****

# Rubrics/Selection Criteria for Immersion Sessions, Papers, Lightning Talks, and Posters

## Immersion Sessions

The proposal overall is clearly communicated and organized.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Proposal is clearly understandable and well organized. |
| 2 - Neutral | The proposal is clear but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Difficult to understand and disorganized. Not viable for MLA. |

The session structure as described is appropriate and relevant to present for up to a 75-minute time slot.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Detailed overview/agenda: potential speaker(s) identified. Agenda and proposed times provided and realistic. |
| 2 - Neutral | Overview/Agenda and proposed times provided but potentially unrealistic. |
| 1 - Disagree | Lack of overview/agenda and/or limited speaker information. Mostly a collection of ideas. |

## Immersion Sessions (continued)

The selected program format is appropriate for the content.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Deep dive into a well-defined topic. Effective use of instruction methods and/or participant engagement using Immersion format. Participant engagement methods are appropriate based on learning outcomes. |
| 2 - Neutral | Instructional methods and/or participant engagement could be more fleshed out. |
| 1 - Disagree | More details and activity needed to fit Immersion format or topic is not a good fit for the Immersion program format. |

The program will appeal to the target audience and target learner level.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Target audience and learner level is clearly identified and applicable to the MLA Conference. |
| 2 - Neutral | Target audience and learner level is identified but could be better described. May not be applicable to the MLA Conference.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No target audience identified or not applicable to MLA Conference. |

The program description is interesting, inspiring, and/or addresses a relevant and timely idea, issue or need. The program addresses current [MLA strategic goals](https://www.mlanet.org/about-mla/vision-values-mission-and-planning/) or current topics/events/controversies in the profession.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Description is interesting and describes a program that would appeal to or benefit MLA audiences. Includes evidence indicating member interest in the topic or would potentially be interesting, inspiring, and/or timely.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Description is light on details or doesn’t present a particularly timely idea, issue, or need to MLA audiences. |
| 1 - Disagree | Description is light on details AND does not present a relevant or timely idea to MLA audiences.  |

The program description shows originality and innovation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | The immersion proposal presents an entirely new idea. It could be that the manner of presentation is novel or unconventional from what is usually at the MLA meeting. |
| 2 - Neutral | Proposal focuses on an old(er) idea or concept but with a new lens/framework. |
| 1 - Disagree | Proposal is covering a recently/previously covered topic with no new information or updates. |

## Immersion Sessions (continued)

The learning outcomes of the program are specifically described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Outcomes are clearly listed, described, and actionable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Outcomes are listed but need to be fleshed out.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No learning outcomes indicated.  |

**\*\*Reviewers: Include suggestions for how applicants can strengthen their submission in your reviewer comments.**

## Paper – Research

The abstract is clearly understandable and organized.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Proposal is clearly understandable and well organized.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Proposal could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewers: Include suggestions in review comments. |
| 1 - Disagree | Difficult to understand and disorganized. Not viable for MLA. |

The research project described relates to one or more aspects of health sciences librarianship or libraries. Topics need not be of interest to all health sciences librarians. Niche area topics (i.e., history of medicine, dentistry, optometry, ILL, etc.) should not be scored lower based on an assumption of fewer attendees.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly identifies a question/area/research topic that health sciences librarians are interested in learning about. Proposal uses data and/or evidence to demonstrate interest. |
| 2 - Neutral | Identifies a question/area/research topic that health sciences librarians are interested in but could make a stronger case. |
| 1 - Disagree | Research topic is not clear. No mention of why this topic is interesting or why another librarian might be interested. |

## Paper – Research (continued)

The submission is appropriate for the format of Paper - Research.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | Appropriate amount of information to fill a 15-minute presentation. |
| 2 - Neutral | Format of paper is likely appropriate but not entirely certain.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Not enough information (or too much information) to fill a 10–15-minute presentation.  |

The overall objectives of the research are specifically described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | The objectives are explicitly stated and well developed.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Objectives are listed but they are not clear, or they could be better described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Objectives are not identifiable or are not appropriate for the topic.. |

The research question or hypothesis is clearly stated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | Research question or hypothesis is clearly stated. |
| 2 - Neutral | Research question or hypothesis is stated but could be described more clearly.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Research question or hypothesis is not stated or is incomprehensible. |

This research project responds to an information need in the health sciences librarianship field.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Strongly Agree | Information need is clearly stated and well described.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Information need is stated but could be more clearly described.  |
| 1 - Strongly Disagree | No indication of the information need this research is trying to address, or a gap might be stated but not as convincing. |

