

Name: HLi Committee

Website: <https://hlinc.org.au/>

Organisation or group: Health Libraries Inc.

Are you responding on behalf of your organisation? Y

Do you give permission to make this submission public? Y

The Professional Pathways [Consultation Paper](#) invites you to respond to a number of questions about the draft framework and future career pathways in the LIS sector. To aid your response to the Paper, the questions are reproduced below. You do not have to answer every question. If you prefer to write a submission in a different format that is also fine but please include the information above in your submission.

Submissions should be emailed to professionalpathways@alia.org.au with the word "submission" in the subject line. Submissions are due by 31 October 2022.

Further information is available from the Professional Pathways website or by emailing professionalpathways@alia.org.au

Section	No	Question
2.2	Q1	<p>Do you believe that the 10 core values remain relevant for the LIS sector today? Please explain your reasons.</p> <p>A clear description that defines the LIS (library and information sector), including roles and sector boundaries, is needed to understand who the values apply to and how they might differ between roles.</p> <p>The paper states that, "values and ethics are at the core of professional practice across the library and information sector" but they do not adequately distinguish the sector. Most of the core values listed are applicable to any professional, not just LIS professionals (e.g. 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10). Other professions that work with information, such as accountants, financial advisors, solicitors and teachers, would subscribe to most if not all of the values listed. While values are relevant to the LIS sector, they do not establish the core professional practice of LIS workers.</p> <p>In addition, some core values (e.g. 2, 3, 4 and 10) can be integrated for simplicity. The 7th value on the 'human' record is unclear as there are many different record types worth preserving.</p> <p>The concept of knowledge exchange should be considered as a key LIS value.</p>
2.2	Q2	<p>Do you agree with the range and scope of the proposed Foundation Knowledge domains? Please explain the reasons for your responses.</p>

Foundation domains:

The LIS is distinguished by professional knowledge and the work that knowledge enables. Core knowledge and expertise is a conspicuous omission from the foundation domains. A cynical view is that knowledge has been deliberately omitted to move away from professional qualifications in favour of micro-credentials.

Moreover, the foundation domains lack specificity. The list comprises of areas many professionals require to operate competently. It is not a sufficient list for academic, government or special libraries.

Regarding the domains, 'wider information contexts' and 'sector and organisational contexts' are universal to practising as a professional. All professionals must understand the contexts in which information relevant to their profession is originated and described, events that impact their profession, legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and standards, terminologies and vocabularies. Successful professionals, across a range of industries, also need to understand their employer organisation. This does not define our sector.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges, cultures and Country is essential however, inclusion under both foundation and knowledge is confusing. We question this duplication when other foundational areas have been overlooked (e.g. core professional knowledge, information needs of communities/library users and technology).

Meeting the information needs of LIS communities is foundational, with special knowledge required for minority groups. This foundation is missing from the framework.

Professional knowledge domains:

Knowledge domains in the framework are weighted towards a public or state library environment. There are missing knowledge domains such as collection management, subscription management, marketing, website design, content creation, technology development and innovation.

Technology and the LIS are now inseparable, but this is not evident in the framework.

Relationship to education:

If the foundation domains are considered fundamental, ALIA needs to communicate with the tertiary sector to ensure all domains are encompassed in accredited LIS course curriculums. The framework must influence and be influenced by LIS tertiary education, while also providing clarity for workers in the sector who do not hold LIS qualifications.

