

**Michigan Health Sciences Libraries Association
Fall Educational Conference
Baronette Renaissance Hotel
Novi, MI
October 17-19, 2012
Final Report of the Education Committee**

Committee Roster:

Nancy Bulgarelli, Co-Chair
Janet Zimmerman, Co-Chair
Mary Fitzpatrick

Christopher Hunt
Cheryl Putnam
Stephanie Swanberg

Continuing Education Courses

Continuing education courses were selected from recommendations submitted via evaluation forms from the previous year's MHSLA conference and from committee member recommendations. The following MLA-approved CE courses were all offered on Wednesday, October 17, 2012:

Introduction to Epidemiology

Instructor: Kristine Alpi, North Carolina State University

CE credits: 4

Attendance: 26

Average grade given by attendees (4-point scale, see appendix for MLA course evaluation summaries): 3.64

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects

Instructor: Merle Rosenzweig & Irina Zeylikovich, University of Michigan

CE credits: 4

Attendance: 20

Average grade given by attendees (4-point scale, see appendix for MLA course evaluation summaries): 3.75

Walking in Nurses' Shoes: Information Needs from Novice to Expert

Instructor: Pamela Sherwill-Navarro, Remington College of Nursing; Joy Kennedy, Northwest Community Healthcare

CE credits: 6

Attendance: 15

Average grade given by attendees (4-point scale, see appendix for MLA course evaluation summaries): 3.85

Speakers and Conference Sessions

In keeping with the theme "Librarians Driving Medical Education," the committee offered programming on Thursday and Friday that covered the different types of clientele and educational needs supported by medical libraries. Dr. Ernst Yoder, founding dean of the Central Michigan University Medical School, and one of two keynote speakers on Thursday, presented "CMED: A New Approach to Medical Education."

In the afternoon, we heard from Irene Williams, GMR Michigan Liaison, who presented the "GMR Update." She was followed by our second keynote speaker of the day, Jane Blumenthal, director of the Taubman Library at the University of Michigan and current president of the Medical Library Association. Ms. Blumenthal shared with us her "Perspectives of an Academic Health Sciences Library Director" and led a discussion about MLA's priorities and direction.

The program continued Friday morning with presentations that covered our health consumer and nursing populations. Jamie Verdi JD, Attorney for Michigan Patient Advocacy, presented on "Patient Advocates in the New Reform Arena." Caroline Medcoff CNS, Chair of Beaumont Health System's Nursing Research and Magnet Committees, spoke on "Nurses and Librarians: Research Partners."

The Education Committee had made a conscious decision not to offer concurrent sessions, but to keep the group together during the sessions in order increase and enhance networking opportunities.

Posters / Lightning Rounds

The committee tried a new format this year, offering a session that alternated between poster presentations and lightning rounds (formerly called Pecha Kucha). Each presenter was given seven minutes to present their work. The 15 presentations are listed below.

Posters:

- Sustaining Librarian Vitality: Embedded Librarianship Model for Health Sciences Librarians – Misa Mi, OUWB School of Medicine
- Architecting Learning Contexts to Support First-Year Medical Students in Learning Fundamental Library Information Skills – Keith Engwall, Misa Mi, & Stephanie Swanberg, OUWB School of Medicine
- Library Services to a New Distance Medical School Campus – Andrea Kepsel, MSU
- LibGuides: Going from Ordinary to Extraordinary – Mark Bremel & Carol Shannon, University of Michigan
- Show Us Your Heart! A State-wide Library Initiative to Increase Organ Donation Registration – Carol Shannon, Jean Song, Kate Saylor, University of Michigan
- Sharehousing: Adopting a Household Model in the Establishment and Integration of a New Virtual Medical Library – Stephanie Swanberg, Shawn Lombardo, Nancy Bulgarelli, & Misa Mi, OUWB School of Medicine
- Availability of eBooks in the Vision Sciences: A Snapshot in Time – Gale Oren University of Michigan
- Hitting a Moving Target: Resource Access in a Mobile World – Whitney Townsend & Carol Shannon, University of Michigan

Lightning Rounds

- Designing a Medical School Library – Jennifer Barlow, Borgess Medical Center
- Free, as in Kittens! – Jennifer Bowen, DMC
- Quality Improvement Tools for Health Sciences Libraries – Toni Janik & Orien Duda, Hotel Dieu Grace Hospital
- Expanding a Librarian's Role through Building and Managing a Faculty Learning Community – Misa Mi, OUWB School of Medicine
- Strengthening the Librarian's Role in an Online Public Health Program – Abe Wheeler, MSU
- Leverage Mobile Resources for Medical Students' Success – Wendy Wu, WSU
- Going Green – Janet Zimmerman, Beaumont Health System

The new format received mixed reviews in the "MHSLA 2012 Conference Survey Results." Some members reported enjoying it very much; while others did not see the purpose of having the posters presented in this way. If subsequent Education Committees decide to continue with this format, we recommend that the posters be displayed ahead of time, so attendees have time to view them in more detail.

