



News/Announcements

**The 6th International Evidence Based Library and Information Practice Conference (EBLIP6):
Conference Report and Reflections**

© 2011 Brettle, Grant, Fraser, Dalziel, Gardois, Lewis, Kaalvik, and Eldredge. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons-Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike License 2.5 Canada (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/ca/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly attributed, not used for commercial purposes, and, if transformed, the resulting work is redistributed under the same or similar license to this one.

Conference Report

Alison Brettle
Senior Lecturer/Information Specialist
Salford Centre for Nursing Midwifery and
Collaborative Research
University of Salford
Salford, Great Britain, United Kingdom
Email: A.Brettle@salford.ac.uk

Maria Grant
Research Fellow (Information)
Salford Centre for Nursing Midwifery and
Collaborative Research
University of Salford
Salford, Great Britain, United Kingdom
Email: M.J.Grant@salford.ac.uk

The 6th International Evidence Based Library and Information Practice Conference (EBLIP6) was hosted by the School of Nursing and Midwifery at the University of Salford, in Salford Greater Manchester, UK from June 27-30, 2011, and was chaired by Alison Brettle and Maria Grant. Planning for the conference took almost two years following a successful bid to host the conference in September 2009. The

conference was attended in person by 170 delegates from 22 countries and 22 delegates registered to attend online using Elluminate software. Not surprisingly, the highest number of delegates came from the UK (71), although countries which had previously hosted EBLIP conferences were also well represented including Canada (17), Australia (7), USA (21), and Sweden (17). Delegates also traveled from Qatar, Saudi Arabia, India, Japan, Nigeria, Turkey, and Estonia, which suggests that the interest in EBLIP is spreading far and wide. The conference planning extended as far as the weather, with the end of June seeing the best days of the whole British summer!

The conference began with a series of pre-conference workshops, attended by over 40 delegates and facilitated by international experts. The workshops included: An introduction to Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (Andrew Booth), Reflective Practice (Barbara Sen), Critical Appraisal (Lorie Kloda), and an Introduction to Meta-Synthesis (Christine Urquhart). All the workshop sessions and the facilitators were rated as good or excellent by the majority of participants.

The main conference was opened by Professor Tony Warne, Head of School of Nursing and Midwifery, who briefly offered his perspectives on evidence based practice. Peter Brophy followed with an engaging keynote "Why Marvin Fell Out of the Top Floor Window Last Week: Why Narrative Based Practice Matters." Keynotes on the remaining days were from Martin Hall, Vice Chancellor of the University of Salford on "Openness: the essential quality of knowledge" (see commentary in this issue); Ross Todd, Rutgers University, "From Information Literacy to Enquiry: Implementing a Holistic Model of Evidence Based Practice in School Libraries"; and Hazel Hall, Napier University and the Library and Information Science Research Coalition, "Project Output versus influence in practice: Impact as a dimension of research quality" (see commentary in this issue).

The volume of submissions was high, as well as excellent, therefore the main programme was very full and organized into seven parallel sessions representing the conference themes of "Innovation, Education and Research," "Practicality and Applicability," "Outcomes, Impact and Value," and "Theory and Reflection." This translated into 59 presentations which were rated good or excellent by 89% of those who completed the evaluation. A selection of these presentations are summarized and published in this issue and we hope to include more in the future. The 20 poster presenters were given an opportunity to describe their posters in two "Minute Madness" sessions which were enjoyed greatly and highly rated by over three quarters of those who completed the evaluation.

