistical and other methods of results analysis used appropriate?	
Conclusions	Is it clear that the data justify the conclusions drawn?	
Reproducibility	Could the study be repeated by other researchers?	
Prospective	Is the study prospective?	
Ethical Issues	Are all ethical issues articulated and managed appropriately? (was Ethical approval documented?)	
Triangulation	Were results supported by data from more than one source?	

6. Outcomes

a) Educational outcomes

Kirkpatrick's framework of educational outcomes (*modifications by Steinert et al, 2012)

- Level 1 Learner reactions
- Level 2a Modification of attitudes and skills
- Level 2b Acquisition of knowledge and skills
- Level 3a* Self-reported change in behaviour
- Level 3b* Observed change in behaviour
- Level 4a Change in organisational practice
- Level 4b Benefits to clients or patients

b) Trainee outcomes

- Progression/non-progression

- Remediation outcomes

- Performance changes on re-assessment (improved, dis-improved, no change)

c) Practice-level outcomes (e.g. changes in use of WBA from routine to targeted)

d) *System-level outcomes* (e.g. modification of tools, introduction of new tools, discontinuation of tools)

--