

1 Different perspectives on Quality in clinical  
2 education of physical therapy students – protocol of  
3 a scoping review

4 Quality in clinical education in physical therapy – protocol of a scoping  
5 review

6 Matthias M Walter<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Slavko Rogan<sup>4</sup>, Alexander P Schurz<sup>3,4</sup>, Evert Zinzen<sup>3</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup>Science and Research, Physio Insight, Haslach im Kinzigtal, Baden-Württemberg, Germany.

9 <sup>2</sup>SRH Fachschule für Physiotherapie GmbH Stuttgart Ost, Stuttgart, Germany.

10 <sup>3</sup>Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Faculty of Physical Education and Physiotherapy, Department  
11 Movement and Nutrition for Health and Performance, Brussels, Belgium.

12 <sup>4</sup>Bern University of Applied Sciences, Department of Health Professions, Bern, Switzerland.

13

14 Address all correspondence to Matthias M. Walter, Seilerstr. 4, 77716 Haslach, Germany,  
15 [walter\\_matthias@outlook.com](mailto:walter_matthias@outlook.com).

16 Slavko Rogan: [slavko.rogan@bfh.ch](mailto:slavko.rogan@bfh.ch)

17 Alexander P Schurz: [alexander.schurz@bfh.ch](mailto:alexander.schurz@bfh.ch)

18 Evert Zinzen: [evert.zinzen@vub.be](mailto:evert.zinzen@vub.be)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 19 Abstract

20 Background: Clinical education (CE) plays a crucial role in physical therapy education, yet  
21 there is a notable absence of established quality characteristics for its implementation.

22 Objectives: This scoping review aims to elucidate how various stakeholders define and  
23 describe the quality of CE in higher education for physical therapy students. Additionally, it  
24 seeks to identify commonalities and distinctions in the application of the term "quality" in the  
25 context of CE.

26 Methods: Peer-reviewed studies encompassing physical therapy students, clinical instructors,  
27 lecturers in physical therapy education, physical therapy educational sites, and supervising  
28 physical therapists in internships across all clinical fields will be included in the review. A  
29 comprehensive search strategy will be employed, utilizing multiple electronic databases,  
30 including MEDLINE, EMBASE, the Cochrane Library, ERIC, Education Research Complete,  
31 Education Database, and CINAHL. Eligibility screening will be independently conducted by two  
32 reviewers. Data extraction will be presented in a tabular or graphical format, aligning with the  
33 review's objectives.

34 Discussion: Insights gleaned from this study hold the potential to inform targeted interventions  
35 and improvements in CE, ultimately enhancing the learning outcomes and satisfaction of  
36 physical therapy students. This endeavor seeks to bridge the existing gap in defining and  
37 achieving quality in clinical education within the realm of physical therapy higher education.

## 38 Introduction

39 Clinical education (CE) is a pivotal component of physical therapy education, constituting up  
40 to one third of the curriculum (1,2). It entails exposing students to genuine clinical practice,  
41 which differs from the theoretical aspects typically presented in classroom settings. During CE,  
42 the foundation for developing therapeutic competencies is formed (2). Given its substantial role  
43 in shaping future practitioners, maintaining high-quality CE experiences is of paramount  
44 importance to ensure the competence and excellence of future physical therapists (3).

45 At the level of physical therapy educational sites Directors of CE aim to control and increase  
46 the quality of CE. However, currently, there are no quality characteristics for its implementation.  
47 The one universal requirement, as mandated by the accreditation criterion, is that physical  
48 therapy education programs must demonstrate their graduates' ability to effectively manage  
49 patients and clients across a wide range of practice settings and throughout different stages  
50 of life and care continuum (4).

51 Physical therapy educational sites operate with varying personnel and financial resources,  
52 which impact the learning experience of students and leads to significant heterogeneity in  
53 quality of education (5). Furthermore, human resources, materials as well as other factors  
54 which could influence CE experiences (CEEs) are mostly managed by clinical practices and  
55 thus, are outside of the control of Directors of CE. Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of  
56 Directors of CE to provide high-quality CEEs (6).

57 In the realm of CE for physical therapists, numerous stakeholders play pivotal roles in shaping  
58 the learning experience. These key stakeholders include physical therapy students, educators,  
59 clinical instructors, supervising physical therapists within healthcare facilities, and physical  
60 therapy educational sites. Each of these stakeholders contributes unique perspectives on what  
61 constitutes quality in CE. There are many factors within the structures and processes of CE,  
62 and they may interact with one another to contribute to various outcomes. Thus, the direction  
63 of students' learning and satisfaction is a collaboration of these stakeholders (7).

