


MLA 2024 Annual Meeting and JMLA Biannual Research Caucus Research Awards

Lindsay Blake, EdD, MLIS, AHIP^a

^aClinical Services Coordinator, UAMS Library, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, Arkansas, <https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-8234-8611> , leblake@uams.edu

Cite as: Blake L. MLA 2024 Annual Meeting and JMLA Biannual Research Caucus Research Awards. *Hypothesis*. 2024;36(2). doi:10.18060/28301.



CC BY-NC 4.0 DEED

Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International

Blake. All works in *Hypothesis* are licensed under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 DEED Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). Authors own copyright of their articles appearing in *Hypothesis*. Readers may copy articles without permission of the copyright owner(s), as long as the author(s) are acknowledged in the copy, and the copy is used for educational, not-for-profit purposes. For any other use of articles, please contact the copyright owner(s).

Congratulations to the award-winning research papers and posters from MLA '24 Portland as well as the biannual 2022-2023 JMLA Research Paper winner!

The MLA Research Caucus is pleased to announce the winners for best research papers and posters presented at the MLA 2024 Portland annual meeting. Thank you to all the judges who volunteered their expertise to help select these deserving awardees, both in the pre-judging phase and during the conference. To learn more about the awards and selection process, visit the Research Caucus website:

<https://www.mlanet.org/communities/all-bb-communities/research/>.

MLA 2024 Annual Meeting Contributed Paper Awards

1st Place – Expert-Recommended Tasks for Hospital Librarians During a Healthcare System Merger or Acquisition: An e-Delphi Consensus Statement.

Authors: Jaclyn Morales, Senior Librarian, Stacy Posillico, Senior Librarian, and Saori Wendy Herman, Assistant Dean of Library Services, Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra Northwell.

Objective: Little empirical research is available to guide hospital librarians through the healthcare system merger or acquisition process. In order to address this knowledge gap, a literature review and the e-Delphi research method were used to develop expert-driven recommendations to prioritize those tasks that librarians should undertake when consolidating the delivery of library services to a newly merged, geographically distributed healthcare system.

Methods: A review of existing literature through January 2021 was performed and updated in October 2023 to discover reports, conference presentations, and articles in which hospital librarians shared their experiences with the merger process.

Twenty-nine hospital librarians and library professionals who had experienced a merger or acquisition in the last ten years at healthcare systems within the seven NNLM regions agreed to participate in this study as experts. Using a modified e-Delphi process that was conducted according to CREDES standards, the expert panelists responded to four rounds of questionnaires during April to December 2022. In the first round, they identified tasks that librarians should undertake during the merger process. Tasks were then eliminated or prioritized in Rounds 2 through 4, based upon the experts' rating of each task using a seven-point Likert scale in which 1 equaled "not recommended" and 7 equaled "essential recommendation." Those tasks rated as either 5, 6, or 7 by $\geq 75\%$ of the panelists at the conclusion of the round were included in the final statement of recommended tasks.

Results: A consensus-based statement of 330 recommended tasks for librarians to consider during a healthcare system merger or acquisition was created. The final set of recommended tasks were grouped into four main domains: Healthcare Organization Tasks, Library Collections & Information Systems, Library Administration, and Library Staff Integration & Interconnection. Tasks related to information technology and services, vendor relations, and library organizational structure were more likely to be prioritized than tasks related to marketing and outreach and physical library space. Expert insight in the final round highlighted the importance of understanding context

and culture when undertaking any recommended task.

Conclusions: Further research and refinement after utilization will likely be needed, but the priority tasks recommended by the expert panel can be used immediately by hospital librarians to create a plan of action for providing library services as healthcare systems transformatively expand and address library assimilation and consolidation after a merger occurs.

2nd Place – This is How We Do It: Tenure & Promotion in Academic Health Sciences Libraries.

Author: Erin Reardon, Public Health Informationist, Emory University.

Objectives: The traditional three arms of the tenure-track professor's duties are teaching, service, and research. Tenure-track academic librarians, though their numbers are dwindling, are expected to meet the same or similar requirements to achieve tenure. Whether academic librarians should have tenure or tenure-like status is a matter of some debate, but what has not been examined are the criteria by which academic librarians are evaluated in order to be awarded tenure. This study aims to examine and compare these criteria across academic health sciences libraries' promotion and tenure documents.

Methods: Data from the Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries (AAHSL) descriptive statistics from Fiscal Year 2021-2022 was used for this project, specifically item D.14a, Faculty Appointment Status. Of the 130 AAHSL member institutions who responded to the survey, there were 29 institutional health sciences libraries who reported a tenure-track faculty appointment system for their staff librarians. This study does not examine the promotion requirements for libraries that reported other faculty-like appointments with tenure-like systems such as continuous appointment, non-tenure-track faculty appointment, faculty appointment outside the library, or no faculty appointment.