<p>2.2</p>	<p>Q3</p>	<p>Are there any elements that you would add, amend, or remove from the Foundation Knowledge domains? Please explain the reasons for your responses.</p> <p>A better starting point would be to review the current accredited LIS course curriculums to assess what is and isn't covered as professional knowledge requiring training. The lack of connectivity between LIS education and this draft framework is a major flaw in the project design.</p> <p>The four foundational domains provide a generic basis for professional practice instead of a foundation for professional LIS practice. This can be addressed by adding core professional knowledge as a foundation domain – or as the basis for the framework. If the sector does not have unique professional knowledge, then we are de-valued by ALIA.</p> <p>Without core knowledge, the foundation domain is generic and meaningless.</p> <p>The professional knowledge domains 'information services', 'information management', 'literacies and learning' are foundational and relevant throughout the LIS. Likewise, all LIS workers and institutions in the sector must be engaging with their communities. The design of the framework does not communicate the compulsory nature of some knowledge domains over others.</p>
<p>2.3</p>	<p>Q4</p>	<p>Do you agree with the range and scope of the proposed Professional Knowledge domains? Please explain the reasons for your responses.</p> <p>As stated above, some professional knowledge domains such as 'information services' are relevant to everyone working in the LIS sector. Whatever their role, and no matter how specialised, all LIS workers must be contributing to the "delivery of data, information and knowledge services that connect users with the resources they need at the right time and place, and in the right format". Many of the professional knowledge domains do not represent career specialisations. They are foundational and would provide a better context to build on than the four foundational domains presented.</p>
<p>2.3</p>	<p>Q5</p>	<p>Are there any elements that you would add, amend, or remove from the Professional Knowledge domains? Please explain the reasons for your responses</p> <p>As mentioned above, 'information services', 'information management' and 'literacies and learning' are foundation domains. These key competencies are covered in LIS course curriculums.</p> <p>The 2022 Consultation Paper explains that the framework can be used to demonstrate career pathways of LIS workers. The examples provided indicate that professional knowledge domains are extra knowledge developed during a career. This is an incorrect assumption. Core professional knowledge is gained from a tertiary education, then developed in the workplace.</p> <p>The following professional knowledge should be incorporated:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analytics and management. • Collection Management, including subscription management, vendor liaison, licensing, access rights, etc. • Circulation / Access Services. • Web design and content creation. <p>The following foundation domain should be re-classified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Sector and organisational contexts’ is a professional knowledge domain. <p>We would like to see more focus on curiosity, future thinking and adaptability, rather than reducing the sector to a generic set of values. The framework is not aspirational enough to secure a bright future for the LIS and ALIA.</p>
2.4	Q6	<p>Do you agree with the range and scope of the proposed Active Professional domains? Please explain the reasons for your responses.</p> <p>The active professional domains are suited to public and state library contexts. They do not encompass academic and special libraries.</p> <p>The proposal suffers from being too general, as it covers activities and behaviours that can be expected in almost all professional practitioners.</p>
2.4	Q7	<p>Are there any elements that you would add, amend, or remove from the Active Professional domains? Please explain the reasons for your responses</p> <p>Distinction should be made about whether Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander contexts and Country is a foundational domain or a professional domain. It is currently in both.</p>
2.5	Q8	<p>Are there any ways you feel the conceptual design of the draft Framework could be enhanced or changed to articulate the knowledge, skills and values for the LIS sector?</p> <p>As explained previously, the draft framework gives too much prominence in the foundation domains to generic professional skills that do not adequately "articulate the knowledge, skills and values for the LIS sector". Core professional knowledge and delivery of information services must be incorporated into the Foundation Domains for the Framework to provide meaningful guidance.</p>
3.2	Q9	<p>How could the draft Framework support LIS courses at the higher education and/or the VET level, for example in course development or ALIA accreditation?</p> <p>ALIA needs to demonstrate that it is supporting and advocating for LIS courses. There has been a lack of advocacy and communication from ALIA on this important issue. Strengthening tertiary courses and employer engagement should be occurring as part of this project – at the heart of it. At the moment, it appears to be secondary considerations.</p>

		<p>The proposed framework does not support LIS higher education. The proposal suggests that working in the LIS only requires general knowledge of professional practice with no specific knowledge domains required. This will make tertiary LIS courses unattractive, which may be ALIA's design to appeal to a wider group of workers. The impact will be decreased enrolments in higher education for the LIS. It is likely that this will cause remaining courses to become unviable.</p> <p>The framework should reflect the collective thinking of the LIS sector and celebrate cutting-edge LIS work, knowledge and expertise. The industry expects the full spectrum of fundamental knowledge and skills sets from its workers, and yet the framework is based on the most basic entry point. Changes to the domains may establish a guideline for core curricula in higher education. This is not currently possible due to the illogical approach between the two domains.</p>
<p>3.2</p>	<p>Q10</p>	<p>To what extent do you feel that the draft Framework could serve as a resource to guide quality assurance in accrediting LIS courses? Please explain the reasons for your response.</p> <p>The framework in its current form is not capable of guiding quality assurance. If the domains can be re-worked between 'foundation' and 'professional knowledge' as described above, the framework may be able to guide the realms of knowledge that the industry would like accrediting LIS courses to cover. However, ALIA needs to engage with employers to clarify and finalise the realms of professional knowledge.</p> <p>The proposed framework does not recognise the in-depth level of education required to become qualified and expert in specific domains. It is silent on study requirements, hands-on experience, practicums, capstone projects and/or portfolio building for specific domains. As a result, is it a very high-level guide that is not useful for quality assurance.</p>
<p>3.3</p>	<p>Q11</p>	<p>What opportunities for micro-credentials do you see in the LIS sector?</p> <p>Specialisation and ongoing professional development.</p> <p>Micro-credentials can be a valuable pathway for up-skilling. However, they should not replace tertiary degrees. We are concerned that micro credentials will replace LIS tertiary education, even though they cannot provide equivalent foundational knowledge. Micro-credentials should not be the basis for professional qualifications or recognition.</p> <p>While micro-credentials can be a valuable pathway for up-skilling, they cannot substitute as an alternative pathway to becoming a LIS professional. If that proceeds through professional pathways, the LIS will be de-valued leading to a fracturing of ALIA's membership base.</p> <p>Many library staff have qualifications in other areas, and many are prepared to undertake a LIS qualification to work professionally in the LIS sector. Recognition</p>

