DEPARTMENT OF GYNECOLOGY & OBSTETRICS

Was there a clear indication of why this case was selected for presentation? Was the overview of the case sufficient to understand the issue? Was the timeline of key events logical and clear? Did other disciplines affected by the case participate in the presentation? Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm Permanent Harm Permanent Harm Permanent Harm	Was the overview of the case sufficient to understand the issue? Was the timeline of key events logical and clear? Did other disciplines affected by the case participate in the presentation? Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm				
Was the timeline of key events logical and clear? Did other disciplines affected by the case participate in the presentation? Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm	Was the timeline of key events logical and clear? Did other disciplines affected by the case participate in the presentation? Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm Death	Was the overview of the case sufficient to understand the issue?			1
Did other disciplines affected by the case participate in the presentation? Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm	Did other disciplines affected by the case participate in the presentation? Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm Death				
Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm	Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm Death	Was the timeline of key events logical and clear?			
Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm	Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. No Harm	Did other disciplines affected by the case participate in the presentation?			
7 If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice 8 Were the take home points valuable? 9 Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm Perman	If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm Death	Was relevant evidence-based literature cited?			
professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. Permanent Harm	professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. No Harm	Was the root cause of the problem identified?			
9 Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Harm Permanent Harm	Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm				
No Harm Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. Permanent Harm	Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. Permanent Harm Death	Were the take home points valuable?			
Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. Temporary Harm Permanent Harm	Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. Permanent Harm Death	Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion?			
Level of narm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of narm. Permanent Harm	Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm. Permanent Harm Death		No	Harm	
Permanent Harm	Death	Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm.			
					rm
	COMMENTS	COMMENTS	De	eatn	
			Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? Level of harm. If the case involved any quality issue, selected the level of harm.	Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Te Pe De De De	Was relevant evidence-based literature cited? Was the root cause of the problem identified? If yes to #6, was it clear that it related to either, medical knowledge, patient care provided or not provided, communication and interpersonal skills, professionalism, practice-based learning and improvement, systems based practice Were the take home points valuable? Was the faculty mentor actively engaged in the facilitation of the case presentation and discussion? No Harm Temporary Ha Permanent Ha Death