Professional Titling Survey - Results

Conducted by the RMAA online via Survey Monkey, 3rd-26th May 2006, a total of 252 people responded to the survey although not every question was answered by every person.

Do you think that the industry should regulate position titles in alignment with qualifications and competencies through an Accredited Professional Titling System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped Question</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1. Whilst it may be a very worthy goal, I doubt employers would buy into it as they might anticipate increased demands for salary adjustments (up)
2. Consistent titling gives exposure and credibility
3. This survey needs responses from a broader audience than traditional recordkeepers to help determine where these positions fit and how they relate to other information management roles.
4. Not only would it benefit Records professionals, it would also assist prospective employers in the selection and recruitment process
5. Yes, if it affects position titles only, not conditions of employment
6. Yes, because it is one way to balance your qualifications, skills & experience with your profession.
7. The Library Industry has position titles according to the qualifications held, i.e. professional or paraprofessional studies.
8. Experience & qualifications, in that order
9. I really think that Records professional have to make their own reputations within any organisation, these Professional Titles will do more to alienate records managers than to assist.
10. A Records Officer in one organisation may have duties completely different than the records officer in another organisation
11. You should follow system to ALIA. Library Technicians have a Diploma, Librarians have a Degree
12. There is a huge difference between positions held in large organisations and small agencies.
13. Aust wide standards can only be a good thing
14. The RMAA is far to Government focused
15. Records professionals are spread across a wide variety of organisations and industries. Standardising these titles would prove far more time consuming than, say, standardising a legal title or similar
16. Else not seen as professional
17. Any Titling System should account for previous experience
18. While specialist knowledge and skills are a legislative necessity, the changing demographics of the workforce may make such a change unmanageable.
19. I have concern that suitably experienced records practitioners might be hindered in upgrading and obtaining higher positions if this titling is not fully understood by employers
20. Similar to IT industry
21. It would help employers understand the skill-set and experiences of the person they were recruiting
22. Not everyone has qualifications in this industry
23. I feel that it will elevate the status of the profession to match that of other professional services.
24. Most if not all Industries align titles through Accredited Titling System
25. A recognised title gives an indication of the basic skill range one could expect
26. I believe there also should be a standard pay classification range to go with the title & qualifications
27. Similar to the library profession
28. Recognition of qualified practitioners is important
29. You would have to include amount of experience on the job
30. Absolutely - it would clarify people's standing. I'm sure there will be some teething problems and people will attack the whole idea because it's not perfect, but it takes all types.
31. It would make the roles and responsibilities clearer, and help with going for jobs, as easier to determine what they are and likely pay rates
32. Cannot see any benefit to those within or outside the industry - except those running the courses
33. Until the profession can get agreement across the various information bodies this is not a useful exercise.
34. You will never be able to do this as no other profession has done this. Look at the IT industry.
35. Could be detrimental to the large numbers of currently employed in the field without formal qualifications.
36. Following lines of best practice.
37. Position titles may need to vary depending on the industry. But I do recommend not using certain words like 'operative'.
38. Insufficient information on proposal and its impact on practitioners to make an informed decision.
39. regulate position titles in alignment with qualifications and competencies will then be accepted by other professional organisations.
40. Badly needed to raise its professional profile.
41. Professional accreditation through standardized approach is the only way I can see to give employers the tools to reduce risk in employing records personnel who are professionals.
42. Don't know enough about Accredited Professional Titling System.
43. My observation is that many people without records qualifications are occupying professional positions, and this is not delivering the level of skill and advice business required.
44. Compare medical field - professional titles and position titles are not expected to coincide, i.e. a Consultant Epidemiologist (professional title) can be employed as a Medical Officer of Health.
45. We use no 5 titles.
46. Depends on career structure and development available at workplace, e.g. a sole charge position can be called anything as there are no comparisons.
47. Not all titles are equal and I think this adds to the perception of RM as a profession.
48. Overkill in a country the size of NZ.
49. Will be difficult to achieve.
50. Should be reflective of the organisation someone is in as that is where you are ranked/compared and your seniority is benchmarked, not through an accredited professional titling system.
51. Standardize the profession.
52. Any standardisation is better than none!
53. Surely position titles also depend on functions?
54. Tertiary education level.
55. I don't think it matters so much, if you have the experience who cares what your title is?
56. We work in an environment where accountability is most important and a standard benchmark is required by our society to gain trust in our industry.
57. Yet to see any outlined benefits to sway my opinion from 'there are more important things we should be doing'.
58. I think you need to adopt a similar naming to the NSW Crown Employees (Librarians, Library Assistants, Library Technicians and Archivists) Award 2002.
59. I do not think this is possible - it would not be adopted by employer organisations who assign titles to reflect the position and culture of the organisation.
60. Should look at what is used internationally to develop cohesiveness.
61. Provides consistency and ready understanding of requirements.
62. I'm not sure of the implications.
63. I understand why the RMAA is promoting this idea - but I do not think professional titles should be regulated.
64. I don't understand how the position titles would be regulated.
65. This industry is too broad. Records is now being tied with IM which requires different skill sets and titles to straight records.
66. When you employ a new starter you would be aware of their level of capability.
67. There should be some way to distinguish qualifications-based titles from experience-based.
68. I think this would provide a more consistent approach and employees would know what they are getting, regarding skills etc.
69. We strongly recommend this as would make skills easily identifiable.
70. I believe that there needs to be some standardisation of accreditations and therefore also relevant pay scales.
71. Prefer word 'category' to 'titling' i.e. Professional category.
72. Would enable employers of prospective practitioners to fit skills and experience to position requirements and expectations.
73. Provided there was publicity to recruiters & businesses to explain & continue reinforcing the message.
74. Anything that helps 'outsiders' understand the profession has to be worthwhile.
Assuming that Professional titles are standardised do you accept that they would not allow for varying roles (ie FOI, joint Archive focus, etc) and that this would be left to individual position titles?

