

Library technician course recognition: Meeting the challenge of a distributed national education program

Associate Professor Gillian Hallam
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, Australia
g.hallam@qut.edu.au

Dr Paul Genoni
Curtin University of Technology
Perth, Australia
P.Genoni@curtin.edu.au

Abstract

This paper looks at the challenges presented for the Australian Library and Information Association by its role as the professional association responsible for ensuring the quality of Australian library technician graduates. There is a particular focus on the issue of course recognition, where the Association's role is complicated by the need to work alongside the national quality assurance processes that have been established by the relevant technical education authorities. The paper describes the history of course recognition in Australia; examines the relationship between course recognition and other quality measures; and describes the process the Association has undertaken recently to ensure appropriate professional scrutiny in a changing environment of accountability.

Introduction

In their study of standards of LIS education across the world, Dalton and Levinson (2000) identified three models that aim to establish and maintain the standards for LIS education: governmental monitoring; formalized LIS accreditation/approval processes; individual course/departmental standards. The processes in place in the United Kingdom, through the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP), in the United States

through the American Library Association (ALA), and in Australia, through the Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA), are examples of the second model of formalized LIS accreditation/recognition processes, although each is distinctive (Hallam, Partridge & McAllister, 2004).

In Australia, ALIA acts as the standards body for the library and information profession, which includes responsibility for the recognition of LIS courses leading to a library and information studies qualification. The recognised courses can be offered by universities or by Registered Training Organisations (RTOs), with the latter consisting principally of colleges of Technical and Further Education (TAFE). The course recognition process is directly linked to membership of the ALIA, with the categories of Associate membership, which requires members to hold an ALIA-recognised LIS qualification at undergraduate or graduate levels; and Library Technician membership, with members holding an ALIA-recognised library technician qualification.

While formal education programs for librarians in Australia were introduced in 1944, when a qualifying examination became established for entry into the profession, the first course for paraprofessional staff was only commenced in 1970. This library technician course was developed in response to the changing dynamics of the workforce and a shortage of professional librarians, with a curriculum that focused on vocational, practical skills as opposed to the more theoretical body-of-knowledge covered in librarianship courses. Under the education standards process, ALIA stands in an unusual situation, recognising not only the professional courses offered by universities, but also eighteen courses that lead to library technician qualifications.

This paper discusses the challenges facing ALIA in recognising courses that constitute part of a national training package, but are delivered at the local level by individual RTOs. It is a circumstance which results in multiple forms and levels of accountability and quality assurance, with different processes put in place by the national body responsible for educational quality (AQTF); the state based education authorities; the individual RTOs

operating both within and outside the TAFE framework; and ALIA as the professional association representing the relevant industry.

The recognition of library technician courses has been before ALIA as a significant issue since 2006. At a time when a number of the RTOs were reaching the end of their existing period of recognition, the Association, through its Education Reference Group (later the Education and Workplace Learning Standing Committee), began working to revise the course recognition process in order to optimise its effectiveness and efficiency. As far as possible, this needed to be achieved in a way that took account of the multiple forms of accountability required of the RTOs while also ensuring the needs and interests of the Association and the technician educators were being met.

Historical review of formal recognition of library technician courses

In order to understand the current context for ALIA's recognition of library technician qualifications it is necessary to have a brief review of past developments.

Discussions regarding the need for formal library technician training took place throughout the 1960s, and the first course for technicians was established at Box Hill Girls' Technical College (Victoria) in 1970. Victoria was the focus of early development and within several years courses had also been established at Prahran and Footscray Technical Colleges, before spreading to other states in the mid 1970s. These early Victorian courses were managed by the Library Courses (Vocational) Standing Committee reporting to the State Council for Technical Education (Pivec, 1975), and courses in other states were developed and managed by similar authorities.

