Contributed Content Rubric

Round 1: September 4 – October 24, 2024

Round 2: December 12, 2024 – January 30, 2025

Contributed 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.

The submission is appropriate for the format of Contributed 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 could be better described.
1 - Disagree	Objectives are not identifiable or are not appropriate for the topic.

Contributed Paper – Research (continued)

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

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, and 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.

Contributed 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.

The submission is appropriate for the selected format of Contributed 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.

Contributed Paper – Program Description (continued)

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 or covers current MLA strategic goals/current topics/events/controversies in health sciences librarianship.

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.

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.

Immersion Session

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 75-minutes.

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.

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 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 covers a recently/previously covered topic with no new information.

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.

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. 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.

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.

Poster – Research (continued)

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.

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. 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.

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.

Poster – 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 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 or covers current MLA strategic goals/current topics/events/controversies in health sciences librarianship.

3 - Agree	It is clear what need the program will address. Abstract likely includes data/evidence to clearly indicate how the program is relevant to health sciences librarianship.
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.
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.

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 described.
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.

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.