Response Total

Yes 180
No 29
Undecided 42
Skipped Question 2

Comments

1. However, individual competencies should cover these instances
2. I am not sure of the question.
3. My current title bears little resemblance to the portfolio of activities I manage
4. Unable to determine from the information provided.
5. Yes, because having one title, will be allow you to have a choice to improve your qualifications as FOI, Archive area,etc. by doing another course that will give you the skills for another job.
6. I am a Library Technician but carry out records management duties.
7. Then what would be the point of standardising the titles?
8. This may only work effectively within the private sector
9. No one standard can probably ever be reached, as Records roles vary.
10. Standardisation refers to a role which in most cases is complimentary to other roles staff are required to undertake
11. These become a responsibility within the position
12. There will always need to be some flexibility at the employer/employee level to add additional roles to a title - it's important to personal development & the smooth running of the organisation
13. FOI could be included as not compulsory
14. Not sure I fully understand the question
15. Professional titling should be completely independent of job titling. Well, completely in the sense that there will be cross-over but RMAA controls the professional and not the other.
16. I think it is important to differentiate
17. Employers are not influenced by the various disunited professional bodies and will do as they see fit
18. If there is an Accredited Professional Titling System this survey should not need to refer to individual position titles. Otherwise the system should be structured in a way to allow for varying roles.
19. This would ensure the roles are filled with qualified individuals and be recognised as professionals
20. Recognition of professional standards in Records Management are just that - they do not exclude other professional achievements but they cannot be tied to other professional areas - they must stand alone.
21. Keep professional and position titles separate
22. There are real problems in NZ because of the size of the field. Most people will be doing a mix of functions across the library, recordkeeping, IT and archives field
23. However if prof titles are standardised you can not make people or organisations use them
24. They should still allow some flexibility in a variety of roles
25. Confusing!
26. Do we want differences between Professional titles and individual position titles? Isn't this likely to lead to more confusion?
27. Development
28. Makes sense
29. There would have to be Variations of the original title composed.
30. There is no reason officers also working in FOI, archives, etc couldn't be accredited by other professional bodies, and think that people in joint roles would still benefit from the RMAA proposal.
31. Records positions can encompass so much that a suitable name may not reflect that
32. This makes a lot of sense
33. This would have to be made clear
34. No I do not accept this as these skills are mandatory records functions eg archiving
35. Applications apply to a variety of roles
36. Depends how it is structured
37. A variety in roles might be expected but again, skills and experience would be best placed to fit roles in accordance with responsibilities of positions.
38. One size never fits all
Please indicate which Professional titles you would support in principle and the level of qualification that you consider should be attained for that title. 
Note: The titles were randomised and therefore appeared in different orders each time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No formal qualifications</th>
<th>Certificate III</th>
<th>Certificate IV</th>
<th>Certificate V (Diploma)</th>
<th>Advanced Diploma</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Would not support this title</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Officer (Para)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Officer</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Coordinator</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Manager</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Consultant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Practitioner</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Technician</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Clerk</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Information Team Leader</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your suggestions for other titles or qualification levels?

