

ICLG Response to the Draft Revalidation Scheme Handbook and the Draft Guidelines for Certification 28 July 2004

Overview

It would be useful to see a “scope” at the start of both documents i.e. what does the document aim to achieve so that one can understand what the two documents cover without reading them in their entirety. Having a “scope” helps a reader to know what to expect and therefore enables the document to be read more fluidly.

The documents should also make it clear from the start what is included. At present both documents read very awkwardly and don’t seem logical as one doesn’t know why the document contains what it does, what to expect and in what order. Equally important is that it should state what it does not cover in the relevant topic.

The writing style of the drafts is very wordy, resulting in extra length and lack of flow e.g. Revalidation 2.5 you may submit as a web page *if you prefer* Certification 2.4.5 *Normally* this letter should be provided by a Chartered Member of CILIP or *where necessary* by your line manager.

There are numerous references to “it” and “they” resulting in a lack of understanding about what or who is being referred to, which affects the natural flow of the documents.

Revalidation Scheme:

The ICLG, whilst in favour of a revalidation scheme, has a number of points to raise in respect to this Draft.

Introduction and Checklist 2

“Provide evidence of a minimum of three-years full-time equivalent employment”

- a. There is no definition of full-time
- b. This is discriminatory against part-time workers, of whom there are many in the private sector, many of them are entirely responsible for the Information Service within an organisation. Working 2.5 days a week, they would have to have worked for at least 6 years before they were allowed to revalidate. This is too long a time span For full time employees it is stated that they should have worked for “a minimum” of three years. This should be extended to all members, the inclusion of the word minimum means that those that wish to take longer may do so.

2.3 Mentoring Scheme

In the private sector there are rarely Mentoring Schemes particularly for Information Professionals the ICLG would look to CILIP to provide mentors across the UK and Ireland.

It would have been useful if the links provided in the draft document were live so that we could get a better feel for this area

2.4.3 Evidence of training etc

- a. Certificates of training. For many company in-house training or lunch-time seminars, no certificates are produced. These sessions are usually immensely useful for learning about the information services one should be providing for a business and networking.
- b. Will CILIP be providing guidance to the Groups and Regions as to which of their events would be acceptable as evidence, e.g. does 1 Umbrella =6 ICLG events.
- c. How much is required for each year. Some guidance will be required as to how much is expected. The draft does not cover this.
- d. Will CILIP be providing free training sessions in the evening for those members whose employers will not support CPD with time and money.
- e. Those of our members who work for companies with big training budgets, will find it easy to revalidate, those who don't won't
- f. What about our members who live outside London and the South East and do not have access to training courses at the moment.
- g. Is there now or is there to be produced a definitive list of what activities equate to CPD. For example: does being involved in ICLG committee work and/or other ICLG activities count as (or towards) CPD? Does organising events and/or meetings counts as CPD?

We accept the comment “The range if CPD activities is inclusive” but in order to be inclusive, CILIP will have to accept less formal evidence, or revalidating, in the private sector, will be restricted to those who work for sympathetic companies in the South East.

2.4.4 Personal Statement

- a. The second paragraph which starts “The evidence of CPD” would sit better in 2.4.3
- b. We suggest that the phrase “personal evaluation and reflection” is rephrased as it will not be clear to everyone what it actually means

2.6.2 Procedure

As far as is possible the assessors should not include anyone from the same workplace but should be independent.