

Network of the National Library of Medicine Virtual Health Misinformation Symposium

Rubric and Evaluation Information for Submissions.

April 4-7, 2023

This symposium will explore both the research behind health misinformation movements and provide practical and evidence-based solutions to support librarians, health educators, and direct care providers in combating the spread of all types of health misinformation. Topics may include the types of misinformation, history of health misinformation, tips to understand health research, combating social media spread, the effects of health misinformation on individuals and communities, and highlighting replicable programs that Network Members can implement to address health misinformation.

This virtual symposium will feature sessions focused on data, public health, libraries, and general health misinformation.

Objectives

1. Distinguish between the types of misinformation
2. Describe current research regarding health misinformation
3. Identify and implement resources and tools to combat health misinformation, resources and tools
4. Explore programs, projects, and practices related to health misinformation in communities

Yes or No questions

Objectives: Does the proposal meet 1 or more of the symposium objectives.

Yes or No. If no, it doesn't move forward.

Does this topic overlap with other submissions?

Yes or No.

If yes, it is significantly different enough to warrant a session? Or should it be combined into a panel?

This rubric borrows heavily from the [ALA Annual Conference 2023 Rubric](#)

CRITERIA	Excellent = 4	Good = 3	Fair = 2	Poor=1
<p>PROPOSAL TITLE: Does the program title clearly describe the program as proposed?</p> <p><i>Weight: 1</i></p>	Title is strong, clear, and matches the program proposed. Audience can rely on the title for an accurate idea of the topic.	Title is clear and generally relevant to the program as proposed.	Title is difficult to understand and/or is an inaccurate description of the program as proposed.	Title is unrelated to the proposed program.
<p>PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION: Does the program description clearly, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation?</p> <p><i>Weight: 2</i></p>	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand.	Description is clear and generally easy to understand.	Description is unnecessarily verbose and/or difficult to understand.	It is unclear what is being proposed.
<p>TARGET AUDIENCE/RELEVANCE: Who is the target audience and why would this session be relevant to them?</p> <p><i>Weight: 2</i></p>	Target audience is clearly defined & the significance of the topic to that audience is clearly described.	Target audience is specified and the relevance of the topic to that audience is loosely described.	Target audience is generally stated, and the relevance of the topic to that audience is not described.	Target audience and relevance are not described or are described only in vague terms.
<p>LEARNING OUTCOMES (TAKEAWAYS): Are learning outcomes (takeaways) clear, specific, observable, and actionable?</p> <p><i>Weight: 4</i></p>	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are clear and specific. There are at least two measurable goals.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are generally clear and specific. There is at least one learning outcome specified.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are vague and will be difficult to assess.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are not specified.

<p>PERSPECTIVES: Does this presentation offer a unique perspective on Health Misinformation response or target unique outreach or research audiences? - examples include urban, rural health, age groups, professions, etc.</p> <p><i>Weight: 3</i></p>	<p>The session will integrate multiple perspectives and a cohesive theme will be readily apparent to audience. This rating may include presentation of a viewpoint that is underrepresented.</p>	<p>Interaction between multiple perspectives is indicated and some cohesion is likely; the range of perspectives is broad.</p>	<p>The range of perspectives will be narrow.</p>	<p>The presentation of multiple perspectives, if any, is unclear, and there is no diversity of viewpoints.</p>
<p>Qualifications: Does the applicant have appropriate qualifications to speak on the topic proposed?</p> <p><i>Weight: 2</i></p>	<p>The applicant has extensive experiences including but not limited to: formal education, research, field-work or other experience that makes them more than qualified to speak on this topic</p>	<p>The applicant has some experiences including but not limited to: formal education, research, field-work or other experience that makes them more than qualified to speak on this topic</p>	<p>The applicant has a little experience including but not limited to: formal education, research, field-work or other experience that makes them more than qualified to speak on this topic</p>	<p>No degrees, past presentations, or other experiences with the topic</p>
<p>UNIQUE APPROACH OR TOPIC</p> <p><i>Weight:4</i></p>	<p>No other proposals cover this topic or this perspective</p>			<p>This topic and/or perspective are adequately covered in the submissions</p>
<p>IS THE PRESENTER A MEMBER OF A GROUP HISTORICALLY UNDERREPRESENTED IN THEIR PROFESSION?</p> <p><i>Weight 4</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>			<p>No</p>