There was soon concern, however, that the separate development of courses within each state would result in inconsistencies in terms of their curriculum and quality. As Edward Flowers noted, by the mid 1970s:

Concern was being felt at the undesirable divergences which had developed between library technician courses established in different states, divergences which made it difficult to secure reciprocal acceptance of library technician qualifications between the states, so impeding library technician mobility, and the achievement of satisfactory Australia-wide salary scales and working conditions. (Flowers, 1979, p.371)

Pressure began to build for the then Library Association of Australia (LAA) to take a role in overseeing these courses, largely with a view to ensuring a degree of standardisation between states. In a 1975 overview of the early developments in technicians' education Catherine Pivec expressed a hope that the LAA would "...produce for the first time guidelines for standards for courses etc, leading to possible accreditation of courses Australia-wide, so that parity of qualifications interstate will be achieved" (Pivec, 1975, p.53).

It was with a view to achieving some standardisation between courses that the Library Courses (Vocational) Standing Committee convened a national workshop in Melbourne in 1976. An outcome of this meeting was the preparation of the *Guidelines for the Education of Library Technicians* (Library Courses, 1976), a first attempt at ensuring a basic degree of consistency between the various courses. It was also suggested at this meeting that "...recognition of courses could be undertaken by the Library Association of Australia, using procedures similar to those already adopted for professional courses" (Ramsay, 1978, p. 137).

These calls for a recognition process were heard within the LAA, with Neil Radford, then Chair of the Board of Education noting that:

There appears to be an urgent need to establish standards for courses for library technicians. These courses have tended to develop along somewhat different lines from state to state and both technicians and their employers have expressed concern about the quality of some courses. (Radford, 1978, p.105)

The Association, however, while apparently concerned about ensuring a consistent standard of technician graduates, was largely unconcerned about the standardisation of the curriculum. As a member of the Board of Education, Ian Miller, reported at the time:

[The Association] believed that the exit abilities of students should be the appropriate measure of the quality of the course content. In other words, the LAA and more particularly the Board of Education would expect to find a variety of different paths being chosen to reach the same exit level standards. (Miller, 1979, p. 10)

Subsequently the Association's Board of Education developed criteria for the recognition of technicians' courses based on recommendations from the 1976 workshop, and in 1977 the Association formalised a *Statement on the Recognition of Library Technician Courses*. In keeping with Miller's claims about a plurality of educational pathways, the statement was primarily concerned with the 'tasks' for which technician graduates should be prepared by their education rather than attempting to ensure they experienced a standardised curriculum.

The institutions offering courses for library technicians were subsequently invited to seek recognition of their courses, with Radford noting that "the goal is to persuade employers to appoint as library technicians only those who have completed a course recognised by the Association" (Radford, 1978, p.105). Formal recognition by the LAA commenced in 1978, and in the same year the Association established a category of membership for library technicians.

It is relevant that the discussions that preceded the introduction of the technicians' courses took place at the same time the profession was grappling with the issue of professional education and leading moves to have courses established within universities or colleges of advanced education. A focus of these negotiations was the issue of the appropriate level for a first professional qualification—that is, should the basic level of entry be a three year Bachelors program or a graduate qualification of one year. It has been argued (Carroll, 2007) that the technicians' qualification was devised with the expectation that professional

education would be at the graduate level, and that a therefore highly professionalised workforce would require a pool of technical assistants. As events transpired dual pathways (undergraduate and graduate) were developed for entry at the professional level, with technicians' courses nevertheless being established to provide a third pathway into library work.

As a result the emphasis of much of the early literature regarding library technicians in Australia was on establishing the exact nature of their workplace roles (Ramsay, 1978). There was a particular concern with separating the technician's role from that of entry-level librarians, and in negotiating matters related to career paths for technicians, including the options that should be provided if they later wished to complete a professional qualification (Radford, 1978; Young, 1979; Hyland, 1990; Ladd, 1992).

Following the introduction of the course recognition process there was very little—if any—investigation of the role or success of course recognition in ensuring the consistency or standard of technicians' courses. Debate continued to focus on the role of the technician in the workplace and how this might relate to their education (Smeaton, 1985; Hyland, 1990). When Jean Whyte provided a 'short history' of Australian course recognition in 1985 she wrote very little about the recognition of the technician courses. She did suggest, however, that the LAA had become involved in recognising these courses more in the interests of maintaining the boundaries between professionals and technicians rather than because they were concerned about the state of technicians' education *per se*.