		<p>of Prior Learning generally assists professionals retraining to undertake a degree or diploma and it is difficult to see why those staff who have "expressed no interest in undertaking a full degree in library and information science" would be more likely to undertake a LIS professional qualification by another route.</p>
3.4	Q12	<p>In what way is LIS professional recognition important to you, as an individual or as an employer? What might make professional recognition have more value and/or use in the LIS sector?</p> <p>As individuals and employers, it is imperative that professional recognition is based on tertiary qualifications.</p> <p>Working in a small library where there is no scope to employ specialist staff, it is important that all staff share the same professional background and core knowledge and competencies achieved by undertaking a LIS qualification. Professional recognition is also important in dealing with other professionals.</p>
3.4	Q13	<p>What should professional recognition be based upon? For example, the attainment of ALIA-accredited academic qualifications, experience in the LIS sector, demonstrated skills and/or knowledge gained from other training or other sectors, or other career opportunities?</p> <p>Tertiary qualifications and ongoing commitment to CPD. This is standard practice.</p>
3.4	Q14	<p>What distinctions do you think are important for professional recognition? Should there be distinctions between:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. people with accredited qualifications in LIS and people with other qualifications or experience? b. librarians and teacher librarians? c. people at the beginning of their careers and people with more professional expertise? d. people who invest in ongoing CPD and those who don't? <p>The following distinctions are important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinctions between people with LIS tertiary qualifications and those without a LIS qualification. • Distinction between people who commit to CPD and those who do not. • Distinctions between certain roles and additional experience or qualifications, i.e. educational qualifications (teaching degrees) and educational focussed LIS roles. This is currently in place for teacher librarians but could be used as well in higher ed/VET/TAFE/adult educational sectors • People at the beginning of their careers and people with more professional expertise.

3.4	Q15	<p>Would you support a program of professional recognition for those working in the LIS sector? Please explain the reasons for your responses.</p> <p>Much needs to be clarified in relation to this question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who does “those working in the LIS sector” include? • Do people working in roles without LIS qualifications want ALIA recognition? • Why is there a change from the existing model where other roles can have affiliated recognition? <p>We are concerned that professional recognition of other roles without LIS qualifications will mean that there is no distinction between qualified librarians/library technicians and someone else, which would lead to further erosion of the profession. The industrial implications of this change do not appear to have been considered.</p> <p>Under professional pathways, when recruitment occurs by a non-librarian into a library role they will no longer see the need to recruit an employee with a professional qualification. Conversely, applicants will not see the value of LIS degrees if they are not celebrated and distinguished by ALIA.</p>
3.4	Q16	<p>Would the draft Framework be suitable to underpin a professional recognition program? Please explain the reasons for your response.</p> <p>No, not across the sector. Distinction needs to be made between different roles reflecting different requirements. Distinction should also be made between holders of LIS qualifications and those who do not hold them.</p>
3.4	Q17	<p>Would you support a system where those working in the LIS sector can demonstrate their career progression? Please explain the reason for your choice.</p> <p>Yes. Support would be necessary from the LIS sector, with consultation with current CPD users. There needs to be employer engagement on this question in tandem with the development of professional pathways (not afterwards).</p>
3.5	Q18	<p>Are there ways for the draft Framework to provide a new structure for the ALIA CPD scheme? Please explain the reasons for your responses.</p> <p>The draft framework needs to be amended as described above to be able to achieve this.</p>
4.6	Q19	<p>How do you see the draft Framework being applied in either your personal career or in your organisation?</p> <p>The HLi does not see a role for the draft Framework, as presented, in our personal</p>

		careers or our organisations.
--	--	-------------------------------

Q20 **Any other comments or feedback**