## Paper – Research (continued)

The method(s) of the research is/are clearly stated and appropriate to the research question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | Specific and appropriate method(s) for conducting the research are clearly identified and thoroughly described. |
| 2 - Neutral | Specific and appropriate method(s) for conducting the research are mentioned but could be more clearly described. |
| 1 - Disagree | Only some aspects of the research method(s) are stated or research methods are not appropriate or missing. |

The approach to analysis (quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods) states how data will inform conclusions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | Clearly states how data will be analyzed and used to inform conclusions. |
| 2 - Neutral | Analysis is mentioned but could be better described. Use of data to inform conclusions may or may not be mentioned. |
| 1 - Disagree | No mention of how data will be analyzed or used to inform conclusions. |

## Paper – Program Description

The abstract is clearly understandable and organized.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | Proposal is clearly understandable and well organized.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Proposal could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Difficult to understand and disorganized. Not viable for MLA. |

The program described relates to one or more aspects of health sciences librarianship or librarians. Topics need not be of interest to all health sciences librarians. Niche area topics (i.e., history of medicine, dentistry, optometry, ILL, etc.) should not be scored lower based on an assumption of fewer attendees.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly identifies a topic that health sciences librarians are interested in learning about. Includes data/evidence to indicate interest of topic to librarians. |
| 2 - Neutral | Identifies a topic of interest to health sciences librarians but could do a better job explaining how/why librarians are interested in the topic. |
| 1 - Disagree | Topic or purpose of the program is not clearly described (or) is not of interest to health sciences librarians. |

## Paper – Program Description (continued)

The submission is appropriate for the selected format of Paper - Program Description.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Appropriate amount of information to fill a 10–15-minute presentation. |
| 2 - Neutral | Format of paper is likely appropriate but not entirely certain.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Not enough information (or too much information) to fill a 15-minute presentation.  |

The overall objectives or purpose of the program are specifically described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Objectives or purpose of the program are clearly identifiable and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Objectives or purpose of the project are identifiable but could be better described. |
| 1 - Disagree | Objectives are not listed (or) objectives are not understandable. |

The key steps or major elements of the program are clearly described and can be easily identified.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Key steps/major elements of the program are identifiable and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Key steps/major elements of the program are identified but could be better described. |
| 1 - Disagree | The key steps/major elements of the program are not easily identified (or) they are not described. |

The program responds to an identified need or presents a novel concept in health sciences librarianship or covers current MLA strategic goals or current topics/events/controversies in the profession.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | It is clear what need the program addresses. It is clear how the program is relevant to health sciences librarianship. Abstract may include data/evidence to indicate relevance. |
| 2 - Neutral | A need is identified, but a better explanation is needed to describe why it is important to health sciences librarianship. |
| 1 - Disagree | Abstract does not explain why the program is needed.  |

## Paper – Program Description (continued)

An evaluation or assessment of the program is described clearly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Method for evaluation or assessment is clearly identified. It is okay if the evaluation has not yet occurred. |
| 2 - Neutral | Abstract mentions that an evaluation or assessment will be completed but does not include a description of what the evaluation will entail. |
| 1 - Disagree | No mention of evaluation or assessment.  |

**\*\*Reviewers: Include suggestions for how applicants can strengthen their submission in your reviewer comments.**

## Poster - Research

The abstract is clearly understandable and structured.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Proposal is clearly understandable and well organized.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Proposal could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Difficult to understand and disorganized. Not viable for MLA. |

The research project described relates to one or more aspects of health sciences librarianship or libraries. Topics need not be of interest to all health sciences librarians. Niche area topics (i.e., history of medicine, dentistry, optometry, ILL, etc.) should not be scored lower based on an assumption of fewer attendees.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly identifies a question/area/research topic that is relevant for health sciences librarians. Proposal uses data and/or evidence to substantiate interest. |
| 2 - Neutral | Identifies a question/area/research topic that is relevant for health sciences librarians but could make a stronger case.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Research topic is not clear. No clear indication of why this topic is relevant or why another health sciences librarian might be interested. |

## Poster – Research (continued)

The submission is appropriate for the selected format of Poster - Research

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly describes how information will be presented visually on a poster. The type and amount of information is appropriate for a poster format. |
| 2 - Neutral | Format of poster is likely appropriate but not entirely certain.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Too much/too little information, or the wrong type of information, to share in a poster.  |

