

This article is downloaded from



<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

**It is the paper published as:**

**Author:** P. Hider, M. A. Kennan, L. Hay, S. McCausland and A. Qayyum

**Title:** Moving from LIS to IS+L: Curriculum Renewal at Charles Sturt University

**Journal:** Australian Library Journal

**ISSN:** 0004-9670

**Year:** 2011

**Volume:** 60

**Issue:** 3

**Pages:** 205-217

**Abstract:** The paper describes a recent review of Library and Information Management courses offered by the School of Information Studies at Charles Sturt University, and the resulting program of curriculum renewal and expansion. This program aimed to address concerns over the long-term sustainability of the courses and respond to an increasingly converging professional landscape. The courses were redesigned in a way that allowed them to maintain their relevance to the School's established librarianship market, while at the same time develop a significant application to other information fields. This was achieved by essentially turning the curriculum on its head. Instead of a library focused core with electives in other information areas, the new curriculum offers core subjects that cover the information-people-technology nexus in generic fashion and provides a foundation for a wide range of specialisations. This transformation represents what could be described as a move from a traditional Library and Information Studies (LIS) approach to a broader Information Studies (IS) orientation, accommodating advanced areas of study in specific fields, including Librarianship (L). The paper goes on to discuss key issues concerning the implementation of the course redesigns, and the results of their implementation to date.

URLs: <http://alia.org.au/publishing/alj/> [http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=31717&local\\_base=GEN01-CSU01](http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=31717&local_base=GEN01-CSU01)

**Author Address:** phider@csu.edu.au  
mkennan@csu.edu.au  
lhay@csu.edu.au  
smccausland@csu.edu.au  
aqayyum@csu.edu.au

**CRO Number:** 31717

## **Moving from LIS to IS+L: Curriculum Renewal at Charles Sturt University**

Philip Hider, Mary Anne Kennan, Lyn Hay, Sigrid McCausland and Asim Qayyum

This paper has been double-blind peer reviewed to meet the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research (DIISR) HERDC requirements.

The paper describes a recent review of Library and Information Management courses offered by the School of Information Studies at Charles Sturt University, and the resulting program of curriculum renewal and expansion. This program aimed to address concerns over the long-term sustainability of the courses and respond to an increasingly converging professional landscape. The courses were redesigned in a way that allowed them to maintain their relevance to the School's established librarianship market, while at the same time develop a significant application to other information fields. This was achieved by essentially turning the curriculum on its head. Instead of a library focussed core with electives in other information areas, the new curriculum offers core subjects that cover the information-people-technology nexus in generic fashion and provides a foundation for a wide range of specialisations. This transformation represents what could be described as a move from a traditional Library and Information Studies (LIS) approach to a broader Information Studies (IS) orientation, accommodating advanced areas of study in specific fields, including Librarianship (L). The paper goes on to discuss key issues concerning the implementation of the course redesigns, and the results of their implementation to date.

### **Implications for best practice**

- Information professions have common foundational elements
- These common foundational elements can be coordinated to form a core curriculum which is supported and supplemented by specialisations
- Information Studies graduates will have a broad range of knowledge and skills that can benefit both library and non-library employers

### **Introduction**

The School of Information Studies (SIS) at Charles Sturt University (CSU) has been offering education for librarianship for over 35 years, starting out as a School of Library and Information Science in the Riverina College of Advanced Education in the mid-1970s (Hider and Pymm 2006). Despite merging with the School of Computing Studies in the mid-1980s, the School continued to offer Library and Information Studies (LIS) courses firmly anchored in librarianship. Crucially, the School established itself as a specialist in distance education with all its LIS courses offered only in this mode by the time the School had become part of the new Charles Sturt University in 1989. As the Australian market for on-campus LIS programs began to shrink in the 1990s, CSU established itself as the largest provider of degree-level

education for the library profession, including teacher librarianship. Over the past decade, this trend has continued, with CSU now accounting for the majority of Australia's LIS students (in 2008, 59% were at CSU, representing 51% of the full-time equivalent load, according to data provided by the Australian Government's Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations).

The success of CSU's LIS programs has enabled the School of Information Studies to build a relatively large cadre of academic staff, covering a wide range of areas in librarianship. The focus on distance education has also seen it move fairly seamlessly into the online learning environment, with traditional mail packages being superseded by e-learning tools such as online modules, forums, wikis and chat. Although its courses were, some time ago, renamed 'Library and Information Management' the emphasis remained on the 'L' word, as indicated by the destinations of most of the graduates (Heazlewood, Pymm and Sanders 2006). To the extent that Information Management subjects were covered in the curriculum, they were mainly electives.

Most LIS programs in Australia are accredited by the Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA), which stipulates a core set of knowledge, skills and attributes, and thus enforces a certain amount of uniformity (Australian Library and Information Association). On the other hand, the Australian LIS community has long been aware of the need to acknowledge and deal with the increasing number of disciplines that have laid claim to portions of the 'information' field, due to convergences brought about by developments in information and communication technologies (Abbott 1988; Abbott 1998; Yu and Davis 2007). Since the 1980s librarianship has been viewed as one of a number of information professions which exist in a turbulent environment where others vie for what librarians have seen as their traditional jurisdiction (Van House and Sutton 1996; Abbott 1998; Myburgh 2005; Yu and Davis 2007). For example, computer scientists, information systems professionals and information technologists also work in the 'digital libraries' and 'knowledge management' spaces. Some of this turbulence is reflected in the changing organisational locations of LIS schools and departments, with the most common affiliations being information systems, communications/media, education, and business. These affiliations are sometimes actively sought by LIS academics looking to leverage the convergence of the information professions; other mergers have occurred for more pragmatic reasons (Harvey and Higgins 2003).

