



iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Article/Paper

Briffa, C & Porter, J 2013, 'A systematic review of the collaborative clinical education model to inform speech-language pathology practice', *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, pp. 1–11.

Article Methodology: Systematic Review

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review address a clearly focused question?</p> <p>The aims of this review were to investigate advantages and disadvantages of the collaborative model and to explore its implementation across allied health.</p> <p><i>The research questions for this review were:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the collaborative model of clinical education across allied health? 2. How is the collaborative model of clinical education being implemented and evaluated across allied health and how could this apply in speech-language pathology? <p>p.2</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the authors look for the appropriate sort of papers?</p> <p>The authors specified that qualitative and quantitative papers would be included. Original research papers, applied research and English-language articles were included however, other systematic reviews, commentaries and letters to the editor were excluded.</p> <p>P.3</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES</p>
3			✓	<p>Do you think the important, relevant studies were included?</p> <p>The electronic databases Medline, CINAHL, and EMBASE were searched; although these are popular databases others could have been searched to increase the relevant articles found. Electronic searches were supplemented by checking the reference list of any relevant identified articles and citation tracking using Google scholar. P.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why didn't they use ERIC? Or one of the

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 iCAHE@unisa.edu.au
 Telephone: +61 8 830 22099
 Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 00121B



University of
 South Australia

International Centre for
 Allied Health Evidence
 iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute

			<p>Psychology databases?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited to English • did not contact experts, or • look for unpublished literature <p>A set criterion was used to identify which papers were included, this involved two reviewers, additional detail can be found under <i>study selection</i> (p 2).</p>
4	✓		<p>Did the review’s authors do enough to assess the quality of the included studies?</p> <p>The quality of included articles was assessed by two reviewers independently using appraisal tools. Qualitative studies were appraised using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) and quantitative studies were assessed using the McMaster quantitative appraisal tool. Any discrepancies of quality assessment ratings between reviewers were resolved by consensus. P.2</p>
5		NA	<p>If the results of the review have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</p> <p>“Meta-analysis was not considered appropriate due to the range of study designs incorporated in the review. Data were synthesized descriptively”. P.3</p> <p><i>This is not appropriate in this type of study. They have investigated the option of combining the results and found it impractical given the data they had. The fact that they have stated that it is not possible shows they have considered the best way to present their results.</i></p>
6			<p>What are the overall results of the reviews?</p> <p>The overall quality of the evidence base for the collaborative clinical education model was not of a high standard across the reviewed studies, hence findings must be interpreted with caution.</p> <p><i>Bottom line result.</i> Advantages and disadvantages identified were consistent across disciplines. A key advantage of the model was the opportunity afforded for peer learning, whilst a frequently reported disadvantage was reduced time for individual supervision of students. Insufficient data were provided on how the model was implemented across studies.</p> <p>Pp8, 10</p>
7		NA	<p>How precise are the results?</p>

			Precision of the results cannot be determined by the analysis in this review.
8		✓	Can the results be applied to the local population? Small sample sizes based in predominantly one discipline (physiotherapy) impacted on the ability to generalize results across the allied health professions where differences in models of service delivery may exist. Also, lack of information on recruitment methods and an absence of inclusion or exclusion criteria limit generalization to local settings. pp.8-9
9	✓		Were all important outcomes considered?
10		✓	Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
iCAHE@unisa.edu.au
Telephone: +61 8 830 22099
Fax: +61 8 830 22853

University of South Australia
GPO Box 2471
Adelaide SA 5001
Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
00121B



University of
South Australia

International Centre for
Allied Health Evidence

iCAHE

A member of the Sansom Institute