Why did the Library Association of Australia decide to try to control the education of library technicians? Because this was seen as part of a duty to improve libraries or because we wanted to preserve what is *not* technicians' work? (Whyte, 1985, p. 23)

Irrespective of the reason for recognition of technicians' courses, by the late 1970s a pattern for the management and recognition of these courses had been established, and it would remain largely unchanged for the next two decades. That is, state education authorities were

responsible for the overall regulation of colleges providing training; curriculum was developed independently by each college; and recognition was granted by the LAA (after 1990 the Australian Library and Information Association). The recognition process during this period was managed by the Association's Board of Education, and based on the description of tasks included in the *Statement on the Recognition of Library Technician Courses* (later the *Statement on the Recognition of First Award Courses: Technician Level*). The recognition process included a visit to training colleges by a representative team chosen by the Board of Education. These visits were undertaken in order to view firsthand the conditions under which courses were provided, and allowed the visitors to discuss the courses with relevant teaching staff and educational managers. A visit was undertaken every seven years for each recognised course, and in the interim colleges were required to submit an annual report advising the Association of any relevant changes to the management of courses, resources, curriculum, and staffing.

Given the requirement for the Association to recognise both professional and technician courses, the cost associated with recognition was a substantial impost on the LAA and ALIA. In 1979 it was estimated to be 9% of the Association's budget (Bower, 1979). There was an early appreciation that there was a potential duplication of cost and effort when recognition was given for those courses which were also tightly regulated at the state level, as was the case with the technical colleges and the colleges of advanced education. As Neil Radford noted in a paper given to a 1980 conference on Australian library education:

...the Board's course recognition work is very costly. Certainly the general Council and the general treasurer are becoming increasingly uneasy about the proportion of the Association's scarce resources which are channelled to this work . . . It is frequently argued that because [some courses] are already closely controlled by the state higher education authorities, which conduct their own assessments for accreditation, there is little point in the LAA duplicating this work and conducting its own assessment. I would argue that while it may be the higher education authority's responsibility to ensure the academic quality of courses conducted under its auspices, it is still the professional association's

obligation to satisfy itself that entrants to the profession receive an adequate preparation. (Radford, 1980, p. 45)

This duplication of effort between state (and national) education authorities and the professional association is one which continues to vex the recognition process for library technicians' courses in Australia to this day.

Recent developments impacting on the recognition of technician courses

Significant changes were made in the area of education for library technicians and library assistants in 1999, with the development of a new national training package, the Museums and Library/Information Services Training Package (IBSA, 2004). The agency responsible for the formulation of the Museums and Library/Information Services Package, with considerable industry consultation, was CREATE (Cultural Research Education and Training Enterprises Australia). In 2004, advice on training for the cultural sector was transferred to Innovation and Business Skills Australia (IBSA) as the relevant industry skills council. Version 2 of the Training Package was released in 2007 (NTIS, 2008) following the review and evaluation of the initial package. As the peak industry body, ALIA again had significant input into the design and development of this revised package (ALIA, 2008).

The Training Package describes the knowledge and skills or competencies required by library and information workers up to and including library technician level, if they are to perform effectively in their workplace. It groups the competencies at the various levels into national qualifications (Certificate, Diploma, etc) that align to the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF, 2008). The package currently comprises three specific components: the Competency Standards, which establish units of competency reflecting workplace outcomes; the Assessment Guidelines, which describe the industry requirements for assessment; and the Qualifications Framework, which details how the units of competency are packaged into nationally recognised qualifications (IBSA, 2005). A further review of the Museums and Library/Information Services Training Package is anticipated in the near future.

