For submitters: Sharing these rubrics with submitters will help them write better abstracts.

For reviewer training: These rubrics will help reviewers provide constructive feedback.

Immersion Session

The proposal overall is clearly written and well organized.

3 - Agree	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), understandable, and well organized.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fairly well written but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewers: Include suggestions in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Poor grammar. Multiple typos. Not well organized. Difficult to understand. Not viable for MLA.

The session as described is appropriate to present in the 90-minute time slot.

5 - Strongly Agree	Detailed agenda; potential speaker(s) identified or confirmed.
4 - Agree	Agenda and proposed times provided and realistic.
3 - Neutral	Agenda and proposed times provided but potentially unrealistic
2 - Disagree	No agenda but rough idea is there.
1 - Strongly Disagree	Lack of agenda. No speaker. Just ideas.

The selected program format is appropriate for the content.

5 - Strongly Agree	Deep dive into well-defined topic. Innovative use of instruction methods and/or participant engagement using Immersion format.
4 - Agree	Topic well defined. Instructional methods provided. Participant engagement methods are appropriate based on learning outcomes.
3 - Neutral	Topic defined but instructional methods and/or participant engagement could be more fleshed out.
2 - Disagree	Topic is not a good fit for the Immersion program format.
1 - Strongly Disagree	Not cohesive or insufficient content

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

3 - Agree	Target audience and learner level is clearly identified.
2 - Neutral	Target audience is identified, but could be better described. Learner level could be better described.
1 - Disagree	No target audience identified, or target audience might not be applicable to MLA Annual meeting.

The program description is interesting, inspiring, and/or addresses a relevant and timely idea, issue or need.

5 - Strongly Agree	Description is well-written. Describes a program that would appeal to or benefit a diverse audience. Program addresses current MLA strategic goals or current events/controversies in the profession. Includes evidence indicating member interested in the topic.
4 - Agree	Description is well written. Program would be appealing to an identified audience.
3 - Neutral	Anecdotally appears relevant to but no data included or available.
2 - Disagree	Description is weak and light on details.
1 - Strongly Disagree	Description is poorly written or uninteresting. No indication of intended audience.

The program description shows originality and innovation.

3 - Agree	It could be an entirely new idea. Or it could be a new way of looking at a topic. It could be that the manner of presentation is novel or unconventional from what is usually at the MLA meeting.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fine but nothing groundbreaking.
1 - Disagree	Proposal is covering a recently/previously covered topic with no new information or updates.

The learning outcomes of the program are specifically described.

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

Paper - Research

The abstract is clearly written and well organized.

3 – Agree	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), understandable, and well organized.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fairly well written but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewers: Suggestions for how to improve should be included in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Poor grammar. Multiple typos. Not well organized. Difficult to understand. 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. Proposal uses data and/or evidence to demonstrate interest.
2 - Neutral	Identifies a question/area/research topic that health sciences librarians are interested 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 paper.

3 – Agree	Appropriate amount of information to fill a 15-minute presentation.
2 - Neutral	Format of paper is likely ok, but not entirely certain. Reviewers: Mention what might help in comments
1 - Disagree	Not enough information (or too much information) to fill a 15-minute presentation. Topic might be better presented as a poster or lightning talk.

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. Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	Objectives are not identifiable.

The research question or hypothesis is clearly stated and understood.

3 – Agree	Hypothesis or research question is clearly stated and understandable.
2 - Neutral	Hypothesis or research question is stated but could be described more clearly. Reviewers: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	Hypothesis or research question is not stated or confusing.

This research project responds to an identified gap in the health sciences librarianship field.

3 - Strongly Agree	Gap is clearly stated and well described
2 - Neutral	Gap is stated, but could be better described. Reviewers: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Strongly Disagree	No indication of what gap this research is trying to address, or a gap might be stated but it does not make sense.

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

3 – Agree	Specific method(s) for conducting the research are clearly identified and thoroughly 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 described inaccurately.

The data methodology (quantitative, qualitative, etc.) states how it will inform conclusions.

3 – Agree	Clearly states how data will be analyzed and used to inform conclusions.
2 - Neutral	Data methodology 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 written and well organized.

3 – Agree	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), understandable, and well organized.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fairly well written but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewers: Provide suggestions for how to improve in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	Poor grammar. Multiple typos. Not well organized. Difficult to understand. 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. 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 paper.

3 - Agree	Appropriate about of information to fill a 15-minute presentation.
2 - Neutral	Format of paper is likely ok, but not entirely certain. Reviewers: Mention in reviewer comments what additional information would clarify.
1 - Disagree	Not enough information (or too much information) to fill a 15-minute presentation. Topic might be better presented as a poster or lightning talk.