64 The intricacy of assessing the quality of CE is highlighted by a systematic review, which yielded  
65 insufficient evidence to ascertain the best practices for CE in physical therapy in general (8).  
66 A recently developed tool by (9) seems to assess quality in clinical education. However, this  
67 tool should be answered by Directors of CE and heads of departments and is therefore missing  
68 the evaluation of quality from a physical therapy student perspective.

69 Evaluating stakeholder satisfaction has the potential to serve as a valuable resource in ongoing  
70 endeavors to enhance quality in CE. However, to develop a tool to assess satisfaction and  
71 quality in CE, it should be clarified what defines quality in CE from the different perspectives  
72 of stakeholders. Therefore, the primary aim of this scoping review is to map how different  
73 stakeholders define and describe quality of CE in higher education of physical therapy  
74 students. Secondary aim is to outline the similarities and differences in the use of the term  
75 quality in CE.

76

77

## 78 **Methods**

79 This scoping review follows the Joanna Briggs Institute Evidence recommendations (10–13)  
80 and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Extension for  
81 Scoping Reviews checklist (PRISMA-ScR) (14).

82

### 83 **Research question of this scoping review**

84 This scoping review aims to answer the following research questions:

85 1) How do different stakeholders (students, clinical instructors, supervising PTs, PT  
86 educational sites) define and describe quality of CE in higher education of  
87 physiotherapy students?

88 2) What are the similarities and differences in the use of the term quality in CE?

89

## 90 Protocol and registration

91 This protocol was preregistered in the International Database of Education Systematic  
92 Reviews under the registration number [IDESR000098]. Any significant updates or changes to  
93 this protocol will be documented in the same registration entry to ensure transparency and  
94 traceability throughout the research process.

95

## 96 Eligibility criteria

97 The current scoping review will consider peer-reviewed studies that include physical therapy  
98 students, clinical instructors and/or lecturers in physical therapy education, physical therapy  
99 educational sites as well as supervising physical therapists in internships from all clinical fields.  
100 Only English language articles will be included, and we will apply no time limit to the search  
101 strategy. Studies from any geographical and clinical setting will be eligible for inclusion.  
102 Investigations focusing on any kind of quality (e.g., satisfaction, learning experiences) in  
103 clinical education will be included.

104 Exclusion criteria include other healthcare professions than physical therapy, study protocols  
105 and abstracts, conference proceedings, and dissertations.

106

## 107 Information source

108 The search strategy will encompass multiple electronic databases, including MEDLINE  
109 (accessed via Ovid), EMBASE, the Cochrane Library, ERIC, Education Research Complete,  
110 Education Database and CINAHL (accessed via Ebsco).

111

## 112 Search

113 We will use the PCC (Population (or participants)/Concept/Context) framework which is  
114 recommended by the Joanna Briggs Institute (11). A comprehensive search strategy will be  
115 conducted to identify relevant studies. The initial search strategy will focus on the electronic  
116 database MEDLINE (PubMed). The researchers will analyze text words in article titles,  
117 abstracts, and index terms related to the research topic. The identified keywords and index  
118 terms will be customized for each information source and combined using Boolean operators,  
119 forming the final search strategy. In addition to electronic databases, the researchers will  
120 explore the reference lists of included studies to uncover further relevant studies. The process  
121 of identifying relevant studies will be completed by the end of October 2023. Table 1 represents  
122 the pilot search strategy.

123

124 *Table 1. Search strategy*

<b>Search strategy: Participants, Concept, Context</b>	
Participants	In general: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- physiotherap*</li><li>- physical therap*</li></ul>

