

**Name: Kathryn Greenhill**

**Organisation or group: University of South Australia**

**Are you responding on behalf of your organisation? N**

**Do you give permission to make this submission public? Y**

---

Thank for the comprehensive and consultative effort by the team behind the Pathways project.

I appreciated the chance to provide fuller feedback at the workshop in Adelaide. Below are some further comments.

---

**TL;DR**

1. The competencies lists are extremely useful for educators in university courses
2. A separate Code of Ethics document must underpin the Pathways process. We cannot clearly know, or communicate, our skills, knowledge and ethics without this
3. Behavioural Skills in Active Professionalism are both foundational and can form part of tertiary courses. This is not shown in the conceptual diagram.
4. A fourteenth behavioural skill should be added "*Comfort with change and ambiguity*"
5. The following qualities should be better articulated in the framework:
  - Collaborative skills
  - Critical thinking about information sources and content
6. Extent of achievement needs to be clear when the framework is used, particularly with accreditation of courses

**Q9 – use of Framework in education**

I teach three courses in the Information Management Program at UniSA:

- INFS 5104 Information Management Foundations
- INFS 5079 Information Retrieval
- INFS 5134 Scholarly Communications

The last competencies statement in December 2020 was an incredibly useful document for me as an educator – providing clear guidance about what I should teach, and an authoritative place to point students toward.

I use the Foundational Competencies and Ethics/Core Values statement extensively in INFS 5104. Students study the competencies in the first few weeks of the ten week course, as the spine to topics about professionalism, basic duties in archives/records/libraries and different types of info services.

The competencies clarify exactly what their program will be teaching them, and contextualises all future courses. I encourage students to ensure they understand what each concept means, and to return to these as a touchstone if they feel like they are being taught something irrelevant, or believe there is a gap in their course material throughout their education.

Ethics are covered as part of the Regulatory Framework around Week Seven. We cover basic ethical theories, and look at IFLA's ethics statement. Then it gets a bit more complex than it needs to. It is difficult for me to explain exactly how the various values/ethics/constitutional endorsement documents fit together. Students are confused between ethics (values behind decisions) are mixed in with more operational elements. For example, in the core values statement, "management, organisation and preservation of the human record", an action that could be carried out malevolently or benevolently, is right next to "excellence, accountability, integrity and responsibility to our communities".

The pathways are about ensuring Information Professionals understand skills, knowledge and ethics. I would strongly advocate that ALIA adopt a clear Code of Ethics to complement the Code of Conduct for members. This should separate aspirational values from the \*how\* of operations. For example, "Encouraging non-users of libraries to become users" is conduct that may have an ethical basis, but is not in itself a statement of ethics.

A clear statement of ethics document is not just a "nice to have" that would be supplementary to the Pathways process. The Pathways project is about communicating and fostering specific ethics of our profession, so these ethics need to be far easier to locate, use and understand.

**Q8 Conceptual Design**

Active Professionalism, as a separate overarching element does not sufficiently communicate where behavioural skills should sit. They are foundational. They also can (and should) be taught as part of university courses.

I am very grateful for the behavioural skills list in the current competencies. I use these in INFS 5104 and INFS 5134. In the first, foundational, course, the behavioural skills provide justification for the last week of the course, which is about "Reflective practice, care, self-care".

In the second course, scholarly communications, I use an online tool (SPARKPlus : <https://sparkplus.com.au/using-sparkplus.php> ) where students rate themselves and fellow team members on the thirteen behavioural skills. This gives them chance to see what the qualities look like when expressed in other people's behaviour and to consider their own strengths and weaknesses. In their assessed reflection on their teamwork, students articulate which qualities were the most useful in their class project, and which would be most useful in the profession. The list of behavioural skills provides a meaningful, industry-based set of criteria for them to use in this exercise.

**Q6 Changes to Active Professionalism**

Please add a behavioural skill – **Comfort with change and ambiguity** .

As part of their analysis of competencies in Australian scholarly communications librarians, Kingsley et al. (2022) compared competencies statements from a number of international bodies. Their supplementary analysis (Kingsley, 2021) identified a key quality “comfort with change and ambiguity”, which features in NASIG Core Competencies for Scholarly Communication Librarians (Rodriguez, 2018).

This is not currently reflected in the list of behavioural skills, but is essential for every single position in library and information services.

**FURTHER DOT POINTS**

- “Collaboration” needs to be more strongly highlighted in the model. The ability to collaborate with peers, within the wider organisation and with external bodies is essential
- “Critical Thinking about information sources and content” needs to be stronger. Understanding of mal/mis/dis information and bullshit. Going beyond checklists of cute acronyms, but ability to critique WHY information is being framed and shared in a particular way, and the social/political impacts of this.
- Extent of achievement of outcomes needs to be indicated in the framework, not just the outcomes themselves. “Research” as taught in a Cert IV course is very different to that within a Masters with dissertation.

**REFERENCES**

- Kingsley, D. (2021). Comparison of competency lists for scholarly communication in relation to their use in a research study: "Scholarly Communication knowledge and skills in Australasian research institutions".  
<https://doi.org/10.25911/5BPD-6X95>
- Kingsley, D., Kennan, M. A., & Richardson, J. (2022). Scholarly communication competencies: An analysis of confidence among Australasian library staff. *College and Research Libraries*.  
<https://doi.org/10.25911/45BB-9Y24>
- Rodriguez, M. (2018). NASIG core competencies for Scholarly Communication librarians. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 35(3), 306–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07317131.2018.1456869>