A second important development was the introduction in 2000 of the Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF). The AQTF provides a set of standards which seeks to achieve nationally consistent, high-quality training and assessment services for the clients of Australia's vocational education and training system. As will be described, ALIA has subsequently been working with library technician educators to collaboratively develop meaningful and relevant course recognition criteria for library technician courses that will not only encompass the quality assurance processes required by the AQTF, but also build a community of practice that will add strength and engagement to paraprofessional education in the Australian library sector.

At about the same time of the introduction of the Training Package and the implementation of the AQTF, ALIA was undergoing a major organizational restructure. The implementation of the Association's new structure meant that the Board of Education, which had been responsible for course recognition, ceased to exist in 2000. The responsibilities of the Board of Education were transferred to the Board of Directors, and a new committee appointed by the Board, the Education Reference Group, was given the task of reviewing the Association's education policies to ensure their relevancy to the changing educational contexts. Revised education policies were endorsed by the Board of Directors in 2005 and 2006. These included the following policies; *Library and Information Sector: Core Knowledge, Skills and Attributes* (ALIA, 2005a); *Courses in Library and Information Management* (ALIA, 2005b); and *ALIA's Role in Education of Library and Information Professionals* (ALIA, 2005c). These various policies stated the Association's philosophies and values with regard to Australian library education, including an ongoing commitment to course recognition.

Course recognition, for both professional and technician level courses therefore remains a core activity for the Association. The specifics of the course recognition process are available on the ALIA website (ALIA, 2008). The key criteria for recognition of courses encompass:

- Course design
- Curriculum content

- Assessment
- Staffing
- Resourcing
- Quality assurance mechanisms
- Infrastructure.

A site visit by a panel of comprised of educators, employers and ALIA representatives remains an integral part of the course recognition activities.

Following the period of restructure the Board of Directors felt that that there was no immediate need to subject the new library technician programs to the course recognition process. The curriculum content of the training package was seen to be appropriately aligned with current industry needs as a result of the input into its development—and redevelopment—provided by ALIA and its representatives. In mid 2006, however, members of the ALIA Education Reference Group expressed their interest in exploring the opportunities for a revised approach to paraprofessional course recognition. This was felt to be necessary in order to determine the relevancy of the existing criteria for course recognition, and to build on the common dimensions of the national training package by considering the potential value of peer review as an evaluation process in line with the premise that, “stakeholders and clients are the best judges of an organisation’s quality and performance” (AQTF, 2008a, p.6). First and foremost, however, ALIA needed to be confident that course recognition was still valid and appropriate for vocational LIS courses in the 21st century.

In Melbourne in July 2006 the Association hosted a meeting of library technician educators from all states of Australia to discuss the potential for peer review of courses. Peer review was believed to offer participants the chance to discuss and share good practice and to develop a community of practice for technician educators. The forum was facilitated by a Working Party comprising two members of the Education Reference Group (Gill Hallam and Paul Genoni) and, ex-officio, the ALIA Education Manager (Marie Murphy). The discussions at the forum proceeded on the basis that while the course design and curriculum content were effectively determined by the National Training Package, a peer review process could

potentially allow educators to consider how the different courses were resourced and delivered and to explore the range of learning activities and assessment approaches. In this way educators could potentially share best practice and learn from each other. Each representative at the forum gave a short overview of the key characteristics of their institution's program, highlighting aspects of the course which were distinctive, innovative or particularly valuable to students. There was a strong focus on the importance of the design and delivery of learning activities and assessment, rather than on the course content. Feedback from the participants indicated that the forum was very valuable to them in their role as educators and that the initiative by ALIA to bring them together to discuss matters of common interest was a significant one for the Association.

This initial meeting was followed by a second forum held in Melbourne in October 2007, when the technician educators were asked to consider a basis for assessing excellence in learning and teaching; to establish a framework for assessment of courses, and to further the peer review process. As the main activity of the day, the educators worked in groups to determine the value of an example taken from the higher education sector, the *Teaching Capabilities Framework* (QUT, 2004). Each group was asked to work through one of four principles of teaching excellence in order to determine its application for vocational education, and the relevance of the content and terminology to the sector. The four principles were:

- Engaging learners
- Designing for learning
- Assessing for learning
- Managing for learning.