The overall objectives of the research are specifically described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Objectives are explicitly stated and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Objectives are listed but they could be better described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Objectives are not identifiable, or are not appropriate for the research. |

The research question or hypothesis is clearly stated and understood.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Research question or hypothesis is clearly stated and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Research question or hypothesis is stated but could be described more clearly.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Research question or hypothesis is not stated or is incomprehensible. |

This research project responds to an information need in the health sciences librarianship field.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Information need is clearly stated and well described. |
| 2 - Neutral | Information need is stated but could be better described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No indication of what information need this research is trying to address, or an information need might be stated but it does not make sense. |

The method(s) of the research is/are clearly stated and appropriate to the research question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Specific and appropriate method(s) for conducting the research are clearly identified and described. |
| 2 - Neutral | Specific and appropriate method(s) for conducting research are mentioned but could be better described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No research method(s) stated or research methods are not appropriate to the research question. |

##  Poster – Research (continued)

The approach to analysis (quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, etc.) states how data will inform conclusions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly states how data will be analyzed and used to inform conclusions. |
| 2 - Neutral | Analysis is mentioned but could be better described. Use of data to inform conclusions may, or may not, be mentioned.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No mention of how data will be analyzed or used to inform conclusions. |

## Poster - Program Description

The abstract is clearly understandable and structured.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Proposal is clearly understandable and well organized.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Proposal could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Difficult to understand and disorganized. Not viable for MLA. |

The program described relates to one or more aspects of health sciences librarianship or librarians. Topics need not be of interest to all health sciences librarians. Niche area topics (i.e., history of medicine, dentistry, optometry, ILL, etc.) should not be scored lower based on an assumption of fewer attendees.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly identifies a topic that health sciences librarians are interested in learning about. Includes data/evidence to indicate interest of topic to librarians. |
| 2 - Neutral | Identifies a topic of interest to health sciences librarians but could do a better job explaining how/why librarians are interested in the topic.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Topic or purpose of the program is not clearly described. or is not of interest to health sciences librarians. |

The submission is appropriate for the selected format of Poster - Program Description.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly describes how information will be presented visually on a poster. The type and amount of information is appropriate for a poster format.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Format of poster is likely appropriate but not entirely certain.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Too much/too little information, or the wrong type of information, to share in a poster. |

##  Poster - Program Description (continued)

The overall objectives of the program are specifically described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Objectives or purpose of the program are clearly identifiable and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Objectives or purpose of the program are identifiable but could be better described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Objectives are not listed, or are not understandable. |

The key steps of the program are clearly described and can be easily identified.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Key steps/major parts of the program are identified and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Key steps/major parts of the program are identified but could be better described. |
| 1 - Disagree | The key steps/major parts of the program are not easily identifiable, or they are not described. |

The program responds to an identified need or presents a novel concept in health sciences librarianship or covers current MLA strategic goals or current topics/events/controversies in the profession.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | It is clear what need the program will address. It is clear how the program is relevant to health sciences librarianship. Abstract likely includes data/evidence to indicate relevance. |
| 2 - Neutral | A need is identified, or a novel concept is presented, but a better explanation is needed to describe why it is important to health sciences librarianship.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Abstract does not explain why the program is needed. |

An appropriate evaluation of the program is described clearly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Method for evaluation is clearly identified and appears reasonable. It is okay if the evaluation has not yet occurred. |
| 2 - Neutral | Abstract mentions that an evaluation will be completed but does not include a clear description of what the evaluation will entail. |
| 1 - Disagree | No mention of evaluation. |

## Lightning Talk - Research

The abstract is clearly understandable and organized.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Proposal is clearly understandable and well organized.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Proposal could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Difficult to understand and disorganized. Not viable for MLA. |

The research project described relates to one or more aspects of health sciences librarianship or libraries. Topics need not be of interest to all health sciences librarians. Niche area topics (i.e. history of medicine, dentistry, optometry, ILL, etc.) should not be scored lower based on an assumption of fewer attendees.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly identifies a question/area/research topic that health sciences librarians are interested in learning about. Proposal uses data and/or evidence to substantiate interest. |
| 2 - Neutral | Identifies a question/area/research topic that health sciences librarians are interested in but could make a stronger case. |
| 1 - Disagree | Research topic is not clear. No indication of why this topic is relevant, or why another health sciences librarian might be interested. |