Views on what should constitute the core LIS curriculum have changed not only through time, but also vary across geographical boundaries, as Tam, Harvey and Mills (2007) argue. They suggest that curricula developed in one part of the world may not necessarily be appropriate elsewhere. However, trends in curriculum development are increasingly of relevance and interest to LIS sectors beyond the countries in which they originate. In the Asia-Pacific region, for instance, a series of international conferences on LIS education for professional leadership (A-LIEP) began in 2006 (Ghosh 2006). A trend that has generated a large amount of interest in recent years is represented by the North American *i-school* movement (iSchools), an off-shoot of which has been the Consortium of iSchools Asia Pacific (CiSAP). Although this movement was not the catalyst for CSU's curriculum redevelopment, it did serve as a reference point. Another major project of note has been carried out by European Association for Library & Information Education and Research (Kajberg

2007). Case studies of curriculum reform at particular universities have also recently been reported by Chow et al. (2011) and Moniarou-Papaconstantinou, Chatzimari and Tsafou (2008). Of particular relevance to this article is Robinson and Bawden's description (2011) of the way in which subject specialism has been introduced as a topic of study in the curriculum at City University.

The impetus for CSU's review of its LIS curriculum was ultimately a combination of an organisational restructure, acknowledgement of changing knowledge and skill requirements by employers, and the limits of the Australian library education market. By 2006, the LIS courses were strong enough to be housed in their own school, and an organisational restructure resulted in the School of Information Studies shedding its Information Technology/Systems component, and moving into the Faculty of Education. However, although the School's LIS courses were large compared with other Australian LIS programs, in the context of its new faculty, the School itself was relatively small. Furthermore, student enrolments were beginning to plateau. While the future of the LIS courses was not in doubt, the long-term sustainability of a school based entirely on these courses was an issue requiring examination. Indeed, the time was right for a general review of the School's activities and operations, which it duly carried out in 2008.

No parameters were set for the School Review. All elements of the School's teaching and research were placed under the microscope and a wide range of possible future directions was considered. The nature of the School's discipline, or set of disciplines, was the driver. If that discipline were to remain librarianship, the School may have reached its limit. It was already dominant in this market, but the market itself was showing few signs of growth (Hallam 2006). However, the School did not arrive at its decision to redefine its discipline simply, or even primarily, because of a market imperative. Rather, it came to the decision through first principles: the School's academic staff came together and workshopped what it meant to be a School of Information Studies. What was their core subject matter? Their answer was not libraries, but *information*. This, of course, is an answer echoed by the *i-school* movement, whose field of study 'deals with all the issues, opportunities, and challenges we face in our emerging Information Age...' (Bonnici, Subramaniam and Burnett 2009, 264).

### **Curriculum review process**

The review of the School's existing curricula, as part of the broader review of the School's activities, involved a large number of staff, students and external advisors. Early discussions at the course level gave way to a comprehensive process of analysis, starting with a 'think tank' in which staff and invited professional and educational leaders established a general direction for the School, based on the decision to redefine its discipline in terms of *information*, rather than a particular type of information agency (such as libraries). A series of focus group sessions, conducted in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Canberra, followed. The groups comprised representatives from a broad range of information professions (not just the library profession). Their discussions fed into a critical analysis of the existing coverage and structure of the School's courses, carried out by a Curriculum Working Party, which comprised the course coordinators and other staff most involved in the

teaching and running of the courses. Student feedback, content analyses, and consultations across industry and the LIS education sector, contributed to a detailed report that was forwarded to the School Review's leadership team, together with reports about the School's research and economic sustainability. A set of recommendations pertaining to the School's curriculum was then submitted for consideration by an external panel of six national and international leaders in the LIS field. A total of over 60 practitioners and educators from outside the School participated in the Review.

### **Curriculum review outcomes**

The external panel concurred with just about all of the proposals towards a new curriculum put forward by the School. Furthermore, the panel recommended that the building of this new curriculum should be given priority. However, the strengths of the existing programs were also recognised, particularly their relevance to mainstream library practice. Thus the curriculum was to be *renewed*, rather than completely replaced.

A new emphasis on the activities of information professionals operating in the digital, networked environment was advocated. The convergence of media in this environment was ultimately leading to a convergence of information professions. Areas of expertise, such as 'digital libraries', represented a melting pot of disciplines. Convergence in practice and research would be reflected in a convergence of educational programs—librarianship was no longer distinct enough from other information work to warrant a separate core curriculum. Instead, subjects from other courses, such as the School's Masters of Information Architecture, would be integrated into umbrella programs that focused on information, particularly digital information, as part of an information-people-technology nexus. This integration of curricula would take the form of additional strands, with the broad, 'information' perspective also allowing for a number of new areas to be included, such as records and archives management, knowledge management, and community informatics. Both technological and 'people' aspects could be covered in all of these strands.