Ironically, as the ALIA team sought to work closely with library technician educators to determine how to support and encourage quality teaching, the vocational education sector itself was raising the stakes in terms of issues of quality. As noted, library technician courses are delivered by Registered Training Organisations (RTOs). RTOs are generally—but not limited to—Colleges of Technical and Further Education (TAFE). In 2007, the

Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) released a revision of the Australian Quality Training Framework, AQTF 2007, as a national set of standards to assure “nationally consistent, high quality training and assessment services for clients of Australia’s vocational education and training system” (AQTF, 2007, p.1). The AQTF comprises three components:

- The Essential Standards for Registration
- Standards for State and Territory Registering Bodies
- Excellence Criteria

AQTF documentation states that the beneficiaries of AQTF 2007 will include both individual learners and, more broadly, industry stakeholders, as well as the RTOs themselves and the State-based registering bodies. It is claimed that under the AQTF learners will “have equitable access to quality training and assessment services tailored to their needs and the learning outcomes they seek”. At the same time industry, which would include ALIA and employers, will “have confidence that RTOs are delivering training and assessment services that achieve the skill requirements of nationally recognized qualifications developed by industry” (AQTF, 2007, p.2). Statements such as these again raised questions regarding the relevancy of, and need for, course recognition processes for professional associations such as ALIA.

Further advice was received in early 2008 indicating that additional quality assurance processes were to be introduced in the vocational education arena. These National Quality Indicators would have the goal of measuring the quality of:

- Learner engagement
- Employer satisfaction
- Competency completion.

All RTOs will be required to implement three quality indicator processes each year: a Learner Questionnaire; an Employer Questionnaire; and a Competency Questionnaire. In addition, a

voluntary process is currently being trialled by 15 RTOs which seeks to encourage and recognise high performance. The proposed Excellence Criteria seek evidence of strategic approaches to quality and continuous improvement in a number of areas, including learning and assessment, client focus and engagement with industry and communities (AQTF, 2008b).

These various developments in the delivery and monitoring of vocational education inevitably imposed a degree of uncertainty on the ALIA course recognition process. The curriculum content is ostensibly determined by the competency standards of the National Training Package, while the quality assurance processes currently being developed within the AQTF 2007 framework seeks to monitor the issues of staffing, resourcing, infrastructure and quality assurance mechanisms. Theoretically, the Quality Indicators aim to scrutinise the relevancy and quality of the training being delivered, while the Excellence Criteria support high quality practice and continuous improvement. It will be interesting to see how the process develops in the near future in order to determine the extent to which the AQTF processes measure the performance of the RTO as an entity, or the quality of the learning and teaching in individual programs delivered by the RTOs. At this point in time, ALIA seeks to work closely with library technician educators to better understand the processes and activities that are mandatory to them as part of the AQTF, 2007 framework. ALIA seeks to ensure that its course recognition processes not only avoid duplication of effort, but also legitimately meet the fundamental goal “to foster excellence in the provision of education for the Australian library and information services sector and to ensure that all students undertaking a course experience a quality program, with an appropriate curriculum delivered effectively and supported by the required resources” (ALIA, 2008).

Subsequent to the October 2007 workshop the four groups of technician educators were asked to continue the development of the assessments relevant to their specific dimension of teaching excellence (i.e. Engaging learners; Designing for learning; Assessing for learning; Managing for learning). A series of teleconferences were held in April 2008 with the groups to assess progress and to further encourage engagement with the principles of quality teaching. Unfortunately the pace of the educators’ everyday lives had seen some slippage in terms of the development of the documents.