1. Should be another level to describe experience attained
2. I would remove the Records & and only have all the above positions read Information Management ...
3. I am undecided re the level for a Manager as a person with Advanced Diploma qualifications AND management capabilities, may well be a better person for the role than an IM with a Batchelors Degree.
4. I would prefer Clerk be replaced with Assistant
5. Corporate Information Officer / Manager
6. Too many titles dilute the importance and impact of each
7. Drop the term 'Records' instead amalgamate descriptions and qualifications with other information management professions after wide consultation outside traditional records environment
8. The problem is not with the titles it's with the qualifications most people I'm aware of in Records & Information positions have no formal qualifications. It's slowly changing but not ready yet
9. Entry level with no qualifications for daily tasks, records officer then records manager with qualifications
10. Records and Information Trainer - Cert IV work place trainer and Assesor
11. As above but only using the title Information Management
12. Given that para is used in most professions for non-degree qualified persons, then this is what we should follow. Check what qualification library technicians are supposed to have for 'RM Technician'
13. No - but I have survived in the Records industry for 34 years and have no professional qualifications
14. Document management systems
15. Sorry - do not understand the term para - is that para legal? I also do not understand the role that a practitioner would do therefore could not answer it.
16. Some of these may be applicable in the right environment, difficult to judge theoretically.
17. Corporate Information Manager/Officer
18. Records & Information Administrator
19. specific to major job focus
20. Information Services Manager etc
21. You should really say what the difference between each job description is?
22. Hang on - why is it only 'qualifications' that are being considered?? What about experience? I’ve therefore answered the above question based on the qualification mentioned or equivalent experience!
23. As with previous survey, don't know what you mean by Para so can't comment
24. Those indicated above would be minimum qualifications
25. ‘Records’ should be removed. Consider ‘Principal Information Officer’
26. Renumeration packages could be organised accordingly and those with higher a level of qualification
   AWA could be negotiated. Those currently in positions and do not have formal qualifications can RCC
27. R & I Administrator - Advanced Diploma
28. Some of the proposed titles imply a level of staff supervision (eg supervisor, team leader) which may
   not be reflected in qualifications and/or experience.
29. You seem to have missed out the post graduate diploma level, which should come between bachelor
   and masters
30. Information manager
31. Depends on the organisation and how the position is benchmarked in the organisation (how much
    authority it has relative to other positions in the organisation)
32. Records & Information Administrator (instead of Technician)?
33. Knowledge Services instead of Records
34. Records & Information Educator
35. Information only, not Records
36. Strategist / Planner
37. The title ‘Records’ is historical and far to removed from core business. A more descriptive word is
    required which supports the business and identifies the functions/role of records is required.
38. I would not exclude people who do not have formal qualifications but have relevant experience from
    applying for these positions.
39. Records Controls Officer (some qual) or Records Representative (Team person) Records
    Assistant/Informant (like interview, or counter person)
40. having said that, it is hard to gain training for Records positions
41. Information Manager, Archivist
42. Information manager; information strategist; document&information manager; recordkeeping manager.
43. by 'bachelor', do you mean 'of Records Management', or does Bachelor include BA?
44. Use R&I Officer for both Cert 3 and 4.
45. Director Records & Information Services
46. This survey assumes the respondent knows what the certificates and diplomas involve.
47. Graduate Diplomas should be included in the mix of qualifications as most specific records
    qualifications are at this level
48. Document Management Officer/Tema Leader/Manager
49. By including 'Information' in the title, there will be confusion with the IT area. Like it or not, Chief
    Information Officer is an IT position
50. Information management positions eg Im officer, IM manager etc
51. I would like to see experience included also
52. Levels within these titles
53. Qualification requirements depend on the complexity and size of the organisation
54. Information Management Services
55. Information and Records Manager
56. I think the above are too varied eg coordinator, manager and supervisor are one of the same for our
    organisation. Also I would like to see Records Compliance Officer and Records System Compliance Offi
57. You have neglected ‘SRSA practical accreditation/s level/s’ I believe these should be recognised;
    particularly where a person sentencing records and assisting in development of procedures.
58. I consider the above to be an appropriate range of titles and qualification levels.
59. Director, Information Management
60. Records Coordinator
61. Records & Information Adviser