A broadening of the curriculum was considered necessary not only to produce a new type of graduate who will be less dependent upon libraries for employment, but also to nurture a new type of librarian, one more confident in handling information in the online world, for a wider range of purposes and circumstances, as called for by employers in Sanders' survey (2008). If the CSU courses were to remain relevant to the library profession at large, they needed to do more than just point to new paradigms; they needed to embrace them. In the new information environment, professionals do not wait for patrons to come visiting; rather, they follow the information, analyse how it is used, how it is transformed, and how it is recorded. Fields such as informatics, information processing, and digital preservation are profoundly relevant to the modern librarian, and to all information professionals. Likewise, they are *core* to the contemporary LIS curriculum, not optional extras.

Analysis undertaken during the Review, revealed that opportunities for the School to expand into new areas of information studies abounded. This was particularly true with respect to research, but was also the case with the curriculum. All of the relevant

professional bodies in Australia, such as the Australian Society of Archivists (ASA), the Records Management Association of Australasia (RMAA), and the Institute for Information Management (IIM), had identified a lack of professional education. Few, if any, of the other LIS departments in Australia were in a position to substantially add to their curriculum, due to low staffing levels (Wilson et al. 2010), yet neighbouring disciplines such as Information Systems were not covering the gaps.

Analysis also showed, however, that many of the information areas outside of librarianship are not supported by large numbers of professionals, even though they are populated by increasing numbers of end-users. Full-blown, stand-alone programs could not be justified given the potential numbers of students and subsequent positions for them in the workforce. Thus the concept of 'strands' was developed into a formal set of optional *specialisations*, beyond a generic core curriculum that would introduce the foundational aspects of all areas. In effect, the old Library and Information Management curriculum was to stand on its head: instead of a library-oriented core and a scattering of non-library electives, the new curriculum started with an information-oriented core, after which was offered a wide range of specialist subjects that could be taken independently or as part of a particular specialisation, including various librarianship specialisations. In this way, students who wished to graduate with a professional *library* qualification could still do so.

The new structure was intended to provide all students with the opportunity to examine, in the core curriculum, the use and management of information resources such as corporate documents and archival records, that had previously been given scant attention; and to present students with the option of further study in areas that represented genuinely alternative careers to librarianship. Accreditation of these new areas of the curriculum was to be sought from the relevant professional bodies, such as the ASA and RMAA, as well as from ALIA.

## **Implementation**

The School accepted all of the external panel's recommendations and resolved to implement them over a two-year period, starting with a redesign of its courses in 2009. Both the undergraduate and postgraduate generalist courses were restructured so as to accommodate a range of formal specialisations offered in the final third of the course, following the common core. Importantly, the courses were also renamed: the existing Bachelor and Master of Applied Science (Library and Information Management) degrees became the Bachelor and Master of Information Studies. Other specialist courses were integrated into the main programs, with the exceptions of a stand-alone Masters in Teacher Librarianship, which subsumed another teacher librarianship course, and a course in audiovisual archiving. As there are twice as many subjects in undergraduate specialisations than in postgraduate specialisations at CSU, the specialisations in the Bachelors of Information Studies were scoped much more broadly. In the undergraduate course, three specialisations were established: Librarianship; Information and Knowledge Management; and Records and Archives Management. In the Masters of Information Studies, on the other hand, eight specialisations were developed: Librarianship (in general); Children's Librarianship; Library Leadership; Information and Knowledge Management; Information Architecture; Records and Archives Management;

Community Networking; and Applied Research. The core components of the existing programs were reconfigured so as to serve as a foundation for all specialisations, with many of the syllabi substantially revised to incorporate a much broader range of institutional contexts.

The course redesigns were consistent with the view that information services now primarily revolve around human-computer interaction, interlaced with technology, culture, ecology, and collections (Seadle and Greifeneder 2007). Although subjects had already started to incorporate this concept, here was an opportunity to embed it more systematically. In particular, the specialisations of Information Architecture, and Information and Knowledge Management were designed with a strong focus on human-computer interaction. Both specialisations were also developed so that they connected to their interdisciplinary heritage, thus maintaining links with computing disciplines, though with an emphasis on communication and organisational issues, leading to user-focused systems design.

The Information and Knowledge Management specialisation was also designed so that students might examine the complexities of knowledge across a variety of organisational contexts. This approach is similar to the one taken in other Knowledge Management (KM) courses (Al-Hawamdeh 2005; Hazeri and Martin 2009), and is based on the view that the potential for LIS professionals to act as knowledge brokers and knowledge entrepreneurs outside of libraries, and their role in building a knowledge economy in small to medium sized organisations, remains underrated. Offering KM subjects in the LIS curriculum is one way of addressing this issue, by producing graduates with a marketable KM skill set. The CSU KM specialisation is thus intended to prepare its graduates for roles as knowledge leaders, knowledge managers, knowledge navigators, knowledge synthesizers, content editors, and Web masters, as Abell and Oxbrow (1999) advocate. Fundamentally, it represents a move away from elective fields such as KM being studied with reference to libraries.

The course redesigns were built from the bottom up. For the core subjects, the key question was, what do *all* information professionals need to know? Likewise, (re)developers of the core subjects were asked whether a prospective records manager or information architect—someone who has no plans for a career in libraries—would find the subject just as relevant? Before the proposed new curriculum was developed, its structure, outlines and direction were evaluated in mid 2009 by another panel of external advisors. This panel represented all of the industries the redesigned courses were intended to support, and mapped against the education policies of the key professional bodies (including those of ALIA).

The curriculum overhaul also presented an opportunity to accelerate the move to a more comprehensive approach in online delivery. This phase has resulted in a number of learning and teaching initiatives, including a Web 2.0 curriculum audit, teaching fellowships, other funded scholarship-of-teaching projects, and the use of a teaching infrastructure grant.

In early 2009, a senior member of the academic staff was commissioned by the Head of School to conduct an audit of the current subjects to determine how Web 2.0 and other emerging technologies were being used in teaching. The audit consisted of interviews with academics and examination of course materials, both in print and

online. It documented specific examples of how Web 2.0 tools were currently being utilised by academics in their teaching, identified the potential application of additional social networking technologies to support the curriculum renewal process, and highlighted a number of key issues and concerns raised by academic staff during the interviews regarding the adoption and integration of technologies in the curriculum. The report concluded with a set of twenty recommendations addressing key areas of curriculum design, the needs of distance education students, technology innovation processes, and academics' expertise and engagement. Academic staff attended a seminar in mid-2009 where they were briefed on the report's contents, and were subsequently provided with opportunities to discuss ideas and issues raised in the report through a series of professional development sessions hosted by the School's Learning and Teaching Committee throughout the second half of that year.

Another component of the curriculum renewal program involved the appointment of academic staff as teaching fellows to conduct projects targeting specific facets of the curriculum identified as requiring particular attention. In 2009, an academic member of staff was awarded a teaching fellowship with the Flexible Learning Institute (FLI), which consisted of part-time release from July 2009 to June 2010 to work collaboratively with academic staff in redesigning existing subjects and supporting the design of new subjects, with an emphasis on integrating Web 2.0 technologies (where appropriate) into subjects to support learning and teaching (Hay 2009; Virkus 2008; Bawden et al. 2007), and on the constructive alignment of learning theories with course objectives, learning tasks and assessment (Biggs and Tang 2007; National Research & Development Centre for Adult Literacy & Learning 2003). This project built on the recommendations of the School's Web 2.0 audit, and findings of a Faculty of Education funded *Innovation in Learning & Teaching* project, which explored ways CSU's Information Studies curriculum could develop increased connectedness, engagement, creativity and collaboration afforded by mobile and social networking technologies (Hay and Crease 2010; Hay and Crotty 2009; Lipu and Hay 2009). A range of Web 2.0 technologies has been integrated in a number of undergraduate and postgraduate subjects as a result of this project, including blogs, wikis, Facebook, LinkedIn, Skype, Delicious, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, Etherpad, SlideShare, TokBox, Amazon Cloud Computing and Second Life.

The School was also successful in securing funds to assist in building the CSU-SIS Learning Centre in Second Life, during the second half of 2009, to provide its students with a more immersive, synchronous 3D learning environment (Hay and McGregor 2010; Hay, McGregor and Wallis 2009). This was seen as the next step in expanding the School's online learning environment, given similar initiatives by other *i-schools* (Kemp and Haycock 2008). At CSU, the FLI Teaching Fellow worked closely with two academic staff in the 2010 teaching sessions to integrate Second Life into four undergraduate and postgraduate subjects. In these subjects students are encouraged to attend online discussion sessions hosted by academic staff and guest speakers, deliver their own 'inworld' presentations, join information professional and educator groups, participate in professional development activities, visit a range of library, museum and education campuses and islands, and meet with lecturers for individual consultation (Hay and Pymm, in press; Gregory et al. 2011).

In 2010, a teaching fellowship at CSU's Education For Practice Institute (EFPI) was also awarded, involving the part-time release of another academic in the second half of the year, to explore the ways a professional portfolio could be embedded in the BIS and MIS courses; evaluate the design and effectiveness of the existing professional portfolio in the MEdTL course; and examine how a portfolio can be best integrated across a course and within subjects to help consolidate student learning throughout their course experience and inform the final professional experience component of courses (Freeman 2010).

The outcomes of these initiatives have contributed to the development of a more cohesive approach to learning and teaching innovation across programs, while building the School's reputation as a hub of technology and learning innovation within the University (Hay 2010; Hay et al. 2010). In the first session of 2009, about a third of the School's subjects were delivered entirely online; a year later, over 90% of subjects were. Yet the new curriculum is not merely delivered: greater integration of learning management tools and Web 2.0 technologies has allowed academics to build 'connected classrooms', in which the curriculum is explored and transacted (Hay 2009).

The new curriculum was formally approved in June 2009 and developed over the second half of the year, ready for the first intakes into the redesigned courses in March 2010. All of the School's academic staff, including four newly recruited members, contributed to the subject development work. Several consultants were also employed to assist in specific areas. The curriculum is outlined at [http://www.csu.edu.au/courses/undergraduate/information\\_studies/course-structure](http://www.csu.edu.au/courses/undergraduate/information_studies/course-structure) (Bachelors) and at [http://www.csu.edu.au/courses/postgraduate/information\\_studies\\_master/course-structure](http://www.csu.edu.au/courses/postgraduate/information_studies_master/course-structure) (Masters). Around sixteen new subjects were introduced, and many of the existing subjects underwent major revisions. Appendices A and B show the old and new postgraduate course structures.

Through the efforts of everyone in the School of Information Studies, and the support of the Faculty of Education, the new curriculum was delivered on schedule. Existing students were given the option of transferring into the new awards, and a large proportion did so. There has also been a marked increase in the number of new students enrolling in the revised courses, and feedback from students suggests that the expanded and renewed curriculum has contributed to the growth. Attrition has also fallen and student evaluations indicate that the new subjects have been generally well received, scoring in the same region, by and large, as established subjects. Another panel of external course advisors visited the School in September 2010 to assess the initial iteration of the new curriculum, and feedback was both helpful and positive. A few subjects have since undergone some modification following discussions amongst the academics involved in their development, but all subjects were carried over into 2011, and all now have healthy enrolments. Although students do not need to register in a specialisation (if they choose to do so) until they reach the end of their course, all specialisations already have students enrolled in them. Further refinements are bound to occur (the new course structure could even accommodate additional specialisations), but early indications are that the curricular reforms have been largely successful.

