

PAEA & AAPA Clinical Doctorate Summit Literature Search Methodology Statement

November 2008

A thorough and organized literature search will be undertaken by the Summit Sponsor Group to:

- Better define the issue
- Delineate the historical perspective on the issue
- Assist with the formation of recommendations
- Gain insight into lessons learned in other professions

This process will include examining the literature from several other health professions. This will include some that have decided to develop a profession-specific clinical doctorate, others that have decided not to go in this direction, and others who have a close relationship with the PA profession (i.e., physicians). The search will also examine governmental and lay sources to try to anticipate some possible effects and consequences that the development of a clinical doctorate in the PA profession would have.

Professions to Be Evaluated:

1. Audiology (master's or doctorate [AuD]; all doctorate by 2012)
2. Advanced Practice Nursing:
 - Nurse Practitioners (master's, post-master's certificate, doctorate [DNP])
 - Nurse Midwives (CNM – bachelor's or master's)
 - Nurse Anesthetists (CRNA – master's)
 - Clinical Nurse Specialists
3. Occupational Therapy (certificate, master's, doctorate)
4. Pharmacy (PharmD and PharmD transition)
5. Physician Assistant (certificate, associate, bachelor's, master's, doctorate)
6. Physical Therapy (bachelor's to master's, direct entry master's [MPT], direct entry doctorate [DPT], transitional DPT)
7. Public Health (BSPH, MPH, MSPH, DrPH, PhD)
8. Social Work (BSW, MSW, DSW or PhD)
9. Dietetics (probably not nutritionists; bachelor's and BA/MA program)
10. Clinical laboratory science (bachelor of science, but considering doctorate)

The Sponsor Group may also evaluate the literature on psychology, although this is a complex field that includes clinical psychology, counseling, and school psychology, and has a variety of degrees (MEd, MS, EdD, PhD, and PsyD).

Research Questions:

1. Has the profession examined the issue of a field-specific clinical doctorate?
2. What issues in the profession prompted the discussion about the clinical doctorate?
3. What was the decision regarding the clinical doctorate?
4. Is the degree entry-level, postprofessional, or both?
5. If entry level, was a bridge or transition degree created?

6. How was the decision reached regarding the clinical doctorate in the profession? What was the methodology?
7. What were the perceived pros and cons regarding the clinical doctorate in the profession?
8. Who were the major advocates and opposition groups to the clinical doctorate?
9. What are the perceptions about the clinical doctorate among people in the profession?
10. If a clinical doctorate was developed, what was the structure (e.g., number of additional credits, additional content and focus)?
11. What additional skill sets does the clinical doctorate give graduates proficiency in?
12. If a clinical doctorate was created, has outcome research been done to examine the effects the degree has had on the profession (admissions, access to education, student demographics, relations with other professions, cost of education, salaries, clinical scope of practice, legislation, credentials process, third party reimbursement, patient acceptance, etc.)? If yes, what are the results?
13. What role does the degree play in determining clinical practice ability? Is there a certification that takes precedence over degree? Is there a minimum degree requirement for certification?
14. Are there lessons learned and best practices that can be gleaned from clinical doctorate development in other health professions?
15. What has been medicine's reaction to increasing scope and responsibilities of other professions? How will medicine react to a clinical doctorate for PAs?

The research questions may have to be refined. Given that the transition to the clinical doctorate in many health professions is a relatively new phenomenon, there may be a dearth of hard data from outcomes research.

Search Criteria:

To answer the above questions adequately we will need to cast a wide net and use a variety of literature sources and research methods. Restricting our effort to well-designed quantitative research with adequate sample size appearing in peer-reviewed journals may have a very limited yield. A process used by the social sciences and history may be more suitable for answering these questions than a methodology resembling a systematic evidence-based medicine review. The process may need to involve the review of research articles (quantitative and qualitative), review articles, editorials, peer-reviewed journals, non-peer-reviewed publications, books, newspapers, professional newsletters, thesis/dissertations, posters, abstracts, meeting minutes, memorandum, white papers, task force reports, organization position statements, Web sites of colleges and professional organizations, government statistics, professional organization archives, accreditation standards and professional organization resolutions. Conducting interviews with leaders in the professions who were involved in the decision-making process may also yield valuable information.

Inclusion Criteria:

1. Reliable sources:
 - a. Professional journals
 - b. Information from professional organizations representing the disciplines in question (journals, newsletters, Web sites, archives)
 - c. Information from government sources (statistics and policy papers)

- d. Information from accredited academic institutions (Web sites and catalogues outlining curriculum)
 - e. Articles from reputable newspapers and magazines (e.g., *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*)
 - f. Books from reputable publishers and authors with the appropriate credentials and expertise
2. Currency: Nothing older than 1985. Note: Researchers may have to go back to the late-1980s to obtain an accurate historical perspective.
 3. Language: English
 4. Country: United States

Search Strategy and Methodology:

- a. Databases: MEDLINE, EBSCO Host, OVID, CINHL, ERIC
- b. Search engines: Google & Google Scholar
- c. Specific professional publications: Newsletters and journals
- d. Professional organization Web site search engines
- e. Lay press search engines: Chronicle of Higher Education, Wall Street Journal, New York Times
- f. Government (e.g., CDC, Bureau of Labor Statistics) Web site search engines
- g. The reference list of task force papers and review articles (backward search strategy)
- h. Library search for books
- i. Ask professional leaders for recommendations on key pieces of literature related to the subject in their field
- j. Search terms and keywords:
 - i. Clinical doctorate
 - ii. Clinical doctorate AND name of profession
 - iii. Doctorate AND name of profession
- k. Start with abstract review, then move on to the review of the full text
- l. Track the number of hits on searches, the numbers of abstracts and the number of full articles reviewed
- m. Consider consultation with a professional librarian

**PAEA & AAPA Clinical Doctorate Summit
Literature Search Critical Appraisal Form**

Title: _____

Authors: _____

Source/Journal: _____

Peer-reviewed: YES NO

Date, Volume, & Number: _____

1. Was the source of the information reliable and reputable?

YES NO **Comment:**

2. Was the source of the information current (1985 or after)?

YES NO **Comment:**

3. What is the type of article:

- Research article**
- Review article**
- Editorial or op-ed**
- Book**
- Newspaper**
- Newsletter**
- Web site**
- Thesis/dissertation**
- Abstract**
- Presentation or meeting proceedings**
- Poster**
- Meeting minutes**
- Resolution**
- Task force report, consensus panel, white paper**
- Archives**
- Memorandum**
- Interview**
- Other:** _____

4. What was the methodology (if research)? _____

5. Was the methodology (design, sampling, data collection, statistical analysis) sound and appropriate?

YES NO **Comment:**

5. Was there any bias?

YES NO **Comment:**

6. List and describe the key findings:

7. Was the information relevant and helpful in answering the questions?

YES NO **Comment:**

8. What was the quality of the information?

Excellent Good Adequate Poor
Comment:

9. Does this article provide details on additional sources of information?

YES NO **If yes, list:**

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____