

Roles and responsibilities of the global specialist digital health workforce: analysis of global census data

Kerryn Butler-Henderson, Kathleen Gray, Salma Arabi

Submitted to: JMIR Medical Education
on: October 30, 2023

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript.....	5
---------------------------------	----------

Preprint
JMIR Publications

Roles and responsibilities of the global specialist digital health workforce: analysis of global census data

Kerryn Butler-Henderson^{1*} PhD; Kathleen Gray^{2*} PhD; Salma Arabi^{1*}

¹Digital Health Hub College of STEM RMIT University Bundoora AU

²Centre for Digital Transformation of Health University of Melbourne Parkville AU

*these authors contributed equally

Corresponding Author:

Kerryn Butler-Henderson PhD

Digital Health Hub

College of STEM

RMIT University

345 McKimmies Road

Bundoora

AU

Abstract

Background: The Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census is the largest workforce survey of the specialist roles that support the development, use, management, and governance of health data, health information, health knowledge, and health technology.

Objective: The objective of this paper is to present the analysis of the roles and the functions reported by respondents in the 2023 Census.

Methods: The 2023 Census was deployed using Qualtrics® and was open between 1 July to 13 August 2023. A broad definition was provided to guide respondents about who is in the specialist digital health workforce. Anyone who self-identifies as being part of this workforce could undertake the survey. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis and thematic analysis of the functions respondents reported in their roles.

Results: A total of 1,103 respondents completed the Census, with data reported about their demographic information and their roles. The majority of respondents live in Australia (870, 78.9%) or New Zealand (130, 11.8%), with most (56.3%) aged between 35-54 years and identifying as female (65.3%). The top four occupational specialties were Health informatics (179, 20.2%), Health information management (175, 19.8%), Health information technology (128, 14.4%), and Health librarianship (104, 11.7%). Nearly all (797, 90.0%) of participants identified as a Manager or Professional. Less than half (42.2%) had a formal qualification in a specialist digital health area and only a quarter (26.0%) held a credential in a digital health area. Whilst two-thirds (65.7%) reported undertaking professional development in the last year, most was self-directed activities, such as seeking information or consuming online content. Work undertaken by specialist digital health workers could be classified as either leadership, functional, occupational or technological.

Conclusions: Future specialist digital health workforce capability frameworks should include the aspects of leadership, function, occupation, and technology. This largely unqualified workforce is undertaking little formal professional development to upskill them to continue to support the safe delivery and management of health and care through the use of digital data and technology. Clinical Trial: None

(JMIR Preprints 30/10/2023:54137)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.54137>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/>



Original Manuscript

Roles and responsibilities of the global specialist digital health workforce: analysis of global census data

Abstract

Background: The Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census is the largest workforce survey of the specialist roles that support the development, use, management, and governance of health data, health information, health knowledge, and health technology.

Objective: The objective of this paper is to present the analysis of the roles and the functions reported by respondents in the 2023 Census.

Methods: The 2023 Census was deployed using Qualtrics® and was open between 1 July to 13 August 2023. A broad definition was provided to guide respondents about who is in the specialist digital health workforce. Anyone who self-identifies as being part of this workforce could undertake the survey. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis and thematic analysis of the functions respondents reported in their roles.

Results: A total of 1,103 respondents completed the Census, with data reported about their demographic information and their roles. The majority of respondents live in Australia (870, 78.9%) or New Zealand (130, 11.8%), with most (56.3%) aged between 35-54 years and identifying as female (65.3%). The top four occupational specialties were Health informatics (179, 20.2%), Health information management (175, 19.8%), Health information technology (128, 14.4%), and Health librarianship (104, 11.7%). Nearly all (797, 90.0%) of participants identified as a Manager or Professional. Less than half (42.2%) had a formal qualification in a specialist digital health area and only a quarter (26.0%) held a credential in a digital health area. Whilst two-thirds (65.7%) reported undertaking professional development in the last year, most was self-directed activities, such as seeking information or consuming online content. Work undertaken by specialist digital health workers could be classified as either leadership, functional, occupational or technological.