The teleconferences also revealed another development that had not been made apparent at either of the face-to-face forums—a further indication of the rapid progress of the quality assurance processes under AQTF 2007. Teleconference participants indicated that in the months subsequent to the October 2007 meeting they had been asked by their institutions to complete a considerable amount of documentation to prepare their courses for an official audit as part of the AQTF 2007 process. However, while ALIA has stressed the need to avoid irrelevant duplication in the preparation of evidence about the quality of library technician courses offered, very little of the information provided as part of the AQTF process was proactively provided to the Working Party to help illuminate the potential relationship (including overlap) between AQTF 2007 and course recognition.

The third annual meeting of the technician educators was held in Sydney in October 2008. There was a degree of urgency at this meeting brought on by the lack of progress in the previous twelve months and the imminent end to the extended period of recognition that had been enjoyed by the various RTOs. The Working Group needed to use the meeting to finalise the procedure for recognition, including both the annual reporting requirements and the details of the site visits.

There had been some optimism prior to the meeting that the AQTF reporting requirements could reduce the amount of data collection and reporting required by ALIA. This, unfortunately, proved to be misplaced due to several reasons:

- The AQTF depended upon an irregular reporting cycle, with RTOs being selected for auditing on an occasional and random basis.
- The ‘level’ at which auditing occurred was in many cases at a broader point in the RTO’s academic hierarchy than required by ALIA. This is, it might occur at a level that subsumed the teaching unit responsible for delivering the technicians’ course, and therefore did not provide the necessary detail about the courses being recognised.

- There was an element of confidentiality involved in the AQTF process, as the result of which associated documentation could not be shared with ALIA.

The lack of progress in the previous twelve months, and in particular the lack of contact between the RTOs, had also cast some doubt over the viability of peer review as a component of course recognition. The Working Party therefore took a more proactive position at this meeting, providing the attendees with both a draft of the course recognition documentation in the form of a questionnaire to be completed prior to site visits, and a framework and schedule for a series of visits to be undertaken to most RTOs in early 2009.

This proved to be a very productive meeting, focussing in particular on negotiating the detail of the course recognition questionnaire. This document had to take account of the needs of the Association as expressed in the course recognition process; the ability of the RTOs to provide the required information; and the ongoing concern to avoid unnecessary duplication with other accountability processes. A revised draft of the questionnaire was distributed subsequently and used as the basis for further discussion and negotiation using both a wiki created for the purpose by ALIA and a further teleconference in November 2008.

The finalised versions of the questionnaire were to be completed and returned by RTOs prior to the proposed site visits. These visits commenced in February 2009 and will continue until May. The participants are a member of the Working Party (Gill Hallam); the Association's Education Officer (Dianne Walton-Sonda); and a local library technician. RTOs that are successful in meeting the requirements of the course recognition process will have their courses approved for seven years subject to satisfactory annual reporting.

Conclusion

Through the course recognition process, ALIA seeks to “work collaboratively with educators and training providers, employers and practitioners to promote the development and continuous improvement of courses in library and information management” (ALIA, 2005c). The Association is keenly aware that it has important roles to play as the facilitator of

communication between educators, and in steering and guiding the interaction through regular forums and meetings. Participants attending the library technician educator forums report that they benefit greatly from the opportunities to discuss matters of common interest with their peers, and that these occasions are highly valued as professional development activities. The Working Party also senses, however, a degree of passivity on the part of the educators, in that under the pressure of workloads there is not always the opportunity or incentive to take responsibility for moving the process forward. Despite examples of meaningful collaboration between institutions in specific geographic areas, the Working Party is concerned whether there will be sufficient engagement and momentum to effectively establish the peer review process as it had been envisaged.

The concept of ALIA course recognition seems to be regarded negatively by some educators, with the Association seen to be wielding the ‘top down’ stick, rather than attempting to provide an avenue for enhancing the quality of teaching and learning that will benefit the LIS professions. These educators tend to focus on the site visit as a scrutinising inspection with the visiting panel seemingly hoping to find reasons to ‘fail’ the institution as a course provider. The Association, through the Working Group, would rather that educators used the visit as an opportunity to highlight the value of their courses to the LIS sector; to showcase innovation and excellence in teaching and learning; and to utilise the leverage that can result when visiting ‘experts’ meet with key institutional players.