Do you consider you would be favourably or adversely affected if this titling was introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorably affected: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversely affected: 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not affected: 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped Question: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Presently Service Manager Records
2. I work for a RM vendor
3. My role is possibly unique in that I am the manager of both the Customer Service and Records operations in my organisation
4. I've never received formal qualifications but have enormous technical and on the job knowledge.
5. Yes, because the qualifications, skills & experience will be equally distributed accordingly to the job title.
6. Main title is Library Technician and this would be applied firstly.
7. Having worked in Records for over 30 years, & passed the first Records Certificate course conducted in Victoria (completed part-time studies 1976), my experience has taught me more about records
8. I have been a senior records manager for over 15 years working within very large organisations internationally, yet I don't qualify for 'Professional' status, ridiculous!
9. I am 3 subjects of finishing my Degree in Librarianship and CIM through Curtin. CIM includes Records Management, Archiving, Document COnrol and Conservation/Curatorial - bring it on I say!!
10. In larger organisations the structure and position duties are clearly defined. This is not the case in smaller agencies doing the same work.
11. I have moved beyond simply records management into broader knowledge & information areas that incorporate RM as only one of the activities
12. Titling would be aligned to quals and I do not have any
13. I haven't started any courses for qualifications as yet. However that would be rectified if Titling was introduced
14. only been acting in the area for 12 months and find that my job covers a broad spectrum of records management and implementation across branches of new electronic systems
15. Current title is Document Management Office Team Leader - I like Records & Information Manager better
16. Relative to other positons I am overqualified and underpaid so they couldn't do anything
17. Qualifications are rare in the NT
18. I am a qualified Health Information Manager
19. The position Title would not affect me at all. Only if the title included a standard pay classification increase
20. Even as a Consultant there is no standardisation in titles with my peers
21. I would hope you would sit an exam to gain the titles because I have seen alot of people who have qualification but no experience.
22. My employer is very independent and ignorant
23. Not in my current workplace, although I am the only record staff (officer) with a Master in recordkeeping
24. I have over 10 years experience but no formal qualifications as a Records Manager
25. I was trained as an Archivist but manage a team of records officers and archives officers
26. The list of certifications do not include the Exectutive Certificate in RM
27. Too old - too far gone
28. We use the above titles now
29. But my team would be adversley affected - where does experience, but nor formal qualifications fit in?
30. Self employed
31. Nothing any system the records management profession does now affects us
32. Too many titles confusing, easier to have 'professional' for those with degrees in the disciline, 'technician /para-professional' for vocational quals TAFE/RTP, clerk/officer no quals at all
33. I work as an archivist which is not quite the same as some one in Records & Information management in the sense it seems to mean here
34. Experience & education recognition
35. I have no current formal training
36. I have no formal qualifications in this field
37. I am a successful Records Manager yet have only completed Certificate III - knowledge and ability are not always clearly indicated by the level of formal education
38. It depends on how it is introduced and whether it is accepted as an industrial award.
39. Need to emphasise Information - not just records, as we also manage information and need to distinguish information as a record from non-record.
40. As I have 25 years experience in the RM Industry and hold a Senior Management Position but only ever got a basic RM Certificate when it was first introduced in TAFE (Experince should also play a part)
41. Clerk, technician, coordinator and consultant have particular connotations associated with them and not always in a positive light & so I wouldn't support their use
42. As we are not talking about Position Titles, it will take a long time to be recognised
43. Completing Masters at present, so could appear to be over qualified to future employers
44. Have not yet managed to acquire necessary qualifications
45. I have a Diploma of Business and a Cert 1V in Records so my quals are not only in Records
46. The problem is for SME's where one person will have many roles.
47. Should accompany years practical experience
48. Only from the point that I would need a University Degree for my current role under this table.
49. Would add persuasive power to requests/requirements
50. 20 years experience would mean little
51. I am a Records Compliance Officer and monitor officers compliance in registering documents in line with the State Records Act. I have 17 years exp but am not a team leader or coordinator
52. I would have to consider formal qualifications as per survey
53. These would not be known outside of the RM community
54. The above titling appears to reflect an acceptable description of roles.
55. Title structure important in Govt. orgs