## Discussion

Applying the aforementioned theory of domain convergence to a whole curriculum is easier said than done. To broaden the scope of courses that focused heavily on information practice as carried out in the specific location of libraries so that they cover information practice much more inclusively, independent of location, requires close engagement with various other 'information' disciplines and fields, apart from librarianship, such as information technology and information systems, computer science, archival studies, and records management. The 'information' space, representing the information-people-technology nexus, is crowded and contested (Bonnici, Subramaniam and Burnett 2009; Abbott 1998). Digital libraries, for example, are of central concern in computer science as well as LIS. They can be 'envisioned as collections, suites of technologies, organizations, or combinations of all three' (Thomas and Patel 2008, 302), depending on professional or disciplinary background. While LIS and computer science have different foci, useful digital library programs require the input of those from both disciplinary backgrounds (Pomerantz et al. 2006).

To re-scope and re-focus degree courses also requires the implementation of wholesale changes in a relatively short timeframe. Success is dependent on at least four key elements: buy-in of academic staff; academic expertise; organisational support; and, support from the various communities of practice. The School's 'bottom up' approach to curriculum renewal, involving all staff in the School, fostered the necessary buy-in. With clear aims and objectives aligned with the goals and aspirations of the University, the School received tangible organisational support. Greater challenges were encountered securing the necessary academic expertise and engaging with those professional communities with which the School had previously had few interactions. A further challenge, particularly in the case of the Masters course, was to broaden the coverage of the core program without lengthening it. Lessons learnt from attempting to meet these three challenges are outlined briefly below.

Information studies is more than the sum of its parts. It also has to deal with the relationships between these parts. Broadening the scope of, say, a collection management subject so that it covers, in addition to library collections, the management of archival collections and collections of corporate records, amongst others, is not simply a matter of discussing each type of collection more succinctly. It is also about explaining the different contexts and purposes associated with these collection types and their management. The School does not take the position that digital convergence is leading to a unified system of digital content management. It has established archives and records management specialisations *because* archives and records management is considered to be fundamentally different from, say, library management. This remains the case in the digital environment, where the notion of 'digital recordkeeping' goes further than 'digital curation', which some archivists have critiqued as too passive. Instead, digital recordkeeping is seen as representing the active and necessary responsibility for managing the digital record from the moment of its creation, and even before its inception. For example, Adrian Cunningham (2008), formerly of National Archives of Australia, has identified a list of

thirteen distinct areas of knowledge that digital archivists need. It is in no way a duplicate of similar lists compiled for librarians.

These disciplinary contextualisations have to be integrated, so that each subject forms a coherent whole. The difficulty of this task may be seriously underestimated by academics unaccustomed to working across 'information' domains. All of the core subjects were redeveloped by teams of academics and those teams consisting of staff from a range of professional and disciplinary backgrounds gained a distinct advantage. They could more readily answer the question, does this work for, say, archives and records management, or information architecture, or knowledge management?

Expanding the curriculum into new information areas necessitated an expansion of academic expertise. Despite being the largest LIS school in Australia (Wilson et al. 2010), the expansion could not be fully covered by existing staff. As this shortfall could neither be covered by academic staff from elsewhere in the University, it had to be addressed through external recruitment. This was a difficult task, given that the School was still in the process of drawing up the plans for the new curriculum. It was, to some extent, a chicken-and-egg kind of problem. Nevertheless, the required areas of expertise had to be spelt out as concretely as possible, defined in terms of what they were, rather than what they were not. It was also relatively difficult to recruit from emerging professions (such as information architecture) and from professions which did not closely associate with librarianship (such as records management and computer science). These might also be regarded as chicken-and-egg problems: which comes first, the program or the professional landscape? In any case, it was critical that the new recruits, as well as the existing staff, also bought into the concept of *integrated* information studies.

A post-recruitment issue was the support and development of new staff who may have been the only specialist in their field in the school, or indeed the university. These individuals may find that they need to build wider research networks, even though the plan would ultimately be for them to collaborate with colleagues in the School on projects that cross disciplines and domains, just as the curriculum aims to do.

It was also important to successfully engage with information professionals who did not see themselves as working in the same area as librarians, or even in an aligned area. One stumbling block was the tendency to associate libraries with the public sector, and also with physical collections and spaces. The key was to talk *their* language, and find common ground by breaking down the various institutional and perceptual barriers. Ultimately, representatives from all the targeted information professions could be found who identified, at least partly, with the broader LIS discipline. It seems likely that further convergence will occur amongst the information professions in our increasingly digitally-driven and networked world, and an integrated curriculum should help facilitate this. This theme is also currently being explored at the national level in a project funded by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council, *Re-conceptualising and re-positioning Australian library and information science education for the twenty-first century*. As one of the discussion papers on its website comments, 'LIS educators therefore must attempt to

accommodate the demands of very broad and diverse professional contexts within the curriculum.'

