

Summary of Journal club as an evaluation tool

I. Validity

A. Process of tool construction

1. The tasks for evaluation a journal club article were selected from educational objectives and from generally accepted and previously published norms of practice (Task Force Checklist of review criteria, Academic Medicine)
2. The specific tasks in the checklist were selected using a formal task analysis that was previously published in Academic Medicine
3. The checklist tasks represent the important issues in reviewing a journal article
4. The working group for the evaluation tool construction included experts

B. Formal statistical validation

1. Multicenter evaluation at three institutions (unpublished) show a statistically significant relationship between training year and rating on the task
2. There is no data that faculty do better than initial trainees on the evaluation tool
3. Preliminary self-assessment data shows that residents improve over time on repeated testing with the tool (pre- and post intervention study)
4. The journal club data is kept in a portfolio but linkage with chart audit and change in performance over time has not been studied yet.
5. Task performance improved in a post-intervention assessment (unpublished data)
6. The journal club tool has external validity and similar standardized checklists have been studied in other resident populations

II. Reliability

A. Process of evaluation

1. The faculty journal club mentors were not trained annually
2. The scoring rubric is appropriate for the measure (qualitative assessment of reading the article)
3. Defined checklists have an ACGME cited reliability of up to 0.7 to 0.8,

B. Statistics (at least two measures)

1. The journal club preliminary data shows internal consistency and inter-rater reliability
2. We do not have test-retest reliability data
3. We have no G-coefficient analysis for generalizability

III. Feasibility

A. The residents and faculty journal club leaders completed the evaluations in a useful way

B. The evaluations are useable in a quality improvement model (e.g. chart audit of performance over time)

C. There is a modest time burden for one faculty member per month (1.5 hours) that is reasonable for most faculties

IV. Objectivity: The journal club tool conforms to reasonable standards of objectivity (self assessment with standardized checklist)

V. Fairness: All trainees of equal ability achieve the same score on the instrument (self assessment)

VI. The journal club tool addresses the competency of practice based learning. It is strengthened by linkage with self-documentation in a resident portfolio and could be correlated with a self reported chart audit of change in behavior over time to demonstrate practice based improvement.