	<p>Students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Physiotherapy students</li> <li>- physical therapy students</li> </ul> <p>Clinical Instructors and physical therapy educational sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clinical instructors</li> <li>- Physiotherapy educational sites</li> <li>- Clinical education programs</li> <li>- Physiotherapy educators</li> <li>- physical therapy educators</li> </ul> <p>Healthcare institutions, supervising physical therapists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training sites</li> <li>- Fieldwork sites</li> <li>- Clinical placement sites</li> <li>- Healthcare institutions</li> <li>- Supervising physical therapist</li> <li>- Supervising physical therapists</li> </ul>
<p>Concept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Best practices</li> <li>- Experiences</li> <li>- Effective*</li> <li>- Outcome*</li> <li>- Perform*</li> <li>- Excellen*</li> <li>- Assess*</li> <li>- Eval*</li> <li>- Improve*</li> <li>- Satisf*</li> <li>- views</li> </ul>
Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clinical education</li> <li>- Internship</li> <li>- Fieldwork</li> <li>- Clinical placement</li> <li>- Learning environment</li> <li>- Higher education</li> </ul>
Pilot search string for PubMed	<p>(("physiotherap*" OR "physical therap*" OR "Physiotherapy students" OR "physical therapy students" OR "Clinical instructors" OR</p>



	"Physiotherapy educational sites" OR "Clinical education programs" OR "Physiotherapy educators" OR "physical therapy educators" OR "Training sites" OR "Fieldwork sites" OR "Clinical placement sites" OR "Healthcare institutions" OR "Supervising physiotherapist" OR "Supervising physical therapists") AND ("Quality" OR "Best practices" OR "Experiences" OR "Effective*" OR "Outcome*" OR "Perform*" OR "Excellen*" OR "Assess*" OR "Eval*" OR "Improve*" OR "Satisf*" OR "views")) AND ("Clinical education" OR "Internship" OR "Fieldwork" OR "Clinical placement" OR "Learning environment" OR "Higher education")
--	--

125

## 126 **Selection of sources of evidence**

127 First, two reviewers (MW, AS) will independently screen title and abstract for eligibility criteria.

128 Any articles deemed relevant by both reviewers will be included in the full-text review. If the

129 relevance of a study was unclear from the abstract, then the full article was ordered. Second,

130 two investigators (MW, AS) will conduct an independent assessment of the full-text articles to

131 ascertain their compliance with the predefined eligibility criteria. To gauge the inter-rater

132 agreement, Cohen's  $\kappa$  statistic will be computed for both the initial title and abstract review

133 stage, as well as for the subsequent full article review stage. In cases where any discrepancies

134 arise during the evaluation of full-text articles, a reevaluation of these discordant articles will

135 be performed. Any persisting disagreements regarding the eligibility of studies will be diligently

136 resolved through constructive discussions with a third reviewer (SR). The goal of these

137 discussions will be to achieve complete consensus among all reviewers regarding the inclusion

138 of studies. We will use Rayyan for the screening process (15).

139

## 140 **Data charting process**

141 Data from the articles included will be extracted by two independent reviewers (MW, AS) into  
142 a modified version of the JBI data extraction table (16). To identify any necessary adjustments  
143 to the data extraction table, we will conduct a pilot test of the data extraction table using three  
144 full texts before proceeding with data extraction. In case of any disagreements a third reviewer  
145 (SR) will be involved to find consensus. Where required, authors will be contacted to request  
146 missing or additional data. Due to the primary objective of scoping reviews to comprehensively  
147 map and summarize the existing evidence on a topic, rather than synthesizing the findings to  
148 address a specific clinical question, the evaluation of methodological limitations or the risk of  
149 bias in the included evidence is usually not undertaken, unless explicitly demanded by the  
150 specific aims of the scoping review (11,14,17). Therefore, we did not conduct a risk of bias  
151 assessment.

152

## 153 **Data items**

154 The extracted data will include details about the authors, healthcare settings, Characteristics  
155 of included publications (Contexts & Participants), Location(s) of data collection, other relevant  
156 socio demographic information, publication year, study design, study methods, results and  
157 authors' interpretation or conclusion of significance to the scoping review questions and  
158 objectives. For a detailed prescription of the included details see supplementary file 1.

159

## 160 **Synthesis of results**

161 The data extracted from the included studies will be subjected to a two-step analysis:  
162 descriptive and thematic. In the first step, the extracted data will be presented in a tabular or  
163 graphical format, in line with the objectives of this scoping review. These tables and/or charts

164 will outline the diverse perspectives on quality in CE, as described by different stakeholders.  
165 The thematic analysis will identify key themes related to the definitions and descriptions of  
166 quality. A narrative summary will be provided to interpret the results and demonstrate how they  
167 relate to the review's overall objectives and research questions.

168

169

## 170 Limitation

171 One notable limitation is the potential for publication bias. This study relies on published works,  
172 possibly excluding unpublished research, gray literature, or studies not accessible through the  
173 selected databases. This could lead to an incomplete representation of the available evidence,  
174 potentially affecting the results.