Conclusions: Future specialist digital health workforce capability frameworks should include the aspects of leadership, function, occupation, and technology. This largely unqualified workforce is undertaking little formal professional development to upskill them to continue to support the safe delivery and management of health and care through the use of digital data and technology.

Keywords: workforce; functions; digital health; census

Introduction

The importance of a specialist digital health workforce to support the development, use, management, and governance of health data, health information, health knowledge, and health technology has been well documented [1], particularly through the transformation of digital health during the COVID-19 pandemic. This largely hidden workforce [2] supports the digital health needs for care delivery and management. They are the clinical coders, health informaticians, health information managers, health librarians, and health technologists, and so many other occupational specialties, who work behind the clinical scenes to ensure the care providers and health managers have the right data, information, and knowledge at the right time and right place [1]. However, there is a lack of accurate data about who this specialist digital health workforce is to understand their educational needs, their roles and functions, and their professional development needs. This gap in evidence creates challenges for workforce and education planning and forecasting.

The Global Digital Health Workforce Census was launched in 2018 following a rigorous development process [3]. The census stemmed from a collaborative effort between the University of Tasmania and the University of Melbourne using a Delphi approach. A ten-member expert panel, comprising representatives from key stakeholders, identified issues during a focus group, forming the basis for a health information workforce minimum dataset. The items in the census tool were based on existing workforce data items from other surveys and census datasets and were initially developed with Australian and New Zealand experts. Based on the Health Workforce Australia report [4], which called for the improved data collection about the workforce, the Census was referred to as the Australian Health Information Workforce Census. Following the 2018 census [1], the project undertook a validation study to globalize data items, with the 2021 census a smaller pilot with a more global group of participants [5]. The Census was referred to as the Global HIDDIN Workforce Census, referring to the **H**ealth **I**nmformatics, **D**igital, **D**ata, **I**nformation, and **k**Nowledge workforce. The 2023 Census was the first full census with global participants, renamed to the Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce, as defined by Butler-Henderson, Day and Gray [6]. In addition, the Census project team worked with Telstra Health to incorporate their Women and Digital Health [7] survey questions into the Census. The purpose of this paper is to present the data from the 2023 Census related to the roles and functions of the various specialist occupational groups in the Specialist Digital Health Workforce.

Methods

Study Design

The Census was held online from 1 July to 13 August 2023. The Census project was approved by the RMIT University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Survey Instrument

The Census is a survey deployed through the Qualtrics® survey system at RMIT University. It consists of 186 questions across nine (9) sections, as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1. Census sections and question topics in each section.

SECTION	Topic
1 Demographic	Country, state and postcode of residence

	Country of birth and citizenship status
	Year of birth
	Gender
	Indigenous or ethnic group
	Disability
2 Professional Membership and Health Practitioner Registration	What digital health memberships they hold
	If they are a registered health professional and field
	Hours worked in clinical role
3 Formal education	Specialist digital health formal education at vocational or higher education level
	Clinical qualifications
	Other relevant qualifications
4 Credentials	Relevant credentials
5 Occupation and Paid Employment Information	Discipline group
	Time worked in the specialist digital health workforce
	Seeking work
	Current digital health role/s – for up to two roles, including: country, state, postcode, role title, time in role, role intentions next 12 months, top 5 functions, permanency, organizations type (both public/private and service type (e.g., hospital/educational/department/not for profit etc.) and remuneration
	How many different roles they have
6 Unpaid & Voluntary work	Voluntary roles and other unpaid related work
7 Professional development	What professional development they have done in the last 12 months
	Needs and plans for next three years
8 Workforce intentions	How much longer they plan to stay in the workforce
	Why they will leave
	If they will continue to volunteer or do unpaid specialist digital health work
9 Women and digital health	Questions from the Women and Digital Health survey

Recruitment

Promotion of the Census occurred through multiple ways. The 2023 Census was supported by the Australian Digital Health Cooperative Research Centre, Australian Department of Health and Aged Care, Telstra Health, Australasian Institute of Digital Health, Australian Library and Information Association Health Libraries Australia, and the Health Information Management Association of Australia, all of which promoted the Census to their networks. The Census was launched at the 2023 international health and medical informatics conference, MedInfo. It was also promoted through other professional membership organizations, such as the International Federation of Health Information Management Associations and several other national organizations, such as ANDHealth, and through academic organizations. The Census was advertised in several different publications, such as Pulse+IT and What The Health. Several posts were shared on the Census LinkedIn channel and X (formerly Twitter) account. Lastly, individuals could register for a distribution list, which received two alerts about the Census.