Through internet and institutional website searching, documentation of the tenure criteria was obtained for 21 libraries. A content analysis was undertaken using MaxQDA to count the number of documents in which certain words and themes appeared. The resulting data was organized into domains of criteria (such as librarianship, research, and service) and elements of those criteria (such as job performance, publications, and committee work).

Results: Twenty of the 21 institutions' documents described "service" as a domain; 19 documents each describe "librarianship" and "research and scholarship" as domains. Four documents contained the domain of "teaching and learning," and two documents contained a domain for "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI).

In the "librarianship" domain, 117 individual words or themes were coded as elements. Of these elements, 67 (or 58%) only appear in one document, showing a wide variety in the description of the work of the librarian. In the "research and scholarship" domain, 57 elements were coded, of which 37 (or 57%) only appear in one document. In the "service" domain, 52 elements were coded, of which 30 (or 58%) only appeared in one document. In "teaching and learning," 14 elements were coded with no crossover between the four documents in which this domain was found. Elements were unable to be coded for the DEI domain.

Conclusions: There is a wide variety in the way the work of the librarian is described, as well as what constitutes research or service. These documents describe multiple

ways to engage with librarianship, research, service, and teaching, but the amount of overlap or lack thereof between the documents suggests that academic health sciences librarians' profession is poorly defined or difficult to define in these criteria.

2nd Place – An Exploration of Basic/Life Science Information Professionals: Educational Background, Liaison Roles and Carnegie Classification.

Authors: Jeremy Kupsco, Research Informationist, Emory University, Laura Lipke, Health Science Librarian, Binghamton University, and Stephanie Schulte, Director, Health Sciences Library, Ohio State University.

Objectives: Since the early 2000's and the explosion of electronic information resources, information professionals have been struggling to reconnect to the basic science community. The information profession has expanded its roles beyond collection development to knowledge regarding the data service and research needs of this specialized community. As late as 2022, literature acknowledges that the outreach struggles continue and that this population is still unaware of the "capabilities of a science liaison librarian." Scholarship has supported the ability of information professionals to fulfill the roles of training and instruction.

Methods: The purpose of this study is to identify differences in collaboration between information professionals with and without degrees or training in basic science who work with the basic science community. The study will also examine whether Carnegie classification of the institution impacts information professionals' interactions.

Participants for this study were identified via their institutional websites as well as through the email lists for the Basic Science Caucus of the Medical Library Association, the Science and Technology Section of the American Library Association, the Health Sciences Special Interest Group of the Association of College and Research Libraries and the STEM Librarians Collaborative on Discord. They were recruited via direct email. The study used semi-structured interviews via Zoom to gather data. This data will be analyzed thematically. In addition, basic demographic information from the recruiting survey along with publicly available data about their institutions will provide context for addressing the research questions.

Results: To date, the team has interviewed fifteen basic science librarians from various backgrounds and institutions and transcription of the recorded Zoom interviews has begun. A few noted emerging themes such as librarians that attended basic science program events were more successful in building relationships; most liaison skills for these programs were learned on the job; scientific intellectual curiosity is a skill needed to be successful; and that librarians with a science degree were able to connect with these programs because they spoke "their language." A detailed thematic analysis of the results will be provided at the presentation of this study.

Conclusions: Based on the initial findings of this study, it appears that liaisons with a basic science degree do have an advantage, when connecting to the basic science community. More importantly, though, is for the liaison to look for opportunities to interact/support grant writing, research and sponsored programs, and to demonstrate curiosity regarding the research of these programs. Further thematic analysis and findings regarding the basic science liaison librarians role with this population, and a discussion of how Carnegie classifications play a role in successful collaborations will be presented.

MLA 2024 Annual Meeting Contributed Poster Awards

1st Place – Using Bibliometric Analytic Techniques to Measure the Scholarly Impact of a Health Professions Education Teaching Academy.

Authors: Sarah Cantrell, Associate Director, Beth Blackwood, Research & Education Librarian, Deborah Engle, Diana McNeill, and Kristin Dickerson, Duke University Medical Center Library & Archives.

2nd Place – Stronger Together - Exploring Medical Students' Experiences with ChatGPT.

Authors: Authors: Emily Hannum, Library Technical Assistant III and Nadine Dexter, Director, Harriet F. Ginsburg Health Sciences Library, University of Central Florida College of Medicine.

Background: Large Language Model AI use has increased dramatically in the past few years, representing a unique method to engage in collaborative research. With this field developing at a rapid pace, it is valuable to understand how AI offers potential for assisting in medical education. This highlights a need to understand how AI tools are currently being implemented in medical education environments, a consideration of the effectiveness of these tools, and reflection on the ethical implications of AI use in medical education.