Curricula which do not reflect the reality of practice will ultimately be found wanting. Time, and future graduate destination surveys, will tell if the move towards an integrated information studies curriculum was the right one. The new curriculum offered by the School of Information Studies at Charles Sturt University was established in little more than a year, yet has so far proven very popular, with student enrolments rising sharply. Will the School's future graduates and their employers end up better off? This may depend on a reconceptualisation of what it means to be an Information Studies graduate, and what it means to be part of the information industry: An industry that is greater than the sum of its parts, as the core subjects in CSU's new curriculum aim to demonstrate.

## References

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Abbott, Andrew. 1998. Professionalism and the future of librarianship. *Library Trends* 46, no. 3: 430-443.

Abell, Angela, and Nigel Oxbrow. 1999. Skills for the knowledge economy: The reality of the market place. *Business Information Review* 16, no. 3: 115–121.

Al-Hawamdeh, Suliman. 2005. Designing an interdisciplinary graduate program in knowledge management. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 56, no. 11: 1200-1206.

Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Re-conceptualising and Re-positioning Australian Library and Information Science Education for the Twenty-first Century. Project summary.

[http://www.liseducation.org.au/resources/DiscussionPaper1\\_ProjectSummary\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.liseducation.org.au/resources/DiscussionPaper1_ProjectSummary_FINAL.pdf).

Australian Library and Information Association. The library and information sector: Core knowledge, skills and attributes.

<http://www.alia.org.au/policies/core.knowledge.html>.

Bawden, David, Lyn Robinson, Theresa Anderson, Jessica Bates, Ugne Rutkauskiene, and Polona Vilar. 2007. Towards Curriculum 2.0: Library/information education for a Web 2.0 world. *Library & Information Science Research* 31, no. 99: 14-25.

Biggs, John, and Catherine Tang. 2007. *Teaching for quality learning at university*. 3rd ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Bonnici, Laurie J., Manimegalai M. Subramaniam, Kathleen Burnett. 2009. Everything old is new again: The evolution of library and information science education from LIS to iField. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 50, no. 4: 263.

Chow, Anthony S., Teresa L. Shaw, David Gwynn, Dan Martensen, and Margaret Howard. 2011. Changing times and requirements: Implications for LIS Education. *LIBRES* 21, no. 1.  
[http://libres.curtin.edu.au/libres21n1/Chow\\_Shaw\\_Gwynn\\_Martensen\\_Howard\\_REF\\_LIBRES21n1.pdf](http://libres.curtin.edu.au/libres21n1/Chow_Shaw_Gwynn_Martensen_Howard_REF_LIBRES21n1.pdf).

Cunningham, Adrian. 2008. Digital curation/digital archiving: A view from the National Archives of Australia. *American Archivist* 71, no. 2: 541-542.

Freeman, Ashley. 2010. Embedding professional portfolios in Information Studies courses. Paper presented at the CSUED Conference, 10-11 November, in Bathurst, Australia.

Ghosh, Maitrayee. 2006. ALIEP-2006 conference on library leadership at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore: A summary report.  
[http://eprints.rclis.org/bitstream/10760/8128/1/ALIEP\\_\\_leadership.pdf](http://eprints.rclis.org/bitstream/10760/8128/1/ALIEP__leadership.pdf).

Gregory, Sue, Willems, Julie, Wood, Denise, Hay, Lyn, Ellis, Allan, & Lisa Jacka. 2011. Learning and teaching in Second Life: Educator and student perspectives. Paper presented at the DEHub Summit, 15-18 February, in Sydney, Australia.

Hallam, Gillian. 2006. The changing face of LIS education. *inCite* 27, no. 4: 4.

Harvey, Ross, and Susan Higgins. 2003. Defining fundamentals and meeting expectations: Trends in LIS education in Australia. *Education for Information* 21: 149-157.

Hay, Lyn. 2009. Recasting blended learning in a Web 2.0 world. Paper presented at 'Dialogue about Blended Learning' seminar, in the Flexible Learning Institute, Charles Sturt University, 10 November, in Bathurst, Australia.

Hay, Lyn. 2010. Expanding LIS pedagogical horizons through collaborative & immersive learning experiences for DE students. Paper presented at the CSUED Pre-Conference Workshop, 9 November, in Bathurst, Australia.

Hay, Lyn, and Rachel Crease. 2010. Building engaging Interact sites @SIS. Paper presented at the ICT-Enabled Learning Community of Practice Forum, 'How to Create Engaging Interact Sites', 19 February, at Charles Sturt University, Australia.

Hay, Lyn, and Roy Crotty. 2009. Horses for courses: Mobilizing modules design using online, print & podcasts. Paper presented at the ICT-Enabled Learning Community of Practice Forum, 'Imaginative Online Content', 21 August, at Charles Sturt University, Australia.

Hay, Lyn, and Joy McGregor. 2010. CSU's Second Life. *incite* 31, no. 1/2: 19-20.

Hay, Lyn, Joy McGregor, and Jake Wallis. 2009. There goes the neighbourhood! The School of Information Studies moves into Second Life. Paper presented at the CSUED Conference, 26-27 November, in Thurgoona, Australia.

Hay, Lyn, and Bob Pymm. 2011. Real learning in a virtual world: A case study of the School of Information Studies. Paper presented at the Asia-Pacific Conference on Library & Information Education and Practice (A-LIEP), 22-24 June, in Putrajaya, Malaysia.