Conferences are not just about presentations, they offer an opportunity to network and socialize with like-minded professionals from a range of backgrounds. Often the favourite part of conferences, we were keen to make sure that the social programme offered plenty of opportunities for this as well as highlighting

local history and culture. Time to show that the North of England is not just flat caps, whippets, and fish and chips! Pre-conference, there were visits to two historical libraries: Chetham Library, the oldest lending library in the world; and the Working Class Library, which offers an insight into the history from the Industrial Revolution. The pre-conference day ended with a pub quiz at the "Ape and Apple" where a joint team of EBLIP6 chairs and EBLIP journal editors managed a pretty good showing! At the end of the first day, the welcome reception held in Salford Art Gallery and Museum provided opportunities to meet the Mayor of Salford whilst enjoying local delicacies of meat and potato pie and red cabbage followed by Manchester Tart. The conference dinner held at Manchester United's famous football ground "Old Trafford" was for some "one of the most memorable evenings of their lives" and even for supporters of rival teams a "great evening despite the venue." The evening began with a chance to wander round the museum, admire the trophies (although the cabinet was a bit emptier than the previous season), and drink wine. The evening continued with jazz music, a brief history of the club, and a chance to go into the stadium during the dinner itself. At the end of the final day, delegates attended a historical pub crawl (which comprised far more history than local ales) and an evening meal in Manchester's China town.

Andrew Booth closed the conference with his personal reflections on the conference and the status of Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (see commentary in this issue). Andrew also presented the awards for best presentations and posters. The winners of the award for Best Presentation (by IPC and Audience Vote) were Kate Davis, Queensland University of Technology, and Zaana Howard, Swinburn University of Technology for their "Redesigning Evidence Based Practice for Wicked Problem Solving." Winners of the IPC best poster were Philip Kroth, Holly Philips, and Jonathan Eldredge, University of New Mexico for their "Evaluation of an Evidence Based

Scholarly Communication Conference Focused on Support of Translational Investigators Using a Prospective Longitudinal Cohort Design.” The winner of Best Poster as voted for by conference delegates was Mary Dunne, Health Research Board, Ireland for her “Barriers and Facilitators to Research Use: The Role” (this has been written up as a paper and is included in this issue). A full list of winners (including those who were highly commended) was given in issue 6(3): 94-95 of this journal.

Presentations from the conference are available from the conference website (www.salford.eblip6.ac.uk) and will ultimately be hosted on the University of Salford Repository along with podcasts of the presentations which took place in the main hall. Watch this space for details of when these become available.

Report from Day 1, Tuesday, June 28, 2011
(used with permission from the Library and Information Science Research Coalition blog)

Katie Fraser
Information Librarian
Leicester University
Leicester, Great Britain, United Kingdom
Email: KCF5@le.ac.uk

The day kicked off with a quick welcome from Tony Warne, Head of School of Nursing at the University of Salford, talking about information literacy and the teacher-student relationship. He was followed by the first of the conference keynotes, Peter Brophy. Peter took us through the role of narrative in evidence based practice, from the stories that our users tell about our information services, to its underlying importance in capturing the complexity of our own everyday practice. It was a great start to the day, and by the end of the session I'd already had a conversation on Twitter channel with an envious follower of the feed wishing that they were here!

I attended parallel sessions on academic libraries and information literacy, both everyday strands of my own work. Several of the talks picked up on Peter's ideas about the complexity inherent in library work, particularly those talks focusing on assessment and the challenges of reducing complex information behaviours to a mark scheme! I'll definitely be considering some of these ideas in my own teaching. However, my favourite talk looked outside the world of library instruction. Allyson Washburn and Sheila Bibb – who teach an Applied Anthropology course – had asked anthropology students to conduct a series of ethnographic studies on student use of the library as coursework. It was fascinating to hear how the students had investigated the same topic from a variety of different angles, and there was also food for thought about the untapped opportunities academic librarians have to collaborate with departments in order to gather evidence: recruiting social scientists to help us gather evidence, computer scientists to develop our online services, and so on.