Objectives: The goal of this study was to evaluate how frequently and in what ways medical students are using ChatGPT for their studies or extracurriculars, and their level of satisfaction in using this resource for their academic-related needs. While many studies have shown ChatGPT's potential applications in medical education, they do not explore how students currently use ChatGPT and other AI platforms. We believe understanding current medical students' use of AI platforms is an essential step towards integrating them into medical education.

Methods: Medical students from the University of Central Florida's College of Medicine were asked to voluntarily complete a survey including Likert scale and open response questions regarding their use of and comfort with ChatGPT. The survey consisted of 11 questions, remained available for 14 days, and 64 medical students participated.

Results: Regardless of age, the use and confidence of Chat GPT remains similar on average among everyone who took the survey. Most medical student respondents have used ChatGPT despite skepticism of usefulness and accuracy of information obtained. Furthermore, medical students are also either supportive of or indifferent to recommending ChatGPT for medical students. The most frequently used sources for verifying ChatGPT information included Google and Clinical Apps such as UpToDate and Epocrates. Some of the major concerns students cited for ChatGPT use included receiving simplistic answers, falsified studies, reflection of user bias, and ethical implications.

Conclusion: Despite the general skepticism surrounding the benefits of using Large Language Model AI such as ChatGPT, medical students appear to already be incorporating these tools into their education, albeit cautiously. This cautious exploration suggests that as AI tools continue to advance so will their application in medical education. Medical school faculty and support staff must begin to familiarize themselves with these tools and the potential implications of their use in academia.

There are currently no definitive means to consistently identify AI-crafted work nor evaluate potential bias within the AI tool itself, emphasizing the need for AI familiarity to keep pace with AI technological advancements. Further research on the application of additional AI tools is necessary.

**3rd Place – An Environmental Scan of Evidence Synthesis Projects
Published by Yale University and Yale New Haven Hospital Authors:
Preliminary Findings of Scoping Reviews.**

Authors: Alyssa Grimshaw, Clinical Research and Education Librarian and Holly Grossetta Nardini, Associate Director, Harvey Cushing/John Hay Whitney Medical Library, Yale University.

Objective: To better understand our institutions' user behavior, we investigated evidence synthesis publications that have been produced at our institution.

Methods: An exhaustive search was performed across eighteen databases to identify papers associated with Yale University or Yale New Haven Hospital using keywords or publication types related to scoping and systematic reviews. A dashboard was developed for monitoring evidence synthesis publications. Papers with a Yale/YNHH author listed as either the first or last author were incorporated. The analysis centered on extracting information concerning library engagement in the review process and compliance with reporting best practices.

Results: Yale's first and last authors have contributed to 90 scoping reviews. Among these, 59% of the reviews involved librarians, either through co-authorship (38%), mention in the methods section (3%), or acknowledgment (18%). The data indicates that the registration of a protocol associated with a review and reproducible search compliance were more prevalent when librarians were involved. Based on the findings, the library intends to offer 15-minute instruction sessions focused on improving search reporting and recommendations for publishing evidence synthesis protocols.

Conclusion: The findings of this environmental scan could impact the library's policies and procedures relating to librarian involvement in evidence synthesis projects, future staffing support, and creation of new training modules for patrons that clarify proper reporting of searching and methodology in evidence synthesis projects.

JMLA Biannual Research Article Award

Kahili-Heede, M. K., Patil, U., Hillgren, K. J., Hishinuma, E., & Kasuya, R. (2022). Library instruction and Wikipedia: investigating students' perceived information literacy, lifelong learning, and social responsibility through Wikipedia editing. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA*, 110(2), 174–184.
<https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2022.1291>

Objectives: This article presents a multiyear pilot study delineating practical challenges, solutions, and lessons learned from Wikipedia editing experiences with first-year medical students at the John A. Burns School of Medicine at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. The purpose of our project was to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of Wikipedia editing to improve information literacy and lifelong learning skills and to investigate aspects of social responsibility in first-year medical students.

Methods: Lessons were provided through a combination of in-person and online

instruction via the WikiEdu learning management system (LMS). Students next selected a health-related Wikipedia article to edit. After the editing experience, structural completeness data were collected from the WikiEdu LMS. Feedback was collected via an anonymous retrospective pre-post survey to assess the students' attitudes toward their perceived information literacy skills and the social responsibility of improving Wikipedia articles. Nonparametric tests were conducted to compare pre versus post outcomes.

Results: Fifty-seven (79%) participants in the 2018 cohort and forty-nine (64%) participants in the 2019 cohort completed the retrospective pre-post survey. In both cohorts, respondents showed statistically significant increases ($p < .05$) in self-rating of all ten domains of information literacy and social responsibility after completing the program.

Conclusions: This study showed that medical students are competent editors of Wikipedia and that their contributions improve both the quality of the articles and their own perceived information literacy. Additionally, editing medicine-related articles provides an opportunity to build students' social responsibility by improving content on an open platform that reaches millions each day.