Completion of the Census was open to those who self-identified as part of the Specialist Digital Health Workforce. The following general guidance was provided:

You are part of the workforce if any part of your role (including volunteer or actively seeking) includes a function (listed below) related to health data, information, or knowledge. You may undertake a role that has both a Specialist Digital Health component and another component (for example, clinical or management). For this Census, only consider the Specialist Digital Health component. Functions could include analysing, designing, developing, implementing, maintaining, managing, operating, evaluating, or governing the data, technology, systems, and services for the health sector. You might not identify as part of the Specialist Digital Health workforce if the primary function of your role is limited to using health data, information, or knowledge but none of the other functions listed above.

An information sheet was provided so that participants could make an informed decision about participation. At the start of the Census, participants were reminded about the information sheet and asked to review the questions with regards to providing consent. If they did not consent to participation in the study, they were taken out of the survey. The Census took on average 14 minutes to complete, however this varied depending on how much detail the participant chose to provide.

Statistical Analysis

Once the survey was closed, the data for all responses was cleaned and only responses where all of Section 1 was completed were included in analysis. Most data items were analyzed using descriptive statistics, such as number and percentage of responses. Where there are less than five (5) responses, the data is presented as “<5”. Only items relevant to capabilities and skills were analyzed for this manuscript and not all sections of the Census are presented in this article due to the relevance of the topic.

Participants were asked to provide up to five (5) functions related to their primary specialist digital health role. All responses were grouped and using NVivo® were analyzed for word frequency. The top five percent of the most frequently reported terms were then thematically analyzed, using a modification of the themes identified by Prommegger, Wiesche and Kremar [8] Where Prommegger, Wiesche and Kremar examined occupational aspects, human aspects and technological aspects, this study examined the Leadership aspects, Functional aspects, Occupational aspects, and Technological aspects. The top four (4) occupational specialties were identified, and the functions listed by respondents who identified with those occupational specialties were then extracted and thematically analyzed in the same fashion, where five (5) or more participants identified the term.

Results

Complete responses for all of Section 1 were received from 1103 participants. The majority of responses were from Australia (870, 78.9%). Countries with more than five responses are shown in Table 2. More than half (56.3%) of participants are aged between 35-54 years of age and two-thirds (65.3%) identify as female. A total of 73 (7.1%) participants identified as Indigenous and 42 (3.8%) as living with a disability.

Table 2. Participants characteristics of 2023 Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census (n=1103).

Characteristic	Selections	Number (%)
Countries respondents) (≥ 5)	Australia	870 (78.9%)
	New Zealand	130 (11.8%)
	United States	33 (3.0%)
	England	9 (0.8%)
	Nigeria	8 (0.7%)
	Saudi Arabia	6 (0.5%)
	Spain	5 (0.5%)
	India	5 (0.5%)
Age group	<25	15 (1.4%)
	25-34	123 (11.2%)
	35-44	283 (25.7%)
	45-54	337 (30.6%)
	55-64	273 (24.8%)
	65>	72 (6.5%)
Gender	Female	720 (65.3%)
	Male	364 (33.0%)
	Non-binary, gender fluid, agender	8 (0.7%)
	Prefer not to say	11 (1.0%)

Occupational Specialization

Respondents were asked to select which occupational specialty they identified with from a list of sixteen (16) occupation areas previously identified through the analysis of responses to the 2018 census. The top four occupational specialties were Health informatics (179, 20.2%), Health information management (175, 19.8%), Health information technology (128, 14.4%), and Health librarianship (104, 11.7%) (Table 3). When asked how they classify their occupation against the major categories used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics [9], 90.0% (797) of participants identified as a Manager or Professional. While these classifications are based on the Australian context, the census recognized the international nature of the digital health workforce. Respondents from other countries were encouraged to align their occupations with the provided categories, acknowledging that the ABS classifications served as a reference point for a standardized comparable analysis across diverse geographical contexts. This approach facilitated a more inclusive representation of the global specialist digital health workforce while maintaining a structured framework for analysis.