The session I enjoyed most, however, was a little bit more outside my professional comfort zone, the post-lunch discussion on “Theory and Models of EBLIP.” I was hoping to get an overview of how researchers and practitioners see evidence based practice from this conference, and the three talks harmonized perfectly to answer this question. First Helen Partridge asked us to challenge what constitutes evidence in library and information practice. She suggested that most of our ideas about evidence based practice were inherited, and that we need to consider what constitutes “good” evidence in our own profession, and demonstrate that its use can transform practice. Denise Koufogiannakis followed this up with a discussion about the non-traditional types of evidence that library and information professionals use: “local evidence” like user feedback, usage data, and observations gained in context; and “professional knowledge,” which is often tacit (highly contextual and

difficult to explain) or produced by reflection on our own practice. Finally, Barbara Sen and Chris Lee spoke about evidence and reflection. Both, they emphasized, are about critically examining everyday practice. Each uses a different approach to examine that practice, but in the end they're highly complementary. No research could begin without reflection on potential explanations and approaches to studying a problem.

Overall, it was interesting to hear that the library and information community is only just starting to reach an overview of how it sees and uses evidence based practice itself.

Report from Day 2, Wednesday, June 29, 2011

(used with permission from the Library and Information Science Research Coalition blog)

Katrina Dalziel
Deputy Subject Librarian (Medicine)
Swansea University
Swansea, Wales, United Kingdom
Email: k.dalziel@swansea.ac.uk

There was rain in Manchester this morning but by the time the conference got under way on Wednesday the skies were already brightening!

The morning keynote session was delivered by Professor Martin Hall, Vice Chancellor of the University of Salford, our conference host. In "Openness: the Essential Quality of Knowledge" Martin gave a thought-provoking and entertaining talk focused on the question "What should a fully open-access university, structured around an open access repository for publications, resources, and data sets, look like?" He argued that openness drives the knowledge economy. The closure of knowledge restricts innovation and is alien to the essential qualities of a university, especially in the context of how and why universities were established and evolved: to allow experts or academics in a field to share their knowledge in exchange for academic reputation. He asked publishers to

look at their current business models and develop tools that could aid open access publishing and encourage a new era of openness in the world of academia. One comment made by Martin that was particularly popular with the audience was that he considers all people involved in populating and promoting open access repositories as heroes. It was good to hear that librarians and information professionals are appreciated in this role!

This first keynote session was followed by "Poster Madness." This was a one minute madness presentation opportunity for those delegates presenting posters at the conference. I hadn't experienced the one minute format before and was thoroughly impressed by the participants' ability to provide coherent outlines of their research in such a short period of time. There was a second madness session in the afternoon, so I review both together here. I feel that I need to make special mention of those presenters that particularly impressed me. Mary Dunne from the Health Research Board in Ireland presented one minute on her "Barriers and Facilitators to Research Use: the Role of Library and Information Services" in poetry form. I also enjoyed Emma Thompson's minute. She remarked on her position as one of just a couple of business librarians attending the conference. She questioned how to encourage *all* subject librarians to get involved in EBLIP. "EBP by stealth" was her recommendation!

After the morning coffee break I attended the "Innovation, Education and Research: Theory and Searching" strand. Jason Eyre of De Montfort University discussed an alternative outcome to "The PITSTOP Project (Supporting Students on Placement Using Social Media)." In "Learning by Example: Developing Evidence Based Library and Information Practice Through Supporting Academic Programmes with a Culture of Evidence Based Practice," his main message was that social workers work in a "real" world environment where peer approval, time constraints and other issues mean that EBP

is NOT practiced. We need to remember that our students will be moving into real world situations and careers, where they may not even have access to the suite of resources that their academic library provides. Our teaching of information literacy (IL) needs to fit with this experience, and empathy is key. This presentation made me reflect on how I approach IL instruction with nursing and medical students and how we need to offer advice and training that can fit into the real world of our students.

The afternoon keynote session of the day was delivered by Dr. Ross J. Todd, Associate Professor in the School of Communication and Information at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and Director of the Center for International Scholarship in School Libraries (CISSL) at Rutgers University. This was another inspirational keynote address, this time reflecting on EBP from the School Librarianship perspective.