Scholarships

Three scholarships were awarded – two to WSU students and one to a MHSLA member.

The committee received four applications for the student scholarships, which covered full conference registration, lodging and mileage. The recipients were selected by Mary Fitzpatrick and Diane Gardner, who used a blinded process to read the essays and reach consensus on the

winners. All four applications were from Wayne State University; we did not receive any applications from the University of Michigan program. Scholarship awardees were expected to write a brief summary of their conference experience for the MHSLA newsletter and to assist at the registration/hospitality desk.

The committee also offered two scholarships for MHSLA members. The first covered the full-cost (registration and hotel) for a member who had never before attended the conference. The second scholarship covered either the registration or the hotel fees for a member who needed assistance with the costs of attending. We received no applications for the first-time attendee scholarship and only one application for the second scholarship.

The conference scholarship winners:

- 1.) Raynitra Pugh, Wayne State University student
- 2.) Laura Bollman, Wayne State University student
- 3.) Jennifer Bowen, MHSLA member. Jennifer chose to have her registration covered and presented in the lightning rounds.

Appendix
MLA-accredited Courses – Summary of Attendees’ Evaluations

Course Evaluation – Institutional Review Board (IRB) – Merle Rosenweig & Irina Zeylikovich
MHSLA Annual Conference
October 17, 2012
Novi, MI
Attendees: 20

1.) On a scale of 1 to 4 (with 4 being the highest), rate the instructors

- Merle Rosenzweig
 - i. Knowledgeable
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 0; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - ii. Well-prepared / organized
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 0; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iii. Effective Presenter
 - 1. 4 – 13; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iv. Responsive to questions
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 0; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
- Irina Zeylikovich
 - i. Knowledgeable
 - 1. 4 – 12; 3 – 2; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - ii. Well-prepared / organized
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 0; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iii. Effective Presenter
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 0; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iv. Responsive to questions
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 0; 2 – 0; 1 – 0

2.) Please check the appropriate rating for each of the following aspects of this session.

Instructional Materials

Were used effectively

Agree – 15

Somewhat Agree – 12

Were relevant/useful

Agree – 14

Somewhat Agree – 3

Hands-on sessions were useful

Agree – 13

Somewhat Agree – 4

Session objectives met my expectations

Agree – 14

Somewhat Agree – 4

Session content was well organized

Agree – 16

Somewhat Agree – 2

Length was appropriate for course content

Agree – 14

Somewhat Agree – 3

I acquired knowledge & skills I can use

Agree – 15

Somewhat Agree – 2

Somewhat Disagree – 1

Facility was conducive to learning

Agree – 16

Somewhat Agree – 2

3.) Identify the major strengths of this session (check one or more)

Instructors-13 Demos/Hands-on-6 Networking-4 Creative Ideas-1

Information gained-11 Support materials-4 Other-0

4.) What part of this session was most helpful?

- Hands on IRB scenario
- Creating an actual IRB
- Hands-on exercise to develop an IRB application for a library-specific project
- Excellent course!
- IRB handouts
- The hands-on group activity
- Content, activity, instructors
- Having access to the slides so I could follow along on my laptop during the class, being able to make our own IRB application
- The background overview information
- Creating an IRB
- Very good overall presentation on topic
- Understand the IRB process better

5.) What part of this session was least helpful?

- Maybe not so much history of IRB
- Could have been a little more instructor assistance during hands-on session
- The content is not very relevant to my professional responsibilities, so in general the course was not incredibly useful. More for personal curiosity.
- The online system for submitting IRB at U of M may not be applicable to people from another institution.
- Needed a little more focus for the hands-on project. I think we spent too long on that.

6.) Overall, I would give this session a grade of:

- A – 12
- B – 4

7.) Additional comments:

- Good
- Great job, especially with the historical perspective.
- I was not interested in this course, but for lack of better options took it. I learned a little, but don't plan to use this information much.
- This was an amazing session!
- Interesting. Was definitely worth my time!