The submission is appropriate for the format of Lightning Talk.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | General overview could be conveyed in a lightning talk of 5 minutes |
| 2 - Neutral | Format of lightning talk is likely appropriate but not entirely certain.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Too much (or too little) information to convey in a lightning talk of 5 minutes. |

The overall objectives of the research are specifically described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Objectives are explicitly stated and well developed. |
| 2 - Neutral | Objectives are listed but they could be better described. Reviewers: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments. |
| 1 - Disagree | Objectives are not listed or are not understandable. |

## Lightning Talk – Research (continued)

The research question or hypothesis is clearly stated and understood.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Research question or hypothesis is clearly stated and understood |
| 2 - Neutral | Research question or hypothesis is stated but could be more clearly described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Research question or hypothesis not clearly stated or is confusing. |

The research project responds to an information need in the health sciences librarianship field.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Information need is clearly stated and described |
| 2 - Neutral | Information need is stated but could be better described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No indication of what information need this research is trying to address, or gap might be stated but it doesn’t make sense. |

The method(s) of the research are clearly stated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Specific method(s) for conducting the research are clearly identified and described. |
| 2 - Neutral | Specific method(s) for conducting research are mentioned but could be better described. |
| 1 - Disagree | No research method(s) is stated (or) research methods are not appropriate to the research question. |

The approach to analysis (quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, etc.) states how data will inform conclusions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly states how data will be analyzed and used to inform conclusions. |
| 2 - Neutral | Analysis is mentioned but could be better described. Use of data to inform conclusions may, or may not, be mentioned. |
| 1 - Disagree | No mention of how data will be analyzed or used to inform conclusions. |

## Lightning Talk - Program Description

The abstract is clearly understandable and organized.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Proposal is clearly understandable and well organized.  |
| 2 - Neutral | Proposal could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. |
| 1 - Disagree | Difficult to understand and disorganized. Not viable for MLA. |

The program described relates to one or more aspects of health sciences librarianship or librarians. Topics need not be of interest to all health sciences librarians. Niche area topics (i.e., history of medicine, dentistry, optometry, ILL, etc.) should not be scored lower based on an assumption of fewer attendees.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Clearly identifies a topic that health sciences librarians are interested in learning about. Includes data/evidence that illustrates interest in the topic. |
| 2 - Neutral | Identifies a topic of interest to health sciences librarians but could do a better job explaining how/why librarians are interested in the topic.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No mention of why this program is relevant, or why another library might be interested. |

The submission is appropriate for the selected format of Lightning Talk - Program Description.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 – Agree | General overview could be conveyed in a lightning talk of 5 minutes |
| 3 - Neutral | Format of lightning talk is likely appropriate but not entirely certain.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Too much (or too little) information to convey in a lightning talk of 5 minutes |

The overall objectives of the program are specifically described.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Objectives or purpose of the program are clearly identifiable and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Objectives or purpose of the project are identifiable but could be better described. |
| 1 - Disagree | Objectives are not listed, or are not understandable. |

## Lightning Talk - Program Description (continued)

The key steps of the program are clearly described and can be easily identified.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Key steps/major parts of the program are identifiable and understandable. |
| 2 - Neutral | Key steps/major parts of the program are identified but could be better described.  |
| 1 - Disagree | The key steps/major parts of the program are not easily identifiable, or they are not described. |

The program responds to an identified need or presents a novel concept in health sciences librarianship or covers current MLA strategic goals or current topics/events/controversies in the profession.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | It is clear what need the program will address. It is clear how the program is relevant to health sciences librarianship. Abstract likely includes data/evidence to indicate relevance. |
| 2 - Neutral | A need is identified, or a novel concept is presented, but a better explanation is needed to describe why it is important to health sciences librarianship.  |
| 1 - Disagree | Abstract does not explain why the program is needed. |

An appropriate evaluation of the program is described clearly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3 - Agree | Method for evaluation is clearly identified and appears reasonable. It is okay if the evaluation has not yet occurred. |
| 2 - Neutral | Abstract mentions that an evaluation will be completed but does not include a description of what the evaluation will entail.  |
| 1 - Disagree | No mention of evaluation. |

**\*\*Reviewers: Include suggestions for how applicants can strengthen their submission in your reviewer comments.**

**Note:**

For submitters: Reviewing the rubrics will help write better abstracts.

For reviewers: Reviewing the rubrics will help score abstracts and provide constructive feedback.