Checklist for reviewing external resources for NEMO

Reviewer:       Date of review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of resource</th>
<th>Date of review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Date of review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource format</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5 booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio/visual file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4 booklet/handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other, please describe:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark as many boxes as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group:</th>
<th>Clients/patients and/or their carers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dietitians and nutritionists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other health professionals _________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other, please describe:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark as many boxes as appropriate.

1. **Quality of information**
   a) Is the resource consistent with the appropriate national/statewide guidelines e.g.
   - [ ] Australian Dietary Guidelines or [ ] Australian Infant Feeding Guidelines
   - [ ] Australia’s Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour Guidelines
   - [ ] Other guidelines relevant to the clinical area
     - [ ] Yes
     - [ ] No

   Comments:

   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
   [ ] Not sure

   If unsure, who else should be involved in the assessment process?
   - [ ] Clinical dietetics expert group (incl other NEMO group):
   - [ ] Other health professionals (e.g. diabetes educator, doctor, pharmacist etc)

   Comments:
c) Has nutrition information been referenced appropriately to the needs of the target group? (e.g. no referencing may be appropriate for some consumer groups, while full reference may be appropriate for health professionals)

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

2. Community consultation
   a) Consultation was conducted at appropriate stages.
      ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
   
   b) Appropriate methods were used.
      ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
   
   c) The resource was piloted.
      ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Piloting is in progress/planned

Overall, has the resource been developed using appropriate consultation and engagement processes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

3. Resource format and language
   a) Has the resource been developed in an appropriate manner in terms of *readability*, language, layout, size of font, graphics and amount of text for intended target audience. This could include artwork, photographs, images, wording and/or translated material etc.?
      ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:
*How to calculate readability using Microsoft Word*

How to calculate readability scores varies with your version of Microsoft Word. Use your ‘help’ function to complete this task. The readability calculator function generally sits under the **spelling & grammar** tab. Once activated, you will need to click through any spelling and grammar identified by Microsoft Word before your readability statistics will be displayed.

It is required that NEMO patient resources have a readability score of 8 or less.

**Overall rating**

- [ ] Appropriate to publish on NEMO
- [ ] Not appropriate
- [ ] Need for further review by: ____________________________

**Rationale for overall rating**

Special thanks to the NEMO Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Group for developing this resource.