175 Furthermore, the primary objective of this scoping review is to explore quality perspectives  
176 from a diverse group of stakeholders, including students, educators, clinical instructors, and  
177 supervising physical therapists. This diversity may result in varying interpretations and  
178 definitions of quality. Consequently, synthesizing findings across these different perspectives  
179 may prove challenging and may introduce subjectivity.

180 Moreover, this study encompasses perspectives from different countries and educational  
181 systems, each with its unique context and approach to physical therapy education. These  
182 variations may introduce differences in the understanding and measurement of quality. As a  
183 result, the findings may not be universally applicable to other countries or regions.

184 Lastly, it's important to note that this scoping review does not assess the methodological  
185 limitations or risk of bias in the individual studies included. Variations in the quality of these  
186 studies may impact the overall findings and interpretations, potentially affecting the robustness  
187 of the conclusions drawn.

## 188 Discussion

189 We plan to conduct a scoping review using the scoping review methodological framework by  
190 the Joanna Briggs Institute Evidence recommendations to ensure the replicability of our study  
191 and to reinforce our methodology (10–13). This scoping review would like to represent factors  
192 that influence various aspects related to CE in physical therapy education. The findings of the  
193 scoping review proposed should be made available within the broadest possible audience.  
194 They should understand the different perspectives of quality in CE to help educational  
195 institutions and clinical sites identify areas for improvement. Insights gained from this study  
196 may lead to targeted interventions and enhancements of CEEs, ultimately benefiting physical  
197 therapy students' learning outcomes and satisfaction.

198 The findings of this review could inform policymakers and regulatory bodies involved in  
199 physical therapy education. By identifying different stakeholders' perspectives on quality in CE,  
200 the study may contribute to the development of standardized procedures and guidelines for  
201 implementing and assessing CE programs.

202 This scoping review's results may facilitate better collaboration and communication among key  
203 stakeholders, including students, educators, clinical instructors, and supervising physical  
204 therapists. By recognizing and addressing differences in how each group defines and  
205 describes quality, stakeholders can work together to create more cohesive and effective CEEs.  
206 This could contribute to the development of tools for assessing stakeholder satisfaction in CE.  
207 By understanding the elements that different stakeholders consider essential for quality,  
208 researchers and educators can design assessment instruments that capture diverse  
209 perspectives comprehensively.

210 Furthermore, the scoping review may also identify research gaps and areas for further  
211 investigation related to CE quality. By highlighting aspects that have received less attention or  
212 exploration, the study may inspire future research endeavors aimed at addressing unmet  
213 needs in the field.

214 Overall, this scoping review has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field of  
215 physical therapy education by shedding light on different perspectives of quality in CE and its  
216 impact on students' experiences and outcomes.

217

218

## 219 Ethics and dissemination

220 This scoping aims to provide a comprehensive overview of how various stakeholders, including  
221 students, clinical instructors, supervising PTs, and PT educational sites, define and describe  
222 the concept of quality in CE for higher education of physical therapy students. Additionally, the  
223 review seeks to identify similarities and differences in the usage of the term "quality" within the  
224 context of CE. Due to the nature of a scoping review and its secondary data analysis ethical  
225 review is not required. The results of this scoping review will be disseminated through a peer-  
226 reviewed publication to ensure the rigor and credibility of the findings.

227

228

## 229 Contribution of Authors

230 MW and SR originated the concept, while EZ provided supervision and substantial input. AS  
231 offered substantial input. MW and SR crafted the search strategy, and all authors have reached  
232 a consensus on the current protocol for this scoping review.

233

234

## 235 Acknowledgements

236 We have no acknowledgments to make as there was no external funding or support for our  
237 research.

238

## 239 Declaration of interest

240 All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

241

## 242 Sources of support

243 There are no sources of support to report.

244

## 245 References

246 1. Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education. 2022 Physical Therapist  
247 Education Programs Fact Sheet [Internet]. 2023 [zitiert 24. Juli 2023]. Verfügbar unter:  
248 [https://www.capteonline.org/globalassets/capte-docs/aggregate-data/2022-pt-aggregate-](https://www.capteonline.org/globalassets/capte-docs/aggregate-data/2022-pt-aggregate-data.pdf)  
249 [data.pdf](https://www.capteonline.org/globalassets/capte-docs/aggregate-data/2022-pt-aggregate-data.pdf)

250 2. Mattfeld U. Klinisch-praktische Ausbildung. *Z f Physiotherapeuten*. 2010;62(6):24–7.

