

RESEARCH SECTION
Business Meeting Minutes
Monday, May 16, 2011

Approved May 22, 2012

Attendees: Kris Alpi, Kathleen Amos, Marie Asher, Leslie Behn, Brooke Billman, Diane Cooper, Sandy DeGroote, Roz Dudden, Jon Eldredge, Ruth Fenske, Carole Gilbert, Molly Harris, Heather Holmes, Deborah Lansing, Susan Lessick, Brenda Pfannenstiel, Suzie Roy, Donghua Tao, Beth Whipple.

1. Introductions:

Chair Diane Cooper called the meeting to order at 7:09 a.m. and welcomed new and continuing Research Section (RS) members. Introductions were made.

2. Officer Reports:

A. Secretary /Treasurer, Brooke Billman

- a. The 2010 RS Business Meeting minutes were reviewed. Extra questions marks that were used as place markers to solicit additional information that may have been missing from the minutes will be removed as no other information needs to be added. Carole moved that the minutes be accepted, Susan seconded, and the minutes were approved by the membership.
- b. Brooke distributed copies of the 2010-2011 Treasurer's report, detailing the section's dues income and expenditures.
- c. A question about the contribution made from Cornell University was explained by Jon Eldridge- the reimbursement from a class that he taught was sent back to the Research Section as a donation.
- d. Inconsistencies in several of the weekly financial reports sent by MLA were discussed and the treasurer will continue to work with MLA to figure out why they appeared.

C. Outgoing Program Chair, Carole Gilbert

- a. Carol reported that there were approximately 60 people at the Research Section program on Sunday.

D. Incoming Program Chair, Kris Alpi

- a. Kris attended the 2012 program committee planning meeting and presented program ideas drawn from the recent strategic plan draft from the Strategic Planning Committee. Three ideas that were discussed for next year's meeting were demystifying research funding, ramping up research skills related to statistical literacy, and strategies of effective dissemination

of research. Members then provided feedback on programming ideas for the Wed AM follow-up meeting.

- b. Related to the funding program idea, Kris asked whether MLA should require submitters to disclose funding similar to funding disclosures for JMLA articles. This would allow tracking of how many and which poster and paper presenters had received funding to help identify funded work for the proposed program. Concerns of concealing the funding information during judging process and having a check-box on the submission information were discussed. Kris will discuss this issue with MLA on behalf of the section.
- c. Unrelated to section programming, but related to MLA's funding of research, Kris asked whether Research Section should work with MLA about the process MLA uses to award funds to individuals rather than institutions for research grants so that there is an option for the awards and their librarian recipients to work within the institutional grant program. RS deferred this issue to Kris and past recipients to raise with MLA directly rather than via the section.

E. Section Council Representative, Rosalind Dudden

- a. Rosalind had not yet come to the meeting.
- b. It was suggested that the section should consider digitizing RS information.

F. Section Chair, Diane Cooper

- a. Presents report during New Business Report

G. Awards Committee, Co-Chairs Donghua Tao and Kris Alpi

- a. This year we had 55 onsite and online judges.
- b. Research Judging Revealed session had 17 participants. The definition of research was discussed and a formal definition needs to be designated for the section.
- c. There were 57 papers self-designated as "research" and 90 posters.
- d. Clarification about what should be designated as research was discussed. Often times, if there is even a minimal semblance to research it is designated as being in the research category.
- e. It was discussed that there is a problem that many abstracts in the MLA online program don't have results and are never updated after the results become available. It was suggested to look at the EBLP conference as a model for research submission.
- f. Sandy volunteered to co-chair the Awards Committee.

H. Bylaws Committee, Peggy Mullaly-Quijas- No report.

I. CE Committee, Leslie Behm

- a. Leslie will take strategic planning report to CE chairs' meeting today.
- b. CE classes in general and the process that occurs to provide classes was discussed. It was mentioned that members want more online classes but the amount of time it takes for the instructor to manage the class is often

more than what is projected.

J. Government Relations Committee, Elaine G. Powers- No report.

K. *Hypothesis*, Deidra Woodson and Diane Cooper.

- a. There weren't many volunteers to work on *Hypothesis* but two issues came out last year.
- b. More issues will be released next year.

L. International Research, Jon Eldredge

- a. Jon reported there is an article in *Hypothesis* about the Norwegian librarian's experience
- b. He will attend the 6th annual EBPLIB practice in Manchester.

M. ListServ, Leslie Behm- No report

N. Membership Committee, Beatriz Varman.

- a. **Diane reported for Beatriz.** It has come to the committee's attention that new members don't feel welcome. They join the listserv but didn't get messages (because the list isn't very active). More contact needs to be made quickly and consistently. The new members list gets generated every 6 months and it would be nice if an email and welcome letter get sent out. Susan will contact MLA connections to learn more about the new system that will be unveiled next year. Also, the welcome letter needs to be revamped.

O. Nominating Committee, Susan Lessick- No report.

P. Research Agenda Committee, Jon Eldredge

- a. a. A total of 135 people answered the MLA survey about about the one most important research question facing the profession. The responses will get arrowed down to 12-15 and will be distributed.
- b. Based on feedback from members, it would be nice to have a webpage that explains the Research Agenda, question process, and why it's done every 3 years or so.

Q. Research Mentoring Program Planning Task Force, Heather Holmes and Elizabeth LaRue.

- a. A protocol was developed to see if the mentoring program that was developed worked for mentees and mentors.
- b. There has been a mid-year report and it was submitted as an article to *Hypothesis*.
- c. An announcement went out via MLA Focus and only one person responded.
- d. They would like to ccontact PhD librarians to be members in the Research Section as well as mentors.
- e. In order to promote the mentoring program, an RS liaison could sit in at the MLA conference business meeting.

R. Strategic Planning Committee, Susan Lessick

- a. The survey on research activities of librarians was distributed and it received 624 responses. The information was synthesized and the strategic plan was distributed to the membership. A needs assessment has been started and the top barriers to research and skills of librarians who research have been identified. , would like to have research initiatives highlighted. Respondents are very satisfied with *Hypothesis*. The committee would like to publish the survey results in JMLA.
- b. The committee distributed the strategic plan draft to RS members and comments will be accepted until 6.30.11.
- c. Kris asked for assistance to work on the research definition as an ad hoc committee. Leslie volunteered.

S. Website, Co-Editors, Allan Barclay and Nicole Mitchell- No report

T. Old Business- None.

U. New Business, Diane Cooper

- a. It is suggested that the participants in the contributed paper session New Voices, which highlights the research of current master's degree and doctoral students and recent graduates, be offered a 3 year membership for their involvement.
- b. Future of *Hypothesis*- Diane would like to see changes and have a peer review editorial board review the research articles that come in. It has become more like a newsletter in recent time but she'd like to keep a journal focus and move newsletter items to the back. There could be a section on expanded structured abstracts on research methods as well as issues of technology and access.
- c. Kris commented that the editorial board wasn't involved in the process for a peer review editorial board. More discussion needs to occur on this topic.
- d. Diane mentioned that the co-editors were only thinking of alternative ways to restructure *Hypothesis*.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Brooke L Billman, Secretary/Treasurer