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

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

The key steps or major parts 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 identified (or) they are not described.

The program responds to an identified need or presents a novel concept in health sciences librarianship.

3 - Agree	It is clear what gap or 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, nor does it describe why the program is a novel concept.

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.

Poster - Research

The abstract is clearly written and well structured.

3 - Agree	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), understandable, and well organized.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fairly well written but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewers: Suggestions for how to improve should be noted in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Poor grammar. Multiple typos. Not well organized. Difficult to understand. 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. 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 mention of why this topic is interesting, or why another librarian might be interested.

The submission is appropriate for the selected format of poster

3 - Agree	Information could be distilled onto a poster
2 - Neutral	Format of poster is likely ok, but not entirely certain. Reviewers: Mention In reviewer comments what additional information might clarify.
1 - Disagree	Too much information, or the wrong type of information, to share in a poster. Lends itself better to a paper or lightning talk.

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. Reviewers: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	Objectives are not identifiable.

The research question or hypothesis is clearly stated and understood.

3 - Agree	Hypothesis or research question is clearly stated and understandable.
2 - Neutral	Hypothesis or research question is stated but could be described more clearly. Reviewer: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	Hypothesis or research question is not stated or is confusing.

This research project responds to an identified gap in the health sciences librarianship field.

3 - Agree	Gap is clearly stated and well described
2 - Neutral	Gap is stated but could be better described. Reviewer: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	No indication of what gap this research is trying to address (or) a gap might be stated but it does not 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 described inaccurately.

The data methodology (quantitative, qualitative, etc.) states how it will inform conclusions.

3 - Agree	Clearly states how data will be analyzed and used to inform conclusions.
2 - Neutral	Data methodology 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 written and well-structured.

3 - Agree	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), understandable, and well organized.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fairly well written but could use a bit of additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewer: Suggestions for how to improve should be noted in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Poor grammar. Multiple typos. Not well organized. Difficult to understand. 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. Includes data/evidence to indicate interest of topic to librarians.
2 - Neutral	Identities 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.

3 - Agree	Info could be distilled onto a poster
2 - Neutral	Format of poster is likely ok, but not entirely certain. Reviewer: Mention what additional information would clarify in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Too much information, or the wrong type of information, to share in a poster (or) lends itself better to a paper or lightning talk.

The overall objectives of the program are specifically described.

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

3 - Agree	It is clear what gap or need the program will address. It is clear how the program is relevant to health sciences librarianship. Abstract likely includes data/evident 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, nor does it describe why the program is a novel concept.

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 written and well organized

3 - Agree	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), understandable, and well organized.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fairly well written but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewer: Suggestions for how to improve should be noted in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Poor grammar. Multiple typos. Not well organized. Difficult to understand. 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. 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 mention of why this topic is interesting, or why another librarians 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 ok but not entirely certain. Reviewer: Mention what might help clarify.
1 - Disagree	Too much information to convey in 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. Reviewer: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	Objectives are not listed or clearly identifiable.

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. Reviewer: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	Research question or hypothesis not clearly stated or is confusing.

The research project responds to an identified gap in the health sciences librarianship field.

3 - Agree	Gap is clearly stated and described
2 - Neutral	Gap is stated but could be better described. Reviewer: Provide suggestions in reviewer comments.
1 - Disagree	No indication of what gap 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 described inaccurately.

The data methodology (quantitative, qualitative, etc.) states how it will inform conclusions.

3 - Agree	Clearly states how data will be analyzed and used to inform conclusions.
2 - Neutral	Data methodology 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 written and well organized.

3 - Agree	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), understandable, and well organized.
2 - Neutral	Proposal is fairly well written but could use a bit of additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized. Reviewer: Suggestions for how to improve should be noted in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Poor grammar. Multiple typos. Not well organized. Difficult to understand. 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. 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 interesting, or why another library might be interested.

The submission is appropriate for the selected format of lightning talk.

3 - Agree	General overview could be conveyed in a lightning talk of 5 minutes
3 - Neutral	Format of lightning talk is likely ok, but not entirely certain. Reviewer: Mention what additional information would clarify in review comments.
1 - Disagree	Too much 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 is identifiable but could be better described.
1 - Disagree	Objectives are not listed (or) objectives 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.

3 - Agree	It is clear what gap or 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	Submission does not explain why the program is needed, nor does it describe why the program is a novel concept.

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.