The Working Party is unsure whether the current unfavourable attitude of some educators towards site visits view might result from anecdotes about past visits (although none have actually taken place in the past decade), or whether the culture of the institutions themselves might mitigate against a welcoming approach to independent, external scrutiny. As indicated, the RTO’s offer courses in a highly regulated and assessed environment, and a certain amount of ‘assessment fatigue’ is not unexpected. Indeed it is one of the disappointments of the revamp of the course recognition process that it has not been able to significantly reduce the RTO’s duplication of effort in this regard.

A further challenge for the Working Party has been to engage as many technician educators as possible in the review of course recognition and the potential for peer review, while at the same time knowing that some consistency of representation at the various meetings and teleconferences would be beneficial. It was the case, however, that only a small core group of educators were able to attend all three ALIA forums, and RTOs were sometimes represented at teleconferences by educators who had not attended the forums. Continuity and consistency of communication has therefore been an issue for the Working Party.

This article has highlighted some of the recent and ongoing challenges facing ALIA in what may be described as the quicksand of vocational course recognition. While the accreditation of professional courses offered by universities can be seen as the implementation of a long established and widely practiced process to ensure quality outcomes, the picture is somewhat distorted in the area of paraprofessional education. Whereas once the professional association was the foremost advocate and defender of high educational standards, the need for rigour and quality in vocational education has now been independently addressed by the relevant national and state educational authorities.

At present ALIA maintains its role in course recognition with a reformed process that is being 'tested'. The question remains, however, as to whether the concept of paraprofessional course recognition has become anachronistic. It is open to the Association to decide that ILS education would be better served if the funds spent on course recognition were reallocated in order to support the community of library technician educators through enhanced forms of professional development and networking.

As Neil Radford noted in 1980, ALIA course recognition is an expensive undertaking which involves duplication with other authorities. And although Radford concluded that recognition was nonetheless necessary the intervening decades have seen ever more advanced accountability required of the vocational training sector, to the point where the opposite conclusion could be drawn. The Association will be in a better position to assess this matter following a review of the current round of course recognition.

References

- Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) 2005a. *Library and Information Sector: Core Knowledge, Skills and Attributes*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.alia.org.au/policies/core.knowledge.html>
- Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) 2005b. *Courses in Library and Information Management*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.alia.org.au/policies/courses.html>
- Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) 2005c. *ALIA's Role in Education of Library and Information Professionals*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.alia.org.au/policies/education.role.html>
- Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) 2006. *ALIA Education: National Training Package*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.alia.org.au/education/ntp.html>
- Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) 2008. *ALIA Recognition of Courses: Criteria for the Recognition of First Award Courses in Library and Information Management at Librarian and Library Technician Level*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.alia.org.au/education/courses/criteria.html>
- Australian Qualifications Framework Advisory Board (AQF) 2007. *Australian Qualifications Framework*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.aqf.edu.au/>
- Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF) 2007. *AQTF 2007*. Retrieved on April 28, from <http://www.training.com.au/portal/site/public/menuitem.91cdbaeb7a2bc0e2cd9ae78617a62dbc/>
- Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF) 2008a. *Excellence Criteria for Registered Training Organisations: Draft*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from http://www.training.com.au/documents/aqtf2k7Excellence_Criteria_RTO.pdf
- Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF) 2008b. *Excellence Criteria*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.training.com.au/portal/site/public/menuitem.80d4044662b2bbea3771b51017a62dbc/>