Course Evaluation – Introduction to Epidemiology – Kristine Alpi

MHSLA Annual Conference

October 17, 2012

Novi, MI

Attendees: 26

1.) On a scale of 1 to 4 (with 4 being the highest), rate the instructors

- Kristine Alpi
 - i. Knowledgeable
 - 1. 4 – 21; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - ii. Well-prepared / organized
 - 1. 4 – 17; 3 – 4; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iii. Effective Presenter
 - 1. 4 – 16; 3 – 2; 2 – 3; 1 – 0
 - iv. Responsive to questions
 - 1. 4 – 19; 3 – 3; 2 – 0; 1 – 0

2.) Please check the appropriate rating for each of the following aspects of this session.

Instructional Materials

Were used effectively

- Agree – 19
- Somewhat Agree – 1
- Somewhat Disagree – 2
- Disagree - 1

Were relevant/useful

- Agree – 19
- Somewhat Agree – 5
- Somewhat Disagree - 1

Hands-on sessions were useful

- Agree – 18
- Somewhat Agree – 3
- Somewhat Disagree – 0
- Disagree – 2
- N/A – 1

Session objectives met my expectations

- Agree – 20
- Somewhat Agree – 3
- Somewhat Disagree – 1
- Disagree – 1

Session content was well organized

- Agree – 21
- Somewhat Agree – 3
- Somewhat Disagree – 1

Length was appropriate for course content

- Agree – 15

Somewhat Agree – 9

Somewhat Disagree – 1

I acquired knowledge & skills I can use

Agree – 18

Somewhat Agree – 6

Somewhat Disagree – 1

Facility was conducive to learning

Agree – 24

Somewhat Agree – 1

3.) Identify the major strengths of this session (check one or more)

Instructors-17 Demos/Hands-on-8 Networking-1 Creative Ideas-

Information gained-18 Support materials-13 Other-1: She was very well-spoken

4.) What part of this session was most helpful?

- The handout with all the info and links
- The instructor did seem very knowledgeable and her handouts are extensive.
- Articles included
- Careful explanation of complex topic
- Examples of types of studies and definitions
- Group work
- Group analysis of articles
- The handouts provided good references and definitions.
- Relevant and informative
- Instructor knowledge, hands-on, connection to librarianship
- Group work and detailed handout
- Support materials
- The information. I knew very little about this topic.
- Hands-on assignment
- The examples of actual studies
- Very dynamic instructor
- Group exercise. However overlong, 1-2 papers would be better to allow more discussion time.
- Extensive handouts

5.) What part of this session was least helpful?

- Too much text on slides. Need to spend more time describing the basics of epidemiology
- The hands-on session as I could have used more time to read the article. (I am just slow.)
- Lots of black on screen, rushed, should have had more and longer group work
- Too little time for group work
- Not enough time to cover topic

- Group discussion on articles only one group had read. Would have been nice to have been provided this info ahead of time to familiarize myself so I could understand the discussion.
- None. I enjoyed all of it.
- The handouts need to be redone. I did not find them useful or easy to understand. Tables/charts should be utilized to better present the data.
- Nothing of import

6.) **Overall, I would give this session a grade of:**

- A – 20
- B – 3
- C – 2

7.) **Additional comments:**

- I thought she was a little cold. Group work was kind of pointless. The handout will be useful. Kristine knows her stuff, but needs to work on being a little more personable and interesting when presenting.
- Break up slides with color, less on screen, more group work
- Some of the handouts were not organized and easy to follow.
- Stop saying “Does that make sense?” – Just presume it does.
- I think it would be helpful to email articles to participants ahead of time. Thank you!
- Additional time for group work.
- I could have used a slightly slower pace. I felt rushed.
- Great information; well-organized handouts
- Great job in delivering the class which could be very dry and complicated.
- Wonderful and engaging speaker; content was extremely relevant to our field.
- I wish it was longer.
- Kris did a fantastic job with a complex topic.
- Good class
- More time covering analysis of papers

Course Evaluation – Walking in Nurses Shoes – Joy Kennedy & Pamela Sherwill-Navarro

MHSLA Annual Conference

October 17, 2012

Novi, MI

Attendees: 15

1.) On a scale of 1 to 4 (with 4 being the highest), rate the instructors

- Joy Kennedy
 - i. Knowledgeable
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - ii. Well-prepared / organized
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iii. Effective Presenter
 - 1. 4 – 13; 3 – 2; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iv. Responsive to questions
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
- Pam Sherwill-Navarro
 - i. Knowledgeable
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - ii. Well-prepared / organized
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iii. Effective Presenter
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0
 - iv. Responsive to questions
 - 1. 4 – 14; 3 – 1; 2 – 0; 1 – 0

2.) Please check the appropriate rating for each of the following aspects of this session.