The whole day was informative, engaging, and thought provoking. I have a lot to reflect on in my own practice as an academic library professional and many issues to consider relating to how our profession can embrace EBP more fully. I think perhaps a good starting point would be the adoption of the evidence *for* practice, evidence *in* practice, and evidence *of* practice holistic model in both our practice and research activities.

Report from Day 3, Thursday, June 30, 2011

(used with permission from the Library and Information Science Research Coalition blog)

Paolo Gardois
PhD student
School of Health and Related Research. Sheffield University
Sheffield, Great Britain, United Kingdom
Email: paolo.gardois@sheffield.ac.uk

Professor Hazel Hall opened the final day of EBLIP6 in Salford with a thought-provoking keynote speech on “impact.” Both patrons and managers demand services that really make a difference, and impact may take different forms: from changing users’ information behaviours, to assessing academic impact through bibliometric measures, or evaluating services based on specific outcome measures – especially in the academic sector. Also, impact is very difficult to measure and evaluate. The impact of research on practice, for example, is often dependent on the cumulative and indirect effect of practitioners’ exposure to research output. Impact counts, anyway! In the current economic climate research must demonstrate that it actually has an impact on practice, and that the research–practice gap should be bridged or at least reduced. Hazel then shared with the audience evidence emerging from the LIS Research Coalition’s RiLIES project which is due to report later this year. Several factors play a key role in increasing research uptake by practitioners: quality, scale, and applicability of research itself; means of face-to-face dissemination; availability of accessible textual sources to be used as a reference in daily practice; high profile dissemination partners; and – last but not least – individuals who act as research connectors, as well as social media. Hazel finished her presentation by referring to the question “What difference does it make?” appropriately citing the Smiths, whose Salford Lads’ Club photograph is now one of the most iconic in British music history.

Later in the morning parallel section 6 focused on a range of topics: Web-based services to enhance users’ experience of library services; analysis of electronic resources usage by patrons as a key indicator of value generated by academic library services; the development of evidence based services in academic and health libraries, and their impact on quality improvement. As budgets shrink and patrons’ expectations rise, all three sessions offered really

useful tools to improve service provision and demonstrate value for money.

The session before lunch showed an innovative and interactive format: the LIS Research Coalition organized a panel session involving LIS practitioners and journal editors. The session aimed to improve communication between the two parties and help information professionals plan the publication of their work with a better understanding of the goals and practical steps involved in editorial processes. For example, the editors advised the careful project-management of any potential publication, paying close attention to the information needs of the target journal's audience, and not to underestimate the value of what professionals have to say to their colleagues and peers. Aiming for a high standard of work is important, but the editors encouraged members of the audience not to be obsessed with perfection. Peer reviewers can help improve the quality of work submitted with their feedback. Importantly, the peer review process should be viewed as a dialogue during which both parties have a potential to learn. Also worth emphasizing was the difference between research and practice based articles, for both of which there are specific LIS journals. Even negative results, which are rarely published, are of great interest to audiences.

After a refreshing lunch and a final look at the posters (of amazing variety and really high quality), delegates were ready for the last two sessions of the conference. Parallel session 7 engaged the audience on a wide array of issues related to innovation and development of services, including the role of libraries in the management of scientific datasets, performance measurement techniques such as activities-based costing, methodological reflections on best practices and the uptake of an evidence based approach in library services, and the available evidence base for evaluating the effectiveness of Web 2.0 services. A specific session gauged the progress of evidence based practice in the health sector. Here topics

included the value of services offered by NHS libraries, the efficient use of bibliographic databases, and the impact of clinical librarianship on patient care and organizational objectives.

