**Minutes of the Research Section, MLA, Business Meeting**

**Tuesday, May 17, 2016, 7:00-8:55 AM, Metro Toronto Convention Centre, Room 206B**

In attendance: Martha Earl, Emily Mazure, Merle Rosenzweig, Judy Smith, Jean Song, Kristine Alpi, Terrie Wheeler, Amy Suiter, David Duggar, Michelle Doering, Susan Fowler, Shelley Arvin, Anel Deordorff, Erin Foster, Margaret Hoogland, Virginia Pannabecker, Carol Perryman, Abby Adamczyk, Melissa Rethlefsen, Kim Powell, Patricia Gallagher, Carle Gilbert, Krystal Bullers, Erin Eldermire, Angela Spencer, Erin Wentz, Maggie Ansell, Leslie M. Behm, Kathleen Amos, Margaret Bandy, Susan Lessick, Jana Leibermann, Stephanie Schulte, Brooke Billman, Tony Nguyen, Marie Ascher, Karen Heskett, Christine Morton, Ayaba Logan

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Introductions. Emily Mazure called the meeting to order at 8:06. Members present introduced themselves. New members and interested attendees present were recognized.
2. Emily Mazure had distributed the 2015 minutes on the discussion list in July 2015. Martha Earl had a print copy of the Minutes from the same. There were no further corrections. Minutes were approved.
3. Treasurer’s Report. Martha Earl reported that the year started with $15,804.81 and ended with $16,861.52. She will send a more detailed report to the list.
4. 2016 Program Report. Marie Ascher reported on special content sections and programs. She approximated that about 150 people attended the “Beyond the Search” session, on which she took the lead in facilitating. The other session that the Research Section was involved with, on Professional Communications will occur on May 16. Marie Ascher and Emily Mazure attended the Program Planning Meeting for 2017. Programs will be selected according to the same methodology as 2016. Sections may partner to support special content sessions. MLA Continuing Education goals will play an increasing role. Merle is the Section Council representative to the CE Committee. Marie brought up the fact that there was no Section recognition on the program relative to sponsored special content sessions. This is supposed to be fixed for 2017.
5. Research Section Election Results. Merle announced the election results: Tony Nguyen, Secretary-Treasurer; Michelle Beth Bass, Chair-Elect/Program Chair; and Merle Rosenzweig, Section Nominee to the MLA Nominating Committee.
6. Section Council. Merle Rosenzweig is the Section Council representative to the CE Committee.
7. Web Site Editor. Brooke Billman reported that the Research Section had successfully moved to the Socious platform. The new Community Manger is Margaret Hoogland. Brooke and Margaret will be working together in the transitioning.
8. Membership. Emily reported for Beatriz Varman. The Section has 236 members. Welcome letters to new members are continuously sent by MLA. During the MLA meeting, members have the opportunity to join up to 3 sections for six months in each section without paying Section dues. The January 14, 2016 issue of MLAFocus published an announcement encouraging MLA members to join the Research Section. Beatriz sent a reminder on April 4 to 32 RS members that didn’t renew their section membership encouraging them to consider renewing it. The list was provided by MLA. Beatriz organized a travel schedule to promote the Research Section poster at the following MLA chapter meetings: Midwest Chapter Meeting; South Central Chapter Meeting; Mid Atlantic Chapter Meeting; Southern Chapter Meeting. Beatriz submitted the information to MLA to display the chapter poster at the annual meeting. She also organized volunteers to staff it at the poster session and Meg Foster and Gisella Butera were kind enough to volunteer.
9. Awards Committee. Kim Powell reported that there were 59 paper and 65 poster abstracts self-identified as research during the submission process. Onsite there were 30 papers, 15 posters, and 22 lightning talks judged as research. The awards are Best Paper, Best Poster, and Best Hospital Library Research.

Discussion related to the failure of submitters to provide completed abstracts. The February 1 deadline may be prohibitive for some. Judges cannot judge papers or posters unless results and conclusions are submitted. How can we make this clearer? We could explore options for notifying people to submit their information when they have it, even if that is after the February 1 deadline. Could the system be changed so they can update it? Or could they submit it directly to the Research Section Awards committee after the MLA submission deadline? Another suggestion was to change the wording of the awards to indicate that it is actually ‘What’s the best research that is done by February (deadline),’ even if not the best research presented at MLA. Suggestion was made to announce in MLA News or MLA Focus that the February 1 deadline for final complete abstracts would be nearing and to be more clear what checking the “research” box means. Do people even know that this means they have now entered into the judging process? Kim and Marie will follow up to see if the form can be changed.