Respondents also were asked to review the definition of eight (8) digital health profiles developed by the Australian Digital Health Agency (ADHA) [10], and to select which one they identified as most aligning with their work. These eight (8) digital health profiles capture the diverse perspectives of the health workforce based on individual roles in design, development, implementation, and adoption of digital technologies. The profiles include Patient, Carer, and Consumer digital profile; Frontline Clinical digital profile; Digital Champion digital profile; Clinical and Technology Bridging digital profile; Education and Research digital profile; Technologist digital profile; Leadership and Executive digital profile; and Business, Administration and Clinical Support digital profile [10]. There is no known analysis of the ADHA profiles previously published. In this 2023 Census, there was a distribution across a range of profiles, with the top four being Leadership and Executive (174, 19.6%), Education and Research (162, 18.3%), Business, Administration, and Clinical Support (159, 17.9%), and Clinical and Technology Bridging (136, 15.3%). Only 16.7% (148) of respondents

identified as either Technologist or Digital Champion.

Table 3 summarizes respondents' categorization of their occupations.

Table 3. Occupational specializations and classifications in 2023 Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census (n=886).

Occupation area	Number (%)
Biomedical engineering	<5
Clinical coding	47 (5.3%)
Clinical documentation improvement	31 (3.5%)
Epidemiology	5 (0.6%)
Health artificial intelligence	7 (0.8%)
Health cyber security	<5
Health data science/analytics	53 (6.0%)
Health informatics	179 (20.2%)
Health information management	175 (19.8%)
Health information technology	128 (14.4%)
Health innovation	56 (6.3%)
Health interoperability	28 (3.2%)
Health librarianship	104 (11.7%)
Health simulation	<5
Health technology assessment	7 (0.8%)
Translational bioinformatics	<5
Unable to classify	54 (6.1%)
Occupation classification	Number (%)
Clerical or Administrative Worker	35 (4.0%)
Community or Personal Service Worker	<5
Labourer	<5
Manager	323 (36.5%)
Professional	474 (53.5%)
Sales Worker	<5
Technician or Trades Worker	10 (1.1%)
Unable to classify	38 (4.3%)
ADHA classification	Number (%)
Business, Administration, and Clinical Support	159 (17.9%)
Clinical and Technology Bridging	136 (15.3%)
Digital Champion	54 (6.1%)
Education and Research	162 (18.3%)
Frontline Clinical	34 (3.8%)
Leadership and Executive	174 (19.6%)
Patient, Consumer, and Carer	27 (3.0%)
Technologist	94 (10.6%)
Unable to classify	45 (5.1%)

Qualifications

Participants were asked about their qualifications. With regards to a qualification in a specialist digital health area, the majority (589/1019, 57.8%) of respondents reported no formal educational qualification in a specialist digital health area. Further, only a quarter (244/938, 26.0%) reported any industry-issued credential in a digital health area. Thirty percent (310/1033) reported that they were a registered clinician.

With regards to professional development activities undertaken in the last year, 65.7% (502/763) reported undertaking some form of professional development. Participants were given the option to identify where they had undertaken the activity and could select more than one organization that delivered that professional development activity. Self-directed professional development activities, such as information seeking, reading/listening/watching blogs/podcasts/vodcasts, and other self-directed activities, were the most reported (676, 27.7%) form of professional development activity (Table 4).

Table 4. Sources of professional development activities in 2023 Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census.

Organization delivering activity	Number (%)
Government	223 (9.1%)
Industry organization	509 (20.9%)
Membership organization	511 (21.0%)
Self	676 (27.7%)
Training provider	162 (6.6%)
Workplace	357 (14.6%)

Employment

With regards to their primary specialist digital health role, more than half (487, 55.0%) of respondents reported they had worked in their current role for less than ten years (Table 4). Three-quarters (607, 76.5%) of respondents reported that they were in a permanent specialist digital health role. Representing two-thirds (544, 68.6%) of respondents, the top four (4) organizational types were Hospital (300, 37.8%), Health technology organization (96, 12.1%), State health department (83, 10.5%), and an Educational facility (65, 8.2%). Most (552, 69.6%) were public organizations.