Then the time came for the closing address by Andrew Booth, who underlined the multidimensional and complex nature of "evidence based library and information practice." Virtually all the vocabulary used in the label can be discussed and modified, and the EBLIP6 conference had proved a valuable forum for the concepts to be discussed. Andrew also pondered the future of EBLIP. One key development resides in focusing less on research and randomized controlled trials and more and more on what really needs to be done to improve users' experience in a really messy world. Andrew referred to the concept of "knowledge interaction," which accounts for the need for genuine partnership between actors. Picking up on previous speakers' references to music (keynotes Dr. Ross Todd and Professor Hazel Hall had cited Bjork and the Smiths respectively), Andrew recited his own version of the lyrics of the Go-Go's "My Lips Are Sealed" to close the formal programme. Then awards were conferred and votes of thanks given. Finally it was "Goodbye Salford" after a very interesting and stimulating three days.

Conference Reflection

Suzanne Lewis
Manager, Central Coast Health Service Library
Northern Sydney Central Coast Health
Gosford, New South Wales, Australia
Email: slewis@nscchahs.health.nsw.gov.au

The themes of EBLIP6 were theory and reflection; outcomes, impact and value; practicality and applicability; and innovation, education and research, with the concurrent sessions organized according to the four themes. The theme I found most interesting was theory and reflection, as the speakers in these sessions

challenged their audiences to think about what comprises the evidence on which we claim to base our practice. This was appropriate for the 6th biennial EBLIP conference as it signals that over the last 12 years the paradigm has developed and matured. LIS practitioners are no longer solely concerned with demonstrating EBLIP in practice, but are now (re)examining the theoretical basis of EBLIP and pausing to reflect on how the model might be developed and improved by recognizing points of convergence and synergies with other disciplines and theoretical models.

Helen Partridge from Queensland University of Technology, Australia, challenged the assumption that evidence in LIS is derived solely or even mainly from research. This idea was expanded by Denise Koufogiannakis from the University of Alberta, Canada, who considered the place of practice based evidence in EBLIP. Evidence apart from formal, published research has a valid place in EBLIP and includes local, user-centred evidence such as usage statistics, user feedback, librarian observation, reports from colleagues, evaluation of progress, plus professional knowledge which includes informal and formal learning, tacit knowledge, and reflection. The challenge, of course, is how to capture practice based evidence, particularly tacit and corporate knowledge, which may explain why this kind of evidence has, to date, taken second place to research based evidence in the EBLIP paradigm.

Barbara Sen and Chris Lee from the University of Sheffield, UK, examined the commonality and divergence between the EBLIP model of library and information practice and the SEA-change (Situation, Evidence, Action) reflective model developed by Barbara. They acknowledged being inspired by Denise's editorial on reflective practice in the *EBLIP* journal (Koufogiannakis, 2010), and also Andrew Booth's "5 mirrors" model of reflection. All three papers challenged some of my assumptions about EBLIP and prompted me to consider aspects of my own professional practice relating to practice based

knowledge and the value of reflection in informing practice.

Continuing with the stream of theory and reflection, the awards for best paper (delegates' choice) and best paper (judged by the conference committee) both went to Kate Davis from Queensland University of Technology, Australia, for her presentation entitled "Redesigning Evidence Based Practice for Wicked Problem Solving." This was an innovative and challenging conceptual paper which claimed that EBP focuses on answering the "easy" questions which have already been addressed by research. But what about complex, "wicked" problems for which there is no published evidence and which require agile, innovative thinking? Kate and her co-author Zaana Howard (Swinburne University of Technology, Australia) proposed incorporating elements of design thinking and EBP into a hybrid approach to complex problems. It's a fascinating idea and you can find out more at Kate's website (<http://katedavis.info>).

Apart from the formal program, two highlights of EBLIP6 for me were the conference dinner and Poster Madness! In the Madness session, poster presenters had one minute to "sell" their poster to the delegates. A clock counted down on the screen behind them as they spoke and a siren sounded when time was up. Despite the pressure, all the participants performed very well but the prize for the most entertaining "madness" presentation went to Mary Dunne of the Health Research Board, Ireland, who delivered an overview of "Barriers and Facilitators to Research Use: The Role of Library and Information Services" entirely in rhyming verse!

