

Name: Anonymous

**Professional Pathways Phase 2 Consultation
June 2023**

Comments on the [Consultation Paper: Library and information services workforce: Framework and Recognition](#) (Canberra: ALIA, May 2023) with responses to the questions embedded in that document.

This is an individual response. I'm also aware of, and fully supportive of, the submission prepared by Health Libraries Australia in June 2023.

5 July 2023

Page	Section	Question
21	Q1	<p>What changes should be made to the Framework? Explain why the changes will improve the Framework.</p> <p>My response:</p> <p>I agree that the revised or updated version of the Framework certainly improved on the original version. It benefitted from the extensive consultation and input with the library community during the second half of 2022.</p> <p>I still believe that the Framework should be explicit in stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who are the intended target groups for the Framework, and how it will be applied to each of those.• The <i>Foundation Knowledge, Skills and Attributes</i> position paper is an essential platform for information professionals' status. ALIA should continue to uphold this.• Full professional status as an LIS professional is only achievable by successful completion of an accredited LIS course that covers both the LIS core domains and all the approved professional knowledge domains (currently 8).• Completion of single courses or individual micro-certificates is not adequate to achieve full professional status.• Ongoing CPD is an expectation of the Framework for full professional status. <p>These statements will clarify ALIA's position on full professional status, to inform potential and current employers, educators, workers and partners in the profession.</p>
24	Q1 – Q2	<p>I have no objection to the updated structure, or visual appearance.</p>

24	Q3	As I've written above, the Framework content lacks clear statements for the 4 areas of target groups, full professional status, status of single or micro-courses, and ongoing CPD.
27	Q4	<p>Do you support the use of credentialling such as badges to identify skills and specialisations?</p> <p>My response: I'm not impressed by badges, because in current and common usage they are generally 'lightweight', often self-applied, and likely to be supplanted by a newer fashionable label. The Consultation Paper pushes for badging as a complementary credential to recognise <i>individual skills or activities</i>, but without tight regulation they can become meaningless.</p> <p>As a stronger path, I support the use of certificates and certification to mark achievement of specific skills, for example, the Certified Health Informatician Australasia (CHIA) certificate issued by the Australasian Institute of Digital Health.</p> <p>Recognition of specialisations obtained through a programme of verified external coursework should be clearly labelled as such, and distinctly different from badges and micro-certs.</p>
27	Q5	<p>Do you agree that it is important to have a credential to cover the Core Domains? Why/why not?</p> <p>My response: I believe it's important to have recognition of having acquired understanding of the Core Domains, as these are the entry-level foundation for work in the profession. If this understanding is acquired in the process of undertaking an LIS formal qualification in an accredited LIS course, I don't see any reason for a separate credential for it.</p> <p>The proposition that ALIA accredit courses (or provide the courses) that cover the Core Domains seems sensible to me, as a means to ensure a quality training option for people who don't have a LIS qualification. Staff in libraries should all be able to demonstrate an understanding of the LIS environment, contexts, ethics, values, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges, cultures and Country.</p> <p>I would like to see ALIA develop this 'Core Domains' training proposition more fully, as a pathway for skilling the people in the industry who don't have a LIS qualification, as well as ALIA members in the general and allied fields categories.</p>
27	Q6	Do you support the extension of the CPD scheme to student and general members? Why/why not?

		<p>My response:</p> <p>I can see this extension of CPD to student members being useful for and attractive to students. It could offer a point of ongoing engagement with benefits for the student’s professional career.</p> <p>However, I wonder if it’s warranted or advisable for people in the General membership category. Since this category is open to all interested individuals, with no qualifications required, I’m not clear what benefit it would offer a general member to be a participant in the CPD scheme. What post-nominals would a general member acquire after successfully completing a year of CPD? And how would an employer interpret a CPD annotation on an prospective employee’s CV?</p> <p>I also question: How this will fit with the current Proficiency Recognition Program for student or general ALIA members?</p>
29	Q7	<p>Do you have any concerns or suggestions about the proposal to align the CPD specialisations to the Framework?</p> <p>My response:</p> <p>The Consultation Paper noted some obstacles with CPD offerings. I have been a team member in providing three specialty courses for Australasian health librarians. These were welcomed because no health librarianship subjects are offered in any Australian LIS course. Participants in the specialty courses were nearly all LIS-qualified. They wanted material that was current, relevant to their professional body of knowledge and practice, and to have a certification or award that could be used in future formal education.</p> <p>The alignment of CPD specialisations to the Framework may enable transitions through the stages from initial entry to CPD-scheme sign-up. However, the absence of specialty courses for LIS specialisations in Australia will be a practical obstacle. Any help ALIA can provide for specialist training will be far more tangible.</p>
29	Q8	<p>Are there any specialisations that ALIA does not currently have that should be developed? Are there any that should be retired?</p> <p>My response:</p> <p>I wonder if there’s overlap between the LIS Practitioner Research specialisation and the Research/Academic specialisation?</p>
29	Q9	<p>Would you support a scheme to recognise employers who meet a best practice benchmark in terms of support for LIS staff? Please indicate whether you are answering from the perspective of an employer or employee.</p> <p>My response:</p> <p>Speaking as an employee: Yes, in principle I support this.</p>

30	Q10	<p>Are there any points that are unclear to you that you think ALIA should prioritise in developing explainers? Are there better formats than static text?</p> <p>My response: Yes, I think ALIA should be transparent on their perception of the future of the Association, whether it needs to continually grow or would it still be effective if its membership base was tightly-limited? The membership would have views on these matters.</p>
30	Q11	<p>Are there versions of the Framework that you think ALIA should prioritise developing? Please indicate if you are willing to contribute.</p> <p>Sorry, I don't have a response on this question.</p>
31	Q12	<p>Do you have any suggestions for things that should be factored into the stress testing of the Framework?</p> <p>My response: The Framework planners need to incorporate the standard activities for innovations: Pilot – Review – Implement – Evaluate.</p>
31	Q13	<p>Is there anything else that should be added to the update and review plan?</p> <p>My response: No suggestions.</p>
31	Q14	<p>Do you have any priorities for explanatory materials?</p> <p>My response: No suggestions.</p>