Table 5. Employment characteristics of primary specialist digital health role in 2023 Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census.

Characteristic	Selections	Number (%)
Years in current role (n=886)	<5 years	244 (27.5%)
	5-9 years	184 (20.8%)
	10-14 years	142 (16.0%)
	15-19 years	84 (9.5%)
	20-24 years	87 (9.8%)
	>25 years	145 (16.4%)
Employment status	Casual	28 (3.5%)

(n=793)	Contract	142 (17.9%)
	Permanent	607 (76.5%)
	Self-employed	16 (2.0%)
Employment setting	Community health care service	25 (3.2%)
	Defence force/military	<5
	Educational facility	65 (8.2%)
	Federal health organization	44 (5.5%)
	Health technology organization	96 (12.1%)
	Hospital	300 (37.8%)
	Indigenous health service	9 (1.1%)
	Local health service/district/network	57 (7.2%)
	Other not-for-profit organization	29 (3.7%)
	Other private organization	32 (4.0%)
	Other public/government organization	26 (3.3%)
	Primary care or primary health network	16 (2.0%)
	Private practice	6 (0.8%)
	Residential health care facility	<5
	State health department	83 (10.5%)
Employer status	Not-for-profit	73 (9.2%)
	Private	147 (18.5%)
	Public	552 (69.6%)
	Public/Private partnership	21 (2.6%)

Functions

The Census asked respondents to list the top five (5) functions of their primary specialist digital health role; 792 respondents provided between one to five functions. Thematic analysis of these functions (as described in Methods using a modified list of themes [8]) identified four (4) broad ways of describing their work responsibilities, with example terms shown in Table 5:

- 1) Leadership aspects: these are functions related to leadership.
- 2) Functional aspects: these are functions related to the operational aspects of roles.
- 3) Occupational aspects : these are functions that describe the occupation.
- 4) Technological aspects: these are functions related to the technological aspects of the occupation.

Table 6. Example terms for describing work responsibilities in 2023 Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census.

Leadership aspects	Functional aspects	Occupational aspects	Technological aspects
leadership policy strategic strategy	advice analysis governance manage searching teaching	design development plans research support service	applications data digital software systems user

The analysis identified that there was a broad range of functions across these themes, which is to be expected when analyzing the functions across four (4) occupational specialist groups representing more than half of the workforce. There was a total of 1,353 functions provided across these four groups. The functions of Health Informatics (183 responses for functions), Health Information Management (175), Health Information Technology (135), and Health Librarian (104) were themed (Tables 6).

Table 7. Distribution of work responsibilities by occupational group and theme in 2023 Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census.

Occupational specialist (*)	Leadership aspects	Functional aspects	Occupational aspects	Technological aspects
Health Informatics (183; 584; 141)	7 (5.34%)	44 (33.59%)	39 (29.77%)	41 (31.30%)
Health Information Management (175; 610; 127)	6 (4.88%)	44 (35.77%)	36 (29.27%)	37 (30.08%)
Health Information Technology (135; 477; 85)	4 (4.88%)	20 (24.39%)	30 (36.59%)	28 (34.15%)
Health Librarian (104; 432; 106)	6 (5.88%)	33 (32.35%)	26 (25.49%)	37 (36.27%)

*number of responses; number of functions listed; number of functions included in theme analysis

Discussion

Traditionally, throughout the world, capability and competency frameworks have been developed by experts based on their many years of experience. Thus the existing frameworks for digital health specialist occupational areas in many countries, including but not limited to those shown in Table 7, have been developed by industry and academic experts. However, it is crucial to acknowledge the limitation of our findings, as nearly 80% of responses came from Australia. This geographic concentration may limit the generalizability of the results, particularly for countries with single-digit responses. We recognize that while the census provides valuable insights, its predominantly Australian dataset may impact the applicability of our conclusion globally. Therefore, it is imperative to interpret our framework recommendations within the context of this geographic bias. Nevertheless, this approach was once the only way to develop these frameworks, today we have access to a large resource of data about the workforce to inform these frameworks. The Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census is one such source.