Would your employer be likely to either adopt or acknowledge this titling if it were introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Adopt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Acknowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

1. Job titles change like the weather here
2. I work for a RM vendor
3. My gut feeling is that it would be adopted as my Council is a major supporter of Records Management as an essential service. I believe the organisation would be largely supportive
4. Not likely.
5. Yes, because the organisation employ people accordingly to the qualifications, skills & experience that job is asking to perform.
6. May be added to existing title.
7. Have only been with them for a month, so not sure.
8. It makes no sense for any organisation to adopt a titling convention for the sake of 'professional' vanity, This can only work within government sector as they really have nothing else.
9. There is only one person in the records department here, me!
10. Depending on the financial implications - which ever worked to their benefit.
11. Department of Defence uses it's own acronyms.
12. As above but if we recruited a dedicate records person, then one of the titles would be applied
13. Work for a government department
14. In the Public Service it is hard to introduce titles onto a formal Job description form which is usually just restricted to APS classifications, however it is the Position title by which a person is known
15. Unsure as to whether they would adopt it or not as there seems to be no formal process to title changes in the organisation
16. Company has also employed Records Manager in the past
17. I hope
18. PROV will do what is best for PROV
19. Not in my current workplace, although I am the only record staff (officer) with a Master in recordkeeping
20. The use of the term 'information' in the title is misleading and is likely to be misunderstood.
21. My employer has trouble understanding Records Management itself
22. I'm self-employed!
23. I do not see the need to use standard position titles if these were linked to Professional levels and qualifications across multiple employers - key is comparability not conformity
24. Adoption would be left up to the records management staff to accept or decline as a group
25. Possibly adopt as this is an area they are now coming to recognise appropriately
26. It is up to the manager what the titles are
27. One of the major criteria of a profession is a uni level education
28. Only if it is beneficial to Managers
29. I think they would if the majority were in to it
30. The current view is that formal qualifications are not absolutely necessary. On the job training and industry experience are much more valued and would be too hard to fill vacancies.
31. Acknowledge but not necessarily agree with the qualifications.
32. Given time I think J&P specifications would recognise and become aligned with the scheme.
33. See comments at 8.
34. I believe the employer would think it is no longer relevant to use these terms and that the terms would not truly reflect contemporary business, in terms of how it is conducted (e-environment).
35. Would acknowledge and use for selection processes but not necessarily adopt as it would not be consistent with job titling across the agency, particularly for higher levels
36. Including 'information' in position titles is unlikely
37. We run as IM professionals which incorporates web and gis, library, not just pure records
38. Need to be aligned to Mercer
39. The problem is for SME's where one person will have many roles.
40. Organisational naming conventions linked to position level & salary are in place
41. But we are using a variation of the consultant option now.
42. Would help identify right personnel to deal with
43. Keen to reduce numbers so may use this as part of push
44. Due to varying titles we have presently eg Records System Compliance, Records DataWorksTrainers and Records
45. Probably adopt
46. Unless I added it as a requirement in the position description
47. I would hope appropriate levels of skill and experience would be an acknowledgement of ability to undertake level of responsibility.
48. Unlikely as businesses have their own preferences linking to management fads, need to fit within grading structures that rarely involve adopting a professional organisations views.
49. Assists HR Managers

An alternative to the Professional titling method suggested previously could be "field titling" which demonstrates a particular field of work. Please indicate which of the following titles you may consider and the minimum qualification levels you believe should be attained for that title.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No formal qualifications</th>
<th>Certificate III</th>
<th>Certificate IV</th>
<th>Certificate V (Diploma)</th>
<th>Advanced Diploma</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Records &amp; Information Manager</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Records &amp; Information Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyst Records &amp; Information Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Records &amp; Information Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Records &amp; Information Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your suggestions for other titles or qualification levels?