- Bower, G. 1979. 'The role of the Library Association of Australia in the recognition of courses in librarianship in Australia,' *Library Technicians in Australia: Proceedings of the Second National Workshop Held at the University of Sydney 18-19 May 1979*, Sydney: Library Association of Australia, 4-7.
- Carroll, M. B. 2007. *Role Perception and the Library Worker in Australia: The Role of Library Education in Defining Roles and Tasks of Librarians and Library Technicians*. Charles Sturt University: PhD, 2007.
- Dalton, P. and Levinson, K. 2000. 'An investigation of LIS qualifications throughout the world.' *66th IFLA Council and General Conference, Jerusalem, Israel, 13-18 August 2000*. Retrieved on June 16, 2006 from <http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla66/papers/061-161e.htm>
- Flowers, E. 1979. 'Library technicians in the workforce: the educational framework,' *Australian Library Journal*, 28 (2): 370-373.
- Hallam, G., Partridge, H. and McAllister, L. 2004. 'LIS education in changing times,' *Australian Law Librarian*, 12 (2), 11-32.
- Hanneker, C. 1985. 'Course recognition. Which courses? What levels?' *Education for Librarianship: Australia*, 2 (1): 26-34.
- Hyland, M. 1990. 'Issues of concern to library technicians in Australia today,' *Papers presented at the Australian Library and Information Association, 1st Biennial Conference, Perth, Western Australia, September 30 – October 5 1990*. Canberra: Australian Library and Information Association, 1990, 109-130.
- Innovation and Business Skills Australia (IBSA) 2004. *Museums and Library/Information Services Training Package (CUL04)*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from http://www.ibsa.org.au/content/cultural/tpcul04_overview.html
- Ladd, Y. 1992. 'Continued and appropriate recognition for library technicians: grown up perceptions,' *ALIA '92: Libraries the heart of the matter: Proceedings of the Australian Library and Information Association 2nd Biennial Conference*, Deakin: Australian Library and Information Association, 177-180.
- Library Courses (Vocational) Standing Committee 1976. *Guidelines for the Education of Library Technicians: Report of the National Workshop*, Melbourne: Library Courses (Vocational) Standing Committee.

- Miller, I. 1979. 'Recognition of library technician courses in Australia,' *Library Technicians in Australia: Proceedings of the Second National Workshop Held at the University of Sydney 18-19 May 1979*, Sydney: Library Association of Australia, 8-14.
- Naylor, P., Barrett, K. Williams, R., Talbot, R. & Reid, D. 1988. 'Education for library technicians in Australia,' *Education for Librarianship: Australia*, 5 (2): 77-82.
- National Training Information Service (NTIS) 2008. *CUL04 Museum and Library/Information Services Training Package: Preliminary text*. Retrieved on June 27, 2008 from http://www.ntis.gov.au/Default.aspx?/trainingpackage/CUL04/volume/CUL04_1/chapter/PrelimESMandText
- Pivec, C. S. 1975. 'Middle level library education in Victoria,' *Australian Library Journal*, 24 (2): 48-53.
- Queensland University of Technology (QUT) 2004. *Teaching Capabilities Framework: Delivering Outstanding Student Learning Through Excellence in Teaching*. Retrieved on April 28, 2008 from <http://www.talss.qut.edu.au/about/publications/tcf.pdf>
- Radford, N. A. 1978. 'Education for librarianship: the changing role,' *Australian Library Journal*, 27 (7):102-106.
- Radford, N. A. 1980. 'Aiming high: some problems and challenges for the L.A.A. Board of Education,' *Library Education Under Siege: Proceedings of a Seminar Organized by the Education for Librarianship Section of the Library Association of Australia, held 6th-7th June, 1980, at the Fisher Library, University of Sydney*, J. Schmidt and I. Vincent (eds), 39-49.
- Ramsay, M. 1978. 'Education of library technicians in Australia,' *Australian Library Journal*, 27 (9): 134-138.
- Smeaton, H. 1985. 'The role of the library technician,' *Libraries: After 1984: Proceedings of the LAA/NZLA Conference, Brisbane 1984*. Sydney: Library Association of Australia, 307-316.
- Whyte, J. 1985. 'Control and diversity: a short history of course recognition in Australia,' *Education for Librarianship: Australia*, 2 (1): 5-25.

Young, W. 1979. 'The future of the library technician: education and continuing education,'
*Alternative futures: Library Association of Australia, 20th Biennial Conference, Canberra
1979: Proceedings*. Sydney: Library association of Australia, 444-447.