Hay, Lyn, Bob Pymm, Rachel Crease, and Damian Lodge. 2010. The School of Information Studies curriculum renewal experience: Lessons learned. Paper presented at the CSUED Conference, 10-11 November, in Bathurst, Australia.

Hazeri, Afsaneh, and Bill Martin. 2009. Responding to the challenges of KM education in the LIS sector: Some academic and professional perspectives. *Australian Library Journal* 58, no. 3: 250-268.

Heazlewood, Jane, Bob Pymm and Roy Sanders. 2006. Where are they now? A survey of Charles Sturt University library and information management graduates. *Australian Library Journal* 55, no. 4: 330-342.

Hider, Philip, and Bob Pymm, eds. 2006. *Education for Library and information services: A festschrift to celebrate thirty years of library education at Charles Sturt University*. Wagga Wagga: Centre for Information Studies.

iSchools. About the iSchools. <http://www.ischools.org/site/about>.

Kajberg, Leif. 2007. The European LIS curriculum project: An overview. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 48, no. 2: 68-81.

Kemp, Jeremy W., and Ken Haycock. 2008. Immersive learning environments in parallel universes: Learning through Second Life. *School Libraries Worldwide* 14, no. 2: 89-97.

Lipu, Suzanne, and Lyn Hay. 2009. 'We need to talk...': An exploration of first year DE students' use of Interact chat. Paper presented at the CSUED Conference, 26-27 November, in Thurgoona, Australia.

Moniarou-Papaconstantinou, Valentini, Stella Chatzimari, and Stamatina Tsafou. 2008. Revamping the LIS curriculum in the Department of Library Science and Information Systems at the TEI of Athens. *Education for Information* 26, no. 2: 121-132.

Myburgh, Sue. 2005. *The new information professional: How to thrive in the information age doing what you love*. Oxford: Chandos House.

National Research & Development Centre for Adult Literacy & Learning. 2003. Models of adult learning: A literature review. <http://www.nrdc.org.uk/content.asp?CategoryID=424&ArticleID=380>.

Pomerantz, Jeffrey, Barbara M. Wildemuth, Seungwon Yang, and Edward A. Fox. 2006. Curriculum Development for Digital Libraries. Paper presented at the 6th

ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries, 11-15 June, in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Robinson, Lyn, and David Bawden. 2011. Information domains: Subject specialism in Masters courses. *CILIP Update with Gazette*, February: 28.

Sanders, Roy. 2008. Current demand and future need for undergraduate LIS education in Australia. *Australian Library Journal* 57, no. 2: 102-127.

Seadle, Michael, and Elke Greifeneder. 2007. Envisioning an iSchool curriculum. *Information Research* 12, no. 4: 1-11.

Tam, Lawrence Wai-Hong, Ross Harvey, and John Mills. 2007. How relevant are library and information science curricula outside their geographic domain? *Education for Information* 25, no. 2: 73-91.

Thomas, Chuck, and Salwa Ismail Patel. 2008. Competency-based training for digital librarians: A viable strategy for an evolving workforce? *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 49, no. 4: 298-309.

Van House, Nancy A., and Stuart A. Sutton. 1996. The panda syndrome: An ecology of LIS education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 37: 131-147.

Virkus, Sirje. 2008. Use of Web 2.0 technologies in LIS education: Experiences at Tallin University, Estonia. *Program: Electronic Library & Information Systems* 42: 262-274.

Wilson, Concepción, Mary Anne Kennan, Patricia Willard, and Sebastian K. Boell. 2010. Fifty years of LIS education in Australia: Academization of LIS educators in higher education institutions. *Library & Information Science Research* 32, no. 4: 246-257.

Yu, Hairong, and Mari Davis. 2007. The case for curriculum reform in Australian information management & library and information science education. Part 1, Technology and digitization as drivers. *Information Research* 12, no. 4, <http://informationr.net/ir/12-14/colis/colise05.html> (accessed 9 June 2011).

## **Appendix A**

### **Master of Applied Science (Library and Information Management) Course Structure**

#### **Stage 1 (Graduate Diploma)**

INF410 Information Seeking in Context  
INF425 Describing & Analysing Information Resources  
INF429 Introduction to the Information Society  
INF435 Provision of Information Resources  
INF415 Managing Information Agencies

INF439 The Online Information Environment  
INF444 Professional Study Visit  
INF445 Professional Experience  
[Restricted elective]  
[Restricted elective]

### **Stage 2 (Masters)**

INF501 Readings in Information Studies  
[Restricted elective]  
[Restricted elective]  
[Restricted elective]

### **Restricted electives**

#### Stage 1

ETL412 Information Literacy  
INF411 Application of Bibliographic Standards  
INF413 Information Technology in Libraries  
INF417 Research Evaluation  
INF436 Serving Children and Youth in Public Libraries  
INF440 Introduction to Information Architecture  
INF441 Information Management in Organisations  
INF442 Trends in Literature for Children and Young Adults  
INF443 Digital Preservation  
INF511 Advanced Information Retrieval  
ITC423 Database Systems  
ITC431 Computer Networks

#### Stage 2

ETL525 Knowledge Management  
INF508 Value-Added Information Services  
INF511 Advanced Information Retrieval  
INF513 Research Methods in Information Studies  
INF514 Human Resource Management in Libraries  
INF515 Strategic Library Management  
INF551 Research Project in Information Studies 1  
INF552 Research Project in Information Studies 2  
INF553 Research Project in Information Studies  
INF570 Portfolios for Information Professionals  
ITC540 Telecommunications Management  
ITC574 Information Technology for Managers

