

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!

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

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 IN¹, Paterson QS², Lin M^{3,4}, Thoma B^{4,5}, Chan T^{4,6,*}

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

*Corresponding author: 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