

Systematic Review Workshop: Evaluation Grid and Weight of Evidence Scales

In-depth review item	criteria for quality	reviewer response yes/no/partly or brief comment
The abstract	Does the abstract provide sufficient information for initial map	
Introduction/rationale: does the study say	when the study was carried out?	
	Why it was carried out at this point in time?	
	Why it was carried out with this particular group of people?	
	In which country was the study carried out?	
	If the study was funded, and by whom.	
The literature review	Is the study linked to a recognisable theory or group of theories?	
	How much empirical evidence is presented?	
	Is it mainly primary evidence, or mainly secondary evidence?	
	Does it end with a summary?	
	Does the summary clearly invite the research questions that follow?	
Research Questions	clearly stated or implied?	
	Language skills involved	
	Technology involved	
Method	What, broadly, is the methodology adopted? Quant/Qual/mixed	
	cross sectional or prospective?	
Variables	Is it clear what the dependent/independent variable(s) was/were?	
	What other variables are 'controlled for'? (confounding variables?)	
Sampling	Population clearly stated (including nationality and L1)	
	sampling frame provided	
	Sampling procedure explained	
	What was the actual sample?	
Grouping	How many groups?	
	How was the sample divided into groups?	
	Did the groups know they were being divided up like this and for this purpose?	
	Was their consent sought?	
	What treatment if any did each group get?	

Systematic Review Workshop: Evaluation Grid and Weight of Evidence Scales

In-depth review item	criteria for quality	reviewer response yes/no/partly or brief comment
Data collection	Were the research instruments trialed or validated in some way?	
	How/who was the data collected (does this seem a reliable way of collecting the data?)	
	Were there sufficient amounts of data collected?	
Data analysis	Are we told how were the data analysed?	
	Does this seem like a valid way of analysing the data? (how?)	
	Does this seem like a reliable way of analysing the data? (who?)	
	Does the analysis match the requirements of the research questions? (sufficient?)	
Results/findings	Are there any shortcomings in the reporting of the results?	
	What are the actual results?	
	Do their conclusions match your assessment of the findings/results.	
	Are limitations of the study discussed (e.g. confounding variables)	
	Are there implications? For teaching and learning?	
	Do the implications match the study findings?	

Weight of evidence		High /Medium/Low
WOE: Relevance	of particular focus of the study for addressing the question or sub-questions of this specific systematic review.	Effectiveness: Insights:
WOE: Appropriateness	of research design and analysis for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review.	Effectiveness: Insights:
WOE: Trustworthiness.	Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering the study question(s)?	Effectiveness: Insights:
WOE: Contribution	of the study to answer the question/s of this specific systematic review	Effectiveness: Insights: