

# Quality Checklist for Podcasts

A tool for appraising the quality of online health professions education resources

*This tool exists to assist podcast producers, editors, curators, users and researchers in assessing and improving the overall quality of online health professions education resources.*

***It does not replace common sense – still consider your clinical gestalt!***

 <b>Producers</b>	 <b>Editors &amp; curators</b>	 <b>Users</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the checklist to prompt you to consider elements you may have overlooked.</li> <li>• Use the checklist as a guide when creating an educational resource.</li> <li>• Note on the podcast whether the checklist was applied and met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare your podcast to the points in the list. Can you make any improvements?</li> <li>• Apply checklist before publishing resources.</li> <li>• Encourage producers and users to utilize the checklist.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the quality of a podcast using the checklist.</li> <li>• Determine if you trust the information and content enough to change your practice.</li> <li>• Engage with producers and editors. Ask questions, and suggest improvements.</li> </ul>

*Note: Users may answer “Yes”, “No” or “Unclear” (Y/N/U) in order to facilitate overall interpretation of quality.*

## Credibility

### ***Is the resource credible?***

Bias and conflict of interest		Criteria met?
P1	Is the editorial process independent from sponsors, conflict of interest, and other sources of bias?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P2	Do the creators (authors, editors, publisher) list their conflicts of interest?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P3	Are the creators (authors, editors, publisher) free of any financial conflict of interest?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P4	Does the resource clearly differentiate between advertisement and content?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
Authors		Criteria met?
P5	Is the identity of the resource’s author clear?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P6	Is the resource transparent about who was involved in its creation and does it list all entities that contributed?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P7	Is contact information (including email addresses) of the resource’s authority (author, editor, publisher) listed?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
Scholarship		Criteria met?
P8	Does the resource cite its references?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>

## Content

### Is the content of this educational resource of good quality?

Accuracy		Criteria met?
P9	Is the information presented in the resource accurate?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P10	Does the resource make a clear distinction between fact and opinion?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P11	Does the resource identify the areas at the limits of what is known within a field and acknowledge limitations?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
Didactic approach		Criteria met?
P12	Is the content of the resource presented in a logical, clear and coherent way?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P13	Is the topic of the resource well defined and labeled appropriately?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P14	Does the content meet generally accepted standards for journalistic professionalism?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>

## Design

### Is the resource well designed?

Accessibility & layout		Criteria met?
P15	Does the resource employ universally accessible technologies for learners with standard equipment and software using mobile and non-mobile devices?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
Didactic value		Criteria met?
P16	Is the resource useful and relevant for its intended audience?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P17	Does the resource motivate and interest its intended audience?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P18	Is the functionality of the resource self-evident?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P19	Does the resource refer learners to additional resources?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
P20	Is there a way to provide feedback on the resource?	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U <input type="checkbox"/>
Additional notes:		Overall gestalt:

**Created by:** Colmers IN<sup>1</sup>, Paterson QS<sup>2</sup>, Lin M<sup>3,4</sup>, Thoma B<sup>4,5</sup>, Chan T<sup>4,6,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MD (candidate, 2016), University of Alberta; <sup>2</sup>MD (candidate, 2016), University of Saskatchewan; <sup>3</sup>Professor, Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, founder of Academic Life in Emergency Medicine (ALiEM) blog; <sup>4</sup>MedEdLIFE Research Collaborative, San Francisco, CA; <sup>5</sup>Assistant Professor and Research Director, Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Saskatchewan, founder of Boring EM; <sup>6</sup>Assistant Professor, Division of Emergency Medicine, McMaster University, active contributor to various blogs, including Boring EM, ALiEM, ICENet.

\*Corresponding author: [teresa.chan@medportal.ca](mailto:teresa.chan@medportal.ca) @TChanMD. None of the authors have financial or other conflicts of interest to declare.

**Please cite this checklist as:** Colmers IN, Paterson QS, Lin M, Thoma B, Chan T. The Quality Checklists for Health Professions Blogs and Podcasts. *The Winnower* 2:e144720.08769 (2015). DOI:[10.15200/winn.144720.08769](https://doi.org/10.15200/winn.144720.08769)

### References

- Paterson QS, Thoma B, Lin M, Chan T. A systematic review and qualitative analysis to determine quality indicators for medical education blogs and podcasts. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2015. Epub ahead of print. DOI: [10.4300/JGME-D-14-00728.1](https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-14-00728.1)
- Lin M, Thoma B, Trueger S *et al*. Quality indicators for blogs and podcasts used in medical education: modified Delphi consensus recommendations from an international cohort of health professions educators. *Postgrad Med J*. 2015;91(1080):546-50. (PMID [26275428](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26275428/))
- Thoma B, Chan T, Paterson QS *et al*. Emergency medicine and critical care blogs and podcasts: Establishing an international consensus on quality. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2015;66(4):396-402. (PMID [25840846](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25840846/))



MedEdLIFE