1. Experience attained ie no of years in profession competencies gained etc
2. What does the 'Para' define?
3. Preservation Records & Information Manager
4. Don't support field titling as it can lead to demarcation issues
5. Please refer to comments above
6. How many ways can you split one hair.
7. Stick to the ones above and run parallel to ALIA
8. The term records is far to narrowly focused
9. Corporate Manager Records Management, Director Records Management
10. Need more information about Bachelor and Masters - of what? Is possible to complete MIMS without touching much on records management, but a lot of information management.
11. ISO Record Operations & Information Manager
12. Some of these may be applicable in the right environment, difficult to judge theoretically.
13. Corporate Information Manager
14. Specific to job performed
15. I think anything at Manager level should have at least a Diploma
16. As with previous survey, don't know what you mean by Para so can't comment
17. My title is Manager Records and Archives
18. 'Records & ...' should always come first. Not all of these are necessarily managers.
19. Records and Information Analyst; R & I Systems Specialist (databases, EDMS admin, etc)
20. I'm a bit confused with this Manager title. Our records are under the IT Department. We work very closely and tune in well. For Records to become 'manager' in our council we would have to have a shift
21. I'd prefer that there were a couple of titles, say Records & Information Manager and Records & Information Officers, but that there were levels or grades of competency and achievement within them
22. Information Manager
23. Needs to be benchmarked with other roles in org so the records and info roles fit in at the appropriate status - this depends on how the org sees it and how much influence the mgr of the function has
24. All too wordy
25. To gain the respect from the professional community at large we need a standard benchmark in qualification, like for example Bach in Records and Information Management
26. Cert III Records Control Officer
27. This field titling could be confusing and divisive.
28. Post graduate qualifications in archives and records
29. Recordkeeping systems officer/analyst; Information systems analyst
30. Can't make sense of this survey, because i don't know what you mean by Bachelor, Masters. Of what?
31. Qualification requirements depend on the complexity and size of the organisation
32. Unable to comment without knowledge of definitions
33. No other suggestions
34. Too confusing. Keep the actual job clear & first.
35. Business records & information manager

Do you consider you would be favourably or adversely affected if this titling was introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorably affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversely affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

1. Proposal maintains a fragmented approach to information management
2. As per previous related question
3. Risks pigeon holing by field
4. Bring inline with Library / Information Managers
5. FOI is part of current title
6. Having spent the last 12 years consulting, I am most unlikely to return to a Manager role.
7. Our heirarchy doesn't know and doesn't really care
8. Not in my current workplace, although I am the only record staff (officer) with a Master in recordkeeping
9. I work as a consultant - so doubt it would affect me
10. Of structure. It is recognised within our structure the qualifications I have gained. I don't want to have to do it all again so how are you going to recognise NZ cross credits. No11 to narrow
11. Again, team would be - why not go further and include Preservation officers, e-records specialists etc
12. I think insertion of manager in all positions is misleading. Meanings are unclear.
13. Self employed
14. Need to look at what a profession actually is! And bite the bullet!
15. Again no formal training as such
16. I would be favourably affected if you adopted my idea.
17. Too much emphasis on 'records' in titles - should be on 'information'
18. I do not like this approach - again some can have a negative connotation
19. Completing Masters at present, so could appear to be over qualified to future employers
20. As previously, my quals are not only in Records
21. This would allow for other skills to be recognised and define roles to much which I don't think is practical
22. A grading system with attached skills would be better
23. Would have to be a demonstrated ability to undertake specific duties to effect such changes.