An award is also given for Best Research Paper in JMLA. 20 papers are under consideration. Announcements of all awards will be made after the conference.

1. Awards Sponsorship. Merle Rosenzweig and Jean Song introduced discussion on the elevation of Section awards to Association awards. The Cancer Section was told that a Section must get an award endowed in order to make it at the Association, rather than Section level. An endowment requires a minimum of $25,000 to be raised. CAPHIS now has an endowed award. They kicked in $7500 and did fundraising through the Scholarship Booth. They are seeking other donors. For the Bertolucci Award, several Sections contributed over a multiyear period. Merle and Jean recommended surveying members to find out what they would be willing to do to save money for a sponsorship.
2. Mentoring. Susan Lessick reported on behalf of all the Mentoring Coordinators. Mentors can now be looked up on the Professional Development page. There’s a brand new database that will be announced in June. A deadline will be set to add mentoring expertise areas. We now have updated research expertise areas. Kate Corcoran reported that 322 have self-assigned themselves with research expertise. There will be an announcement in June. There is also a Mentoring tab on the Research page. Susan is rolling off as a Mentoring Coordinator. The other two coordinators are Maureen Clark and Jennifer Staley. Susan will continue to support mentoring through the RITF.

Emily referred 3 people to the Mentoring page. The call for mentors generated requests from those seeking mentors. NAHRS will remind members to update their expertise in personal profiles. There are guidelines for mentors and mentees.

1. Research Agenda Committee. Marie discussed the current review of the ongoing systematic review (SR) project. The top 15 questions related to health sciences librarianship were designated as SR topics. Over 200 people worldwide participated in review teams. Systematic reviews take time and many teams have stalled or are rebuilding while others have completely finished and published. The process has yielded knowledge about communication and group dynamics and the importance of strong leadership. We are looking for new leaders for some of the groups and still cheerleading others as they continue the process. One team will need to be rebuilt completely.

Marie took this opportunity also to distribute sign-up sheets for attendees to indicate interest in Section involvement.

1. International Research. Emily reported for Jon Eldredge. She noted upcoming conferences, The 2017 joint International Congress of Medical Librarians/European Association of Health Information and Libraries (ICML/EAHIL) Conference slated for June 12-16, 2017 in Dublin, Ireland; and the 9th International Evidence Based Library and Information Practice Conferences scheduled for June 2017 in Philadelphia.
2. Research Imperative Task Force. Susan Lessick reported that the task force has ten projects. The MLA Board approved continuing planning of a Research Institute, an educational program on research methodology. It is proposed that approximately 20 people will participate in each Research Institute. The cost for the institute will be reduced by utilizing campus housing. Interested members may apply MLA Professional Development grants, available across Sections, to attend the Research Institute. HLS and NAHRS may designate awards for the Research Institute. The Research Section may consider the creation of an award in the future. Another RITF project is the Research in Health Sciences Libraries Institutional Award. The award is for those institutions who advance research in health sciences library and information science by supporting their library staff to do research. No money is involved. The award represents a high profile recognition of excellence. The key authors of the award were Margaret Bandy and Michelle Kraft, hospital librarians.

Maggie Ansell heads the Resources and Tools Working Group within RITF. Maggie and her colleagues are creating web pages, similar to ALA LARKS <http://www.ala.org/research/larks> . There are seven category teams. Areas include research resources and processes. The list has 200 resources so far. They are creating a handbook for the upkeep of the pages and to detail the process in case another group wants to create a similar tool.

1. Survey Tool Update. Brooke Billman reported that the RS members are not using Survey Monkey. In addition we are no longer authorized to share a user license the way we have been doing. It is a single user license. Other sections are dropping it. HLS is keeping it, with one individual managing all surveys. Merle noted that hospital librarians do not have the resources to purchase their own copy of SurveyMonkey, as larger academic libraries often do. Some Sections use it heavily. MLA said that it was cost-prohibitive to purchase an institutional subscription. Brooke will start exploring other options. Someone mentioned Google Tools, though many hospital libraries cannot access that due to institutional firewalls. Maggie’s list of Resources for RITF has a section on survey tools, including free or easy options. It’s annotated. It could serve as a landing page with survey tools that are available listed and information about access, cost, etc.
2. *Hypothesis* Update and Future. Emily Mazure and Christine Marton led this discussion. Emily started by explaining that there was some confusion when Diane Cooper resigned as the editor to take on the editor position at JMLA. Because of that, there was a long lag between issues. Brooke and Emily coedited the last issue of Hypothesis, published at the end of 2015. Brooke and Kris Alpi also surveyed RS members on Hypothesis and published the results of that survey in the last issue. The results were analyzed and recommendations regarding frequency, editorial function, content, and dissemination were presented to the Executive Committee. The position of editor was advertised. Christine Marton is the new editor, appointed in May.