## **Appendix B**

### **Master of Information Studies Course Structure**

#### **Stage 1 (Graduate Diploma)**

INF405 The Digital Environment  
INF406 Information Sources and Services  
INF407 Professional Study Visit  
INF408 Professional Placement  
INF415 Management of Information Agencies

INF425 Describing and Analysing Information Resources  
INF429 The Information Society  
INF435 Collections  
INF447 Research Evaluation

## **Stage 2 (Masters)**

Four restricted electives one or more of the following areas of specialisation:

### *Librarianship*

INF409 Online Reference Services  
INF433 Information Literacy  
INF443 Creating and Preserving Digital Content  
INF446 Fundamentals of Web Publishing  
INF505 Services to Children and Young Adults  
INF506 Social Networking for Information Professionals  
INF507 Marketing of Libraries and Information Agencies  
INF510 Application of Bibliographic Standards  
INF518 Community Histories  
INF519 Community Outreach  
INF520 Preservation of Information Resources  
INF522 Project Management in Information Agencies  
INF531 Information Services Around the World  
INF539 Advanced Information Retrieval

### *Children's Librarianship*

ETL401 Teacher Librarianship  
ETL402 Literature in Education  
INF505 Services to Children and Young Adults  
INF521 Trends in Children's Literature

### *Library Leadership*

INF507 Marketing of Libraries and Information Agencies  
INF514 Human Resource Management in Information Agencies  
INF515 Strategic Library Management  
INF522 Project Management in Information Agencies

### *Information and Knowledge Management*

INF441 Principles of Knowledge Management  
INF443 Creating and Preserving Digital Content  
INF506 Social Networking for Information Professionals  
INF522 Project Management in Information Agencies  
INF523 Knowledge Management Systems  
INF538 Value-Added Information Services

### *Information Architecture*

INF440 Information Architecture for the Web  
INF446 Fundamentals of Web Publishing  
INF506 Social Networking for Information Professionals  
INF522 Project Management in Information Agencies  
INF523 Knowledge Management Systems  
INF525 Web Usability

INF526 Advanced Web Design and Publishing  
INF539 Advanced Information Retrieval  
ITC412 Systems Analysis  
ITC540 IT Infrastructure Management

#### *Records and Archives Management*

INF527 Records, Archives and Society  
INF528 Records and Archives Practice  
INF529 Government, Organisational and Private Records  
INF430 Audiovisual Archiving  
INF431 Preservation of Audiovisual Materials  
INF443 Creating and Preserving Digital Content  
INF520 Preservation of Information Resources

#### *Community Networking*

INF443 Creating and Preserving Digital Content  
INF506 Social Networking for Information Professionals  
INF518 Community Histories  
INF519 Community Outreach  
INF522 Project Management in Information Agencies  
INF539 Advanced Information Retrieval  
INF531 Information Services Around the World

#### *Applied Research*

INF550 is to be taken after the first two subjects:  
INF501 Readings in Information Studies  
INF513 Research Methods in Information Studies  
INF550 Research Project in Information Studies

**Associate Professor Philip Hider** is Head of the School of Information Studies at Charles Sturt University (CSU). He holds a Master of Librarianship degree from the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, and a PhD from City University, London. Dr Hider worked at the British Library from 1995-1997, in Singapore from 1997-2003, and has since worked at CSU, teaching and researching primarily in the areas of information organisation, retrieval and architecture. He can be contacted at [phider@csu.edu.au](mailto:phider@csu.edu.au).

**Mary Anne Kennan** is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Information Studies at Charles Sturt University. While completing her PhD at UNSW she worked as a facilitator in the MBT program at UNSW, a lecturer at UTS and a tutor and research associate at UNSW. Her research interests lie in the areas of open access, e-participation, e-research and education for information. Dr Kennan has published in both the information systems and information science literature. Prior to becoming an academic she worked for 25 years with information, in libraries, information technology and management.

**Lyn Hay** is a Lecturer in the School of Information Studies, and Teaching Fellow of the Flexible Learning Institute (FLI) at Charles Sturt University. Lyn has worked in the field of teacher librarianship for the past 25 years as a practitioner and academic, and

in 2007 was awarded the Australian School Library Association Citation for outstanding contribution to the national leadership of teacher librarianship. Her research interests include the impact of school libraries on student learning, information behaviour, and education informatics, and is currently completing her doctoral research on Web 2.0 technologies and student learning.

**Sigrid McCausland** is a Lecturer in the School of Information Studies at Charles Sturt University. She has long experience as an archivist in the government and university sectors, including six years as University Archivist at the Australian National University where she had responsibility for the Noel Butlin Archives Centre and the University's own archives. Prior to joining CSU in 2009, she was Education Officer for the Australian Society of Archivists. Her research interests include advocacy, the relationship between users and archival institutions in the digital age and labour archives.

**Asim Qayyum** is a Lecturer in the School of Information Studies at Charles Sturt University. Asim completed his PhD from the University of Toronto in June 2005 in the areas of information management and knowledge dissemination. He then worked at the School of Information Sciences, University of Puerto Rico, for three years before moving to CSU in late 2008. Asim has varied professional experiences, ranging from computer design engineer to systems/business analyst, and then working as a reference librarian before taking up full time academic research and teaching. Asim's research areas focus primarily on human computer/document interaction, digital libraries, knowledge management, user needs, and learning technologies.

Manuscript received April 2011.