Finally, conference delegates were given the opportunity to visit what some might argue is the heart of Manchester – the Old Trafford football stadium, home of the Manchester United soccer club. Pre-dinner drinks were served in the Old Trafford museum and trophy room, where we browsed the glittering prizes

and memorabilia of the club. We enjoyed dinner overlooking the famous pitch.

The EBLIP6 conference brought together delegates from the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Scandinavia, India, Nigeria, the West Indies, Japan, Belgium, Taiwan, the Netherlands, and more. I look forward to continuing my involvement with EBLIP which is now a truly international community going from strength to strength.

Conference Reflection

Hilde Kaalvik
Sør Trøndelag University College
Trondheim, Norway
Email: hilde.kaalvik@hist.no

Comment on article presentation by Ib Lundgren: "The Student and the Information Search Process: Library Development Using Student Voices"

First, I would like to start by congratulating the author for his interesting contribution to the conference. Ib Lundgren works as a librarian at Malmö University Library. He primarily works with user services. His study is part of a two year ongoing project at Malmö University. One of the main objectives of the project is to contribute to student retention. To succeed on that, I guess a good start is letting the starting point be - the students! And that's exactly what this study does.

Lundgren's project attempts to reveal new knowledge about students' information search process, from the student point of view. Important questions on this topic are: "How do the students formulate their problems concerning information literacy?"; "What is the students' knowledge?"; and, "What exactly are their problems?" To find out more about these issues Lundgren and his team analyzed the book-a-librarian-service. Students have the possibility to book a librarian for an hour session of guided information searching. They book the session online by filling out a form

where they have to answer some questions. These questions actually reveal their problems when it comes to information literacy. It appears that the so-called 'helpless student' feels completely lost, asking questions she thinks are just silly. Lundgren's example is a student writing: "I'm lost. I want to know how you search a subject. How can I know what has already been done and what kind of literature I have to read? It might be silly to ask questions like this but as I said I'm lost." The quite opposite student writes: "Having trouble finding scientific articles, I'm mostly finding reviews." The first question reveals that the student hardly knows anything about searching databases for literature. Then you have her opposite - the student who knows much about information literacy, therefore asking questions revealing good knowledge about her search strategy. Lundgren and his team are doing this content analysis because they want to develop their services for the students and, in the long run, become an inclusive learning environment at the University.

After finishing the analysis of the book-a-librarian-service they are able to draw some conclusions. Most importantly, they find that there is a great range between the 'driven' student and the much more helpless student when it comes to the knowledge of information literacy and the search process. It's also important to notice that both kinds of students co-exist in the same classroom, and of course in the same library. Lundgren discusses that this diversity among students poses a pedagogical challenge concerning how the library should meet the different needs of a more and more heterogeneous student population. Based on the results of the book-a-librarian analyses, Lundgren concludes that the library should offer a diversity of services and solutions. With this in mind, they have developed their practices regarding IL learning activities as well as the design of the physical library environment and web services.

Why do I find Lundgren's study interesting? It is well known that as a teacher you have to be aware of the differences in knowledge amongst students. Level of differentiation and individualization of teaching is a discussion we've had for a long time in education and pedagogy in Norway and many other countries. Lundgren's study shows that librarians should or could do something more than just adjust teaching in information literacy (IL). The study shows that it's obviously desirable amongst students to make changes that adjust library services to the great differences in student's IL knowledge. What I find interesting is the reflection and that Lundgren and his team collected information before implementing changes to improve service. I think it's important to let student voices be the starting point for changes in the library. The students are our customers and that means we should be aware of how they think and what their problems might be. If you don't reflect, don't do some work to find out what your customer really needs and wants from your services, I'm afraid you might tend to just go on doing things like you always have done. That might be easy and comfortable, but it just can't be smart thinking in the long run. The information crisis we are watching nowadays on the internet shows me that the librarian should be a guide for the students and help them to help themselves.