Instructional Materials

Were used effectively

Agree – 14

Somewhat Agree – 1

Were relevant/useful

Agree – 14

Somewhat Agree - 1

Hands-on sessions were useful

Agree – 7

Somewhat Agree – 4

Somewhat Disagree – 1

Disagree – 1

N/A – 2

Session objectives met my expectations

Agree – 12

Somewhat Agree – 3

Session content was well organized

Agree – 13

Somewhat Agree – 2

Length was appropriate for course content

Agree – 12

Somewhat Agree – 3

I acquired knowledge & skills I can use

Agree – 12

Somewhat Agree – 3

Facility was conducive to learning

Agree – 13

Somewhat Agree – 1

Disagree – 1

3.) Identify the major strengths of this session (check one or more)

Instructors-13 Demos/Hands-on-2 Networking-2 Creative Ideas-3
Information gained-12 Support materials-1 Other-0

4.) What part of this session was most helpful?

- Instructors
- The history & license information very helpful & concise
- Learning how nursing profession and education is organized
- Evidence based nursing
- Really liked the credentialing mix and well-rounded mix of the presenters
- Explanation of state of nursing and how they do their jobs
- Direct applications to library
- Information needs of nurses
- Learning viewpoint and needs of nurses in relation to their experience & job title
- Information about nursing profession

5.) What part of this session was least helpful?

- Kind of read from slides
- The gloves! I'm sensitive to latex and it bothered my nose and skin.
- Could have focused on Magnet more
- History of nursing, but it was interesting
- Nurses and social media
- Felt hour of history and licensing section too long

6.) Overall, I would give this session a grade of:

- A – 12
- B – 2

7.) Additional comments:

- The grade is my fault – most of presented info I already knew – not much has changed in nursing

- Gave me a good overview of nursing profession and information needs of nurses. Thank you!
- Room used – continually smelled of cigarette smoke from ventilation system. Not enough soft pretzels for all in the room. Names of instructors not on program!
- Excellent. Very much exceeded my expectations.
- Creative ways to present information
- Great! Thanks!
- A bit long
- Very helpful class – knowledgeable speakers
- Would like more information on how nurses in the hospital access information and what librarians can do to help with that

MHSLA 2012 - Education Committee Expense Report

WEDNESDAY		
CE Course	Expense	Notes
CE - Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects (4 CEU)		
Honorarium	\$ 400.00	
M. Rosenweig Expenses		Hotel expenses included on Local Arrangements Expense Report; Note: Speaker has not yet submitted reimbursement form
I. Zeylikovich Expenses	\$ 40.16	
CE - Introduction to Epidemiology (4 CEU)		
Honorarium	\$ 200.00	
K. Alpi Expenses	\$ 368.80	Hotel expenses included on Local Arrangements Expense Report
CE - Walking in Nurses' Shoes: Information Needs from Novice to Expert (6 CEU)		
Honorarium	\$ 500.00	
J. Kennedy Expenses	\$ 170.60	Hotel expenses included on Local Arrangements Expense Report
P. Sherwill-Navarro Expenses	\$ 489.99	Hotel expenses included on Local Arrangements Expense Report; Includes \$125 for MLA CE certification
THURSDAY		
Program	Expense	Notes
CMED: A New Approach to Medical Education		
Honorarium	\$ 500.00	
E. Yoder Expenses	\$ 141.30	
GMR Update		
Perspectives of an Academic Health Sciences Library Director		
Honorarium	\$ 250.00	
J. Blumenthal Expenses	\$ 39.96	
FRIDAY		
Program	Expense	Notes
Patient Education: Patient Advocates in the New Reform Era		
Honorarium	\$ 250.00	
J. Verdi Expenses	\$ 49.39	
Nurses and Librarians: Research Partners		
Honorarium	\$ 250.00	
C. Medcoff Expenses		Declined reimbursement for expenses
Posters & Lightning Rounds		
B&N Gift Cards - 15 @ \$15	\$ 225.00	Reimbursed to Janet Zimmerman
Thank You Cards	\$ 10.58	Reimbursed to Nancy Bulgarelli
Poster Session Supplies	\$ 85.80	Reimbursed to Janet Zimmerman
MISCELLANEOUS		
Misc - Easels & Name Badges	\$ 189.17	Reimbursed to Janet Zimmerman
Misc - Transportation for Speakers To and From Hotel	\$ 221.05	Reimbursed to Nancy Bulgarelli
TOTAL	\$ 4,381.80	