



OMAN MEDICAL SPECIALTY BOARD EVALUATION FORM FOR JOURNAL CLUB PRESENTATION

Name of Resident: OMSB #:

Program: Resident Level: Rotation:

Date of Presentation:

CRITERIA		Unsatisfactory 1	Below Expectations 2	Meets Expectations 3	Exceeds Expectations 4	Not Applicable N/A
I. PRESENTATION STYLE						
1	Introduced self.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Delivered presentation clearly and concisely.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Made appropriate eye contact and body language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Encouraged interactive discussion.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Used appropriate teaching method.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Used audiovisuals effectively.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Utilized correct grammar and spelling.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Kept to time limit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. PROCESS AND CONTENT						
9	Selected relevant article for presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Identified study objectives and goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Summarized research abstract.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Discussed suitability of study design.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Identified methodology issues in the conduct of study	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Summarized study results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	Assessed study statistical analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Assessed issues related to Internal Validity (PICO).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	Evaluated the clinical and statistical significance of the results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Summarized the issues related to generalizability of the results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	Identified strengths and weaknesses of the research paper.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20	Made valid conclusions on the paper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Global rating of critical appraisal skills.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:						
Strengths:						
Suggestions for Improvement:						
AGREED ACTION:						

Assessor's Name: Signature: Date:

Designation of Assessor:

SCALE

1. Unsatisfactory

Poor capacity for evaluating Scientific Literature

2. Below Expectations

Inadequate capacity for evaluating Scientific Literature

3. Meets Expectations

Has reasonable skill at evaluating Scientific Literature

4. Exceeds Expectations

Has excellent skills at evaluating Scientific Literature

NA

The question is not applicable to the type of literature/presentation