In the article "Eleven Steps to EBLIP Service" (2009), Andrew Booth concludes by saying: "Above all, our mantra should be 'don't work harder, work smarter' - where smart means using your time and other resources more efficiently, more effectively and more economically." I think that's what Lundgren is trying to achieve by letting the students' voices be in the center of the study.

I work as a librarian at the University College in Sør-Trøndelag. My education is both teacher and librarian. I teach students IL and I always try to reflect by asking myself: "Do I do the right thing when it comes to how I teach?" I often discuss with my colleagues who also teach if we

ought to make some changes. We've thought about the challenge because of the differences in the students' knowledge gaps. In fact, they are all different, and I think you have to teach with this as a starting point. You should ask yourself: "How can I succeed teaching IL?" What we have done recently is to have different kinds of tasks. Some are easy, some are more difficult. In this way the more clever student doesn't just sit and wait, updating her facebook profile because she's already done with the exercises waiting for the more lost ones who really need time to finish. This is an easy thing to do, but not too obvious when you haven't done it before or if you don't know how different the knowledge amongst students is when it comes to IL. Another really important issue is how to teach so it works. That's another question I think the librarians should be aware of and research. Are we all good teachers? How should you teach to be able to give the students new knowledge? Do they really learn or do you just teach without thinking about the learning process? Do you have in mind that learning by doing is important? If you find they seem to be bored or don't listen to what you have to say - could it perhaps have to do with your way of teaching? You have to teach how to teach. To reflect on why, what, and how to do things both in the classroom and in the library is the most important thing in my job as a librarian.

My conference experience was entirely positive. Both the social aspect and the academic content had a very high standard. I was a first time delegate and would really love to join EBLIP7. On the plane from Norway to Manchester I was in such a great conference mood and looking forward to meeting the rest of the delegates. Attending a conference is a bit like going into a new dimension. It's like we're all thinking: "Hey, we're all in the same boat hoping to get to know each other and gain some new knowledge on our way!" When I arrived in Manchester, the sun was shining and I had some fish and chips and a local beer. Piccadilly Garden was crowded and children were jumping in and out of the big water fountain. When I went on a double-decker

bus the next morning, after a very tasteful English breakfast at Ramada Hotel, I thought to myself: "This start is so good, will the conference meet my expectations?" My answer is: "Yes, it did!"

Conference Reflection

Jonathan Eldredge
Associate Professor
Health Sciences Library and Informatics Center
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico, United States of America
Email: jeldredge@salud.unm.edu

As if following an unconscious symmetry, EBLIP6 circled back to the U.K. on the tenth anniversary of the First International Evidence Based Librarianship Conference (EBLIP1) held in Sheffield during 2001. This writer keynoted at EBLIP1 during 2001 so the occasion of his attending EBLIP6 during 2011 prompted him to reflect on the comparisons and contrasts of the two conferences. This reflection piece will focus upon geographic and sectorial representation of attendees, the worldwide EBLIP community, and the research methods referenced at the two conferences.

Sheffield University's Andrew Booth and his colleagues sponsored EBLIP1 amidst growing excitement about the relatively new concept of Evidence Based Librarianship. EBLIP1 included participants from non-U.K. countries such as one each from Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, and the US. Two attendees hailed from Sweden. Otherwise, EBLIP1 was largely a U.K. centred event. EBLIP1 still featured remarkable UK-origin presentations originating in the U.K. such as Catherine Beverley and M. Alison Winning's "Clinical Librarianship: a Systematic Review" (2003) and Alison Brettle's "Information Skills Training," which later was published as a systematic review (2003). Ellen Crumley and Denise Koufogiannakis presented their first effort to define the subject domains of librarianship, which still inform current research

(Eldredge, Harris, & Ascher, 2009). Other presenters included Anne Brice, Maria Grant, and Margaret Haines who all continue to be luminaries in librarianship. EBLIP6, in contrast, could truly claim international attendance. As noted elsewhere in the compilation of reports, 22 countries were represented at EBLIP6.