251 3. Jette DU, Nelson L, Palaima M, Wetherbee E. How Do We Improve Quality in Clinical  
252 Education? Examination of Structures, Processes, and Outcomes: *Journal of Physical*  
253 *Therapy Education*. 2014;28:6–12.

- 254 4. Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education. Standards and required  
255 elements for accreditation of physical therapist education programsw [Internet]. 2022  
256 [zitiert 24. Juli 2023]. Verfügbar unter: [https://www.capteonline.org/globalassets/capte-](https://www.capteonline.org/globalassets/capte-docs/capte-pt-standards-required-elements.pdf)  
257 docs/capte-pt-standards-required-elements.pdf
- 258 5. Wasner M. Qualitätsmanagement in der Ausbildung Physiotherapie in den EU-Ländern -  
259 Eine vergleichende Untersuchung. 2007 [zitiert 24. Juli 2023]; Verfügbar unter:  
260 <http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/id/eprint/7844>
- 261 6. Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education. Evaluative Criteria for  
262 Accreditation of Education Programs for the Preparation of Physical Therapists [Internet].  
263 2022 [zitiert 24. Juli 2023]. Verfügbar unter:  
264 <https://www.capteonline.org/globalassets/capte-docs/portal/pt-worksheets.doc>
- 265 7. Giberson TR, Black B, Pinkerton E. The Impact of Student-Clinical Instructor Fit and  
266 Student-Organization Fit on Physical Therapist Clinical Education Experience Outcomes.  
267 Journal of Physical Therapy Education. 2008;22(1):59–64.
- 268 8. McCallum CA, Mosher PD, Jacobson PJ, Gallivan SP, Giuffre SM. Quality in Physical  
269 Therapist Clinical Education: A Systematic Review. Physical Therapy. 1. Oktober  
270 2013;93(10):1298–311.
- 271 9. Naidoo V, Stewart AV, Maleka MED. A tool to evaluate physiotherapy clinical education in  
272 South Africa. S Afr j physiother [Internet]. 31. August 2022 [zitiert 4. Mai 2023];78(1).  
273 Verfügbar unter: <https://sajp.co.za/index.php/sajp/article/view/1759>
- 274 10. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Munn Z, Tricco A, Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping  
275 reviews. In: JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis [Internet]. JBI; 2020 [zitiert 24. Juli 2023].  
276 Verfügbar unter: [https://jbi-global-](https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687342/Chapter+11%3A+Scoping+reviews)  
277 wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687342/Chapter+11%3A+Scoping+reviews

- 278 11. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, u. a. Updated  
279 methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. JBI Evidence Synthesis.  
280 Oktober 2020;18(10):2119–26.
- 281 12. Peters S, Bussièrès A, Depreitere B, Vanholle S, Cristens J, Vermandere M, u. a.  
282 Facilitating Guideline Implementation in Primary Health Care Practices. J Prim Care  
283 Community Health. Dezember 2020;11:2150132720916263.
- 284 13. Pollock D, Peters MDJ, Khalil H, McInerney P, Alexander L, Tricco AC, u. a.  
285 Recommendations for the extraction, analysis, and presentation of results in scoping  
286 reviews. JBI Evidence Synthesis. März 2023;21(3):520–32.
- 287 14. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, u. a. PRISMA Extension  
288 for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2.  
289 Oktober 2018;169(7):467–73.
- 290 15. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app  
291 for systematic reviews. Syst Rev. Dezember 2016;5(1):210.
- 292 16. Francis E. JBI GLOBAL WIKI. 2022. Appendix 11.1 JBI template source of evidence  
293 details, characteristics and results extraction instrument. Verfügbar unter: [https://jbi-global-  
294 wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687579/Appendix+11.1+JBI+template+source+of+evid  
295 ence+details%2C+characteristics+and+results+extraction+instrument](https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687579/Appendix+11.1+JBI+template+source+of+evidence+details%2C+characteristics+and+results+extraction+instrument)
- 296 17. Khalil H, Peters M, Godfrey CM, McInerney P, Soares CB, Parker D. An Evidence-Based  
297 Approach to Scoping Reviews: EBP Approach to Scoping Reviews. Worldviews on  
298 Evidence-Based Nursing. April 2016;13(2):118–23.
- 299
- 300