Kris Alpi and Brooke opened discussion on how to attract more contributors. They noted that there is a real discrepancy between what people want to read and what they want to write. Brooke noted there is a call for “how to do it” methodology. Conference paper and poster presenters can be invited to publish.

Christine plans two annual issues, a May-June and a mid-November-December issue. Articles and columns will include a blend of the theoretical and practical, including systematic and narrative reviews, methods of data analysis, quantitative and qualitative research in progress, and theses and dissertations in progress. She will seek a variety of authors and an Assistant Editor and Hypothesis Board members. Merle suggested seeking authors outside of the Research Section.

The proposed format will be html with social media links to encourage discussion. The Socious blog platform can also be used for discussion. Kris added that JMLA is moving to another platform, which can be considered for Hypothesis as well. Some Section newsletters use free html and pdf formatting and are free to members only. Some are registered with Scopus and Web of Science. Christine will seek that for Hypothesis. She proposes widgets for social media.

Brooke noted we will need DOIs for articles to get them into Scopus. When an author adds an article to Researchgate, Researchgate assigns a DOI for that article if it does not have one already. We also need a DOI for the entire issue. We can note in Hypothesis contributor guidelines that DOIs boost academic CVs and are critical for online CVs.

We can target doctoral and LIS students for research in progress. We can use LIS discussion lists. Someone on the new editorial board can be assigned this responsibility. Carol Perryman suggested a section on critical appraisals of EBLIP articles. Such articles could be used in journal clubs or class assignments. RS could develop an evidence summaries team, since we would like to expand that in our profession for critical evaluation of our own literature.

Editorial peer review is not always blinded. Christine can set it up to be blinded. Some articles would be blinded and others not. She needs volunteers to be peer reviewers. She will use the mentorship database to locate additional names. Reviewers could include their role as reviewers on their CVs. JASIS has three reviewers per article. She would like to have the same for Hypothesis. She would allow SIS students to assist in peer review under guidance of an expert mentor as credit for research courses. She will need to create a guidance sheet on how to do this properly. Perhaps MLA could have a CE or special content session on how to review an article properly. There could be an article on how to do it, or a webinar on the publishing process. There was already a session at this year’s MLA meeting on publication, but we should check to avoid too much overlap. She will have more conversations in the next month. Then she will appoint the Assistant Editor and Editorial Board members.

1. Sections in the Online Curriculum Creation. Emily and Marie led this discussion. MLA is seeking experts within the Sections to generate online curriculum content. Librarians within MLA membership are content experts. MLA wants to form teams of content experts. Kris explained that the Professional Competencies Task Force wants to connect with member instructors. A question is how members want to be compensated. MLA is willing to help people to design online courses. There is not a formal process yet in place. Barry Grant will work with the Continuing Education Committee. The CE Committee will vet the expertise of those proposing courses. This process will take 3-5 years.

Future Program Planning. Emily and Marie opened this discussion. The 2017 Program Committee will continue with the 2016 process for selection of programs for the annual conference. Individuals can submit program proposals. Partnering will be sought for sponsoring programs. MLA is also seeking different formats. Marie called for ideas from attendees after suggesting a program which looked at Research Tools and Methodology, either a broad overview or a focus on something specific like NVIVO/content analysis.

Other ideas were discussed. Tools for cleaning and wrangling data would be worthwhile, and Ginny Pennabacker who is doing programming for PH/HA would be interested in this topic as well. We could do a session on hot topics in library research. We could learn about big data and informatics, such as what is the librarian’s involvement, ethical issues, etc. What is librarian’s role in data and on the research team, etc.? How do we appraise and use grey literature in our profession? Health literacy and big data could be a topic. What are our roles? The major ethics issues? What about data archiving? How do we use EBLP techniques to critically appraise our literature? NAHRS and HLS have examined the grey literature in nursing and done systematic reviews. Marie will call Michelle Bass after MLA to discuss these topics and how to move forward with some proposals for next year.

1. Adjourn Meeting. Emily called for a motion to adjourn. Tony Nguyen moved to adjourn. Marie Ascher seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 8:54 AM.