Would your employer be likely to adopt or acknowledge this Professional titling if it were introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Adopt</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Acknowledge</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped Question</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

1. Probably not just completed another restructure here
2. As I would argue against such titling, it would require someone from outside the council to make a case for it to happen
3. As per previous related question
4. May do more then professional title, this could be added to existing title for position clarification.
5. The qualifications are not relevant to NT government positions.
6. Depends on the options. As the proposal currently stands I think it unlikely.
7. We already have some of the titles
8. As above - self employed. Would welcome consistent terminology across the profession, even if it was not reflected in position titles.
9. Can't see how you can line up NZ and Aussie qualifications.
10. They would do what they felt appropriate to identify the roles
11. Most don't even know what recordkeeping is!
12. Majority rules
13. He would probably agree to the idea.
14. I doubt they would use any of above
15. We already have internal rating skills & knowledge categories
16. Demonstrated abilities and skills would be a requirement before acknowledgement of change would be effected.

Do you wish to make any other comments?

1. I'd like to win the ipod please
2. The system needs to cater for RIM people with experience and knowledge but lack classroom / formal qualifications.
3. The emphasis is on qualifications and not on the job knowledge. It would be useful if a recognition of prior learning system was established for those without qualifications.
4. The problem as can be clearly seen is that most of the RM teams that I am aware of have no formal qualifications.
5. I think giving professional title is a good idea, if they are used in the same way the Library Industry uses theirs, though there is some blurring of the lines when it comes to duties performed.
6. Does not address the value of experience vs degree. Will work for lg organisations, but not for smaller Councils R/M with hands on experience over all records and are isolated from industry training.

7. It about time!

8. It is the title by which a person is known and respected by colleagues and senior managers which is important. The recognition of the responsibilities that the title brings

9. Health Information Managers changed titling in 1992/93 to better indicate skill range. Now recognised internationally. Other titles Medical Record Manager and many other titles.

10. I’d love to, but I don’t have the time right now and I’d probably also say things I’d regret later.

11. RMAA should not be wasting it’s time doing this sort of work that provides not value to anyone.

12. This survey seems in some ways to put the cart before the horse. In order to effectively make recommendations on titles it is necessary to have some idea of the roles and responsibilities associated.

13. As stated previously those individuals who have not attained a qualification but have the skill set could achieve Recognition of Current Competencies (RCC)

14. What is Para Records? All our corporate, Ref records are together. Titles to specific.

15. Profession definitely needs formal career progression, but shouldn't be overly prescriptive

16. I support the initiative, though would be one of the most adversely affected, being of MRMA status earning over $100,000pa - with only formal records management qualification being a one year certificate

17. I was surprised to hear that you had to run this survey again, in slightly different form. I would have expected that a professional survey would have been pilot tested before use

18. Don't make too many rules and regulations - this gets you into a hell of a bind if you can't be flexible within the profession.

19. It's a losing battle until a university degree is required for professional recognition of status

20. I think the only people whom would want the title change would be people with a lot of exprience in the field, so that they may be formally titled,

21. To keep up with a changing world in information management we need to show the world that we as Records and Information Managers have a professional standards in qualifications and experience

22. We need to look at overseas trends

23. I think there is a distinct difference between the officer who is consulted (so is helped to find the information he wants) and the records controller, who has control over how to locate a particular

24. I appreciate the various initiatives the RMAA is undertaking to raise the professional profile of our industry. Thanks.

25. I think the RMAA would be better of achieving an industrial award covering records and archives for all Australian workers. Should include para and professional levels.

26. This is a difficult exercise to undertake and more to implement as orgns will identify positions according to their business and cultural needs - hence the wide array of pd titles.

27. I don't hold any recognised records qualification but have 19 years experience in the records environment

28. I don't think this is a well structured survey

29. Don't assume that we all know what a para professional is.

30. I am all for qualifications if they mean something and you are not just passed because you attend a course.

31. Agree we need to be seen as a professional group, worried about impact on my career

32. Concept is good but I do not like the proposed titles. What are the associated skills set

33. Thanks for the opportunity to expand on the previous survey, I too misunderstood its prime goal.

34. I don't think you can put everyone in the same category, we need to have a level playing field

35. Not sure I like Information in the title for our particular company.

36. While I understand that here is a ficus ion building this profession, what you're risking is boxing the profession into a corner. Give a boss a title - and they can rarely see outside it
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