U.K. health sciences librarians were the principal attendees at EBLIP1 so conference themes and perceptions of EBLIP concomitantly followed these attendance patterns. At that time EBLIP (or, "EBL" as it was then called) was having difficulty distinguishing itself from Evidence Based Medicine despite the strenuous efforts of EBLIP pioneers to establish a distinct identity. Perhaps health sciences librarians were so steeped in their own collaborative roles in Evidence Based Medicine that this distinction inevitably took a couple of more years to take hold for all health sciences librarians.

EBLIP6 during June 27-30, 2011 still attracted a contingent of librarians and other information professionals from the health sciences. The decided shift of EBLIP toward a multi-sectorial movement was reflected in the attendance by academic, corporate, government agency, non-governmental organization, public, research institute, school, and special librarians. As proved to be the case in 2001, however, academic and health sciences librarians presented most research paper or posters. Could this pattern reflect the fact that these presenters have far more institutional incentives to research and present their findings at professional conferences? This writer has distinguished between EBLIP producers and consumers for a number of years (Eldredge, 2008). EBLIP6 confirmed this pattern since, while all attendees were interested in applying evidence in their decision-making, only a minority of librarians produce applied research evidence. Producers, it turns out, originate from institutions offering incentives to conduct that research. This pattern suggests the need for librarians and other information professionals who apply evidence in their practices to articulate their most

important research questions so that evidence producers' research will be aligned with these professionals' needs.

EBLIP1 provided plentiful tea and meal time opportunities for face-to-face social networking among attendees. EBLIP1 focused primarily on such conference-bound socializing venues. EBLIP6 provided a contrast, beginning with a Pub Quiz at the Ape and Ale Pub in Manchester the night before the EBLIP6 opened. Teams formed quickly and competed readily amidst much merriment. During EBLIP6 groups of attendees continued their discussions following the last official conference events of the evening by migrating to pubs for conversations, some extending into the late night. Overall, EBLIP6 displayed the characteristics of a more mature social movement with recognizable interlocking informal social networks. Over the years a number of EBLIP conference attendees have developed close professional and even personal friendships.

The aforementioned EBLIP1 paper and poster presentations were based upon both quantitative and qualitative research methods. EBLIP6 similarly offered both quantitative and qualitative research methods, just in far greater volume of papers ($n = 57$) and posters ($n = 23$) and far greater diversity of methods represented. Abstracts of papers and posters can be accessed at the EBLIP6 website <http://www.eblip6.salford.ac.uk/abstracts.php>.

This writer has attended all six EBLIP conferences. The many changes in the conferences over the years prompted this writer to wonder about the next 10 to 20 years. Past EBLIP conferences have been hosted in the U.K., Canada, the U.S.A., Australia, and Sweden. In what exciting new venues will future EBLIP

conferences occur? What future developments await us at future EBLIP conferences?

References

- Beverley, C. A. & Winning, M. A. (2003). Clinical librarianship: a systematic review of the literature. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 20(Suppl. 1), 10-21. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2532.20.s1.2.x
- Booth, A. (2009). Eleven steps to EBLIP service. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 26(1), 81-84. doi:10.1111/j.1471-1842.2008.00836.x
- Brettell, A. (2003). Information skills training: a systematic review of the literature. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 20(Suppl. 1), 3-9. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2532.20.s1.3.x
- Eldredge, J. D. (2008). Evidence-based practice. In M. S. Wood (Ed.). *Introduction to Health Sciences Librarianship*, (pp. 241-269). New York: The Haworth Press.
- Eldredge J. D., Harris, M. R., & Ascher, M. T. (2009). Defining the Medical Library Association research agenda: methodology and final results from a consensus process. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 97(3), 178-185. doi:10.3163/1536-5050.97.3.006
- Koufogiannakis, D. (2010). Reflections on Practice. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 5(2), 1-3. Retrieved 29 Nov. 2011 from <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/8266/6971>