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Agenda

• Types of submissions
  • Content type
  • Presentation format

• Rubrics to apply

• Reviewer website

• Important details
**Types of Submissions: Content Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation and improvement of products, programs, technologies, administrative practices, or services</td>
<td>Report on designing, conducting, and analyzing a research project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of Submissions: Presentation Format**

- **Paper**: 15 minute presentation
- **Immersion Session**: 90 minute session
- **Poster**: author should staff poster for 1 hour
- **Lightning talk**: 5 minute presentation
**IMPORTANT NOTE**

Again, this year submissions for papers were NOT automatically considered for posters or lightning talks*

- Consider Poster submissions ONLY for posters
- Consider Lightning Talk submissions ONLY for lightning talks

Evaluate using 3-point standard Likert scale

3 – Agree
2 – Neutral / Neither agree nor disagree
1 – Disagree
Rubric: Common Criteria

1. The proposal is clearly written and well organized.

2. The project/program described relates to one or more aspects of health sciences librarianship or librarians.

3. The submission is appropriate for the selected format (paper, poster, lightning talk, immersion session).

4. The overall objectives of the program or research are specifically described.

Rubric: Additional Criteria by Content Type

Program Description

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

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

7. An appropriate evaluation of the program is described clearly.

Research Abstract

5. The research question or hypothesis is stated clearly and understood.

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

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

8. The data methodology (quantitative, qualitative, etc.) states how it will inform conclusions.
MLA ‘20 Review Site

You will receive a login link with your username and password.

Reviewer Website

Once you have logged in, you will see your Review area:
Click here to begin reviewing

SUBMISSION PREVIEW

Submission ID: 743454
Reimagining the Veterinary Medicine Curriculum (EXAMPLE)
Submission Type: Paper; Program Description Abstract
Submission Area of Practice: Education

Area of Practice
1st choice: Education
2nd choice:

Background
In 2016, the College of Veterinary Medicine was charged with reimagining their Doctor of Veterinary Medicine curriculum and turning it into a cost-effective, learner-centered, integrated curriculum that produces high-value, career-ready graduates. The veterinary medicine librarian has been involved since the beginning of the process, with increasing responsibilities that ultimately led to being embedded in the instruction team when the new curriculum launched in the fall of 2018. This session will describe the process of developing a new curriculum and how the librarian leveraged their expertise to help shape the education of future veterinarians.

Description
After being identified as a College of Veterinary Medicine stakeholder the veterinary medicine librarian was invited to participate in a day long workshop to identify key competencies for the new DVM curriculum. At the same time, a course for the veterinary medical students was developed. The course week included an introductory lecture, including content from the students' medical school classes, and a panel discussion led by the librarian and faculty. The panel discussion focused on the impact of veterinary medicine on professional development and the importance of veterinary medicine in the future of the veterinary medical profession.

REVIEW SCORECARD

[Review card with options for review]
Review the submission details

Use the directional arrows to go to the previous review or next review. To see your review summary, use the "i" icon. To go to the home screen, use the home icon.
Click “Abstain from Review” if you need to recuse yourself.

Read the Likert scale Criteria before beginning.
After reading the Submission, select the appropriate score for each question.

After scoring, please provide comments. NOTE: all comments and scores will be sent to the submitter, please be constructive.
Once you have finished the review, please select your recommendation for this proposal to be part of MLA ‘20

At any time, click on “save review” to save your actions thus far OR to submit your review
### View a Summary of Your Reviews

**SUMMARY OF YOUR REVIEWS**

#### Review Summary (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>521204</td>
<td>Mary Test Immersion Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>521924</td>
<td>Mary Test Lightning Talk Program Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>521925</td>
<td>Mary Test Lightning Talk Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>521949</td>
<td>Mary Test Program Description abstract...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>521960</td>
<td>Mary's Test Paper Research Abstract July...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incomplete Reviews (5)**

**Completed Reviews (1)**

**Incomplete Reviews (4)**
Clicking on the reviewed title gives you this display. Click on “View” to go to review screen to make any desired changes.

Clicking on the non-reviewed title gives you this display. Click on “view” to go to the review screen.
Detail 1: Results and Conclusions

Some of the content you are reviewing may not yet have results or conclusions.

You may be looking at on-going research, so please do not ‘grade’ on whether or not the content has results or a conclusion.

Detail 2: Dates

Review period:

• Posters & Lightning Talks: Jan 28 – Feb 6, 2020
• Acceptance notices: Feb 25, 2020

Meeting: May 15 – 19, 2020, Portland, OR
Detail 3: Reviews

Reviewer comments and evaluation WILL be sent to the submitters

Be CLEAR and CONCISE in your feedback

Be HONEST in your evaluation

Be CONSTRUCTIVE in your critique

Be AWARE the submitter will use your words to improve

Questions?

Contributed Content Working Group
Email: 2020ccwg@gmail.com
FAQ: https://www.mlanet.org/p/cm/ld/fid=1543