This paper shows how capability frameworks can be informed by data from those working in these roles. The insights from this analysis inform not only the types of roles and their functions and responsibilities, but also help to validate expert-originated frameworks and to identify new emerging roles with the analysis of census data over time. The four themes identified in this review, Leadership aspects, Functional aspects, Occupational aspects, and Technological aspects, and associated functions within each theme, could guide future capability framework development for the Specialist Digital Health Workforce.

Table 8. Modified, with addenda, list of competency lists in specialist digital health occupational

areas [11].

Discipline	Name of organisation & Information source
Health Data Scientist	Canadian Institute of Health Information [12]
Health Informatics	American Medical Informatics Association [13]
	Australasian Institute of Digital Health [14]
	Digital Health Canada [15]
	GCC Health Informatics Workforce Working Group [16]
	Faculty of Informatics (FCI) United Kingdom [17]
Health Information & Communications Technologists	HITCOMP [18]
Health Information Managers	American Health Information Management Association [19]
	Canadian Health Information Management Association [20]
	Global Health Workforce Council [21]
	Health Information Management Association of Australia [22]
Health Librarianship	Australian Library & Information Association (Health Libraries Australia) [23]
	Medical Library Association [24]

Of critical concern, this Census identified that the broad specialist digital health workforce is largely untrained in digital health capabilities, with more than half (57.8%) reporting they did not have a qualification in a specialist digital health qualification. Further, this workforce is not developing these skills consistently through a credentialling program (only 26.0% hold a credential) or through professional development activities (65.7% reported undertaking professional development in the last year in digital health).

Whilst it could be assumed that most respondents were developing these skills on the job, most (55.0%) have only been in their role for less than ten (10) years, and a quarter (27.5%) in their role for less than five (5) years. On the job training is an important factor in improving the quality of healthcare [25] and the time it takes to become fully productive in a new job is significantly longer in the health workforce, varying depending on the complexity of the job, the individual's prior experience and skills, and the organization's orientation and induction process. Whilst the first 90 days are important, it can take years for a new recruit to a role to be fully productive in a role [26].

There is unquestioned recognition that qualifications to practice and continuing professional development are critical to safe healthcare [27]. Yet amid the ever-increasing digital transformation of the health and care sector, this Census shows that professional training and continuing professional development of digital health specialists is at least under-reported or at worst absent [28-30].

This is the largest known analysis of the functions of the specialist digital health workforce, however it is acknowledged that this analysis is of 792 respondents and is largely an Australian dataset. It is important to note that the recruitment process may introduce response bias, as those who chose to participate may differ systematically from those who did not. The Australian-centric focus of this dataset could limit the generalizability of findings to a broader global context. Future censuses, with a more diverse and extensive respondent pool, will be essential to mitigate potential biases and enhance the robustness and representativeness of the analysis.

The specialist digital health workforce are dedicated roles where their primary function is to support the development, use, management, and destruction of health data, health information, health knowledge, and health technology. The Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census is the only survey of its kind to capture the critical information about this workforce, including the functions and the capabilities required for them to undertake their roles. However, to enhance the depth of this work, it is essential to provide greater granularity about the specific functions these roles entail. Understanding the intricacies of their daily tasks and responsibilities is crucial for a more comprehensive analysis. The current overview emphasizes the largely unqualified nature of the workforce and their limited engagement in formal professional development. This underscores the need for a detailed exploration of the functions performed by these roles, which will not only shed light on the current state but also inform the creation of a more nuanced and informed capability framework. Future frameworks should encompass leadership, function, occupation, and technology aspects to offer a holistic perspective on the specialist digital health workforce.

Acknowledgements

The Global Specialist Digital Health Workforce Census project was funded through the Digital Health Cooperative Research Centre, with funding support from RMIT University, the Australian Department of Health and Aged Care, and Telstra Health, and in kind support from the University of Melbourne, Australian Digital Health Agency, Australasian Institute of Digital Health, Australian Library and Information Association Health Libraries Australia, and the Health Information Management Association of Australia. The authors wish to acknowledge the representatives of each of these organizations and their support as members of the Census Steering Committee: Allison Clarke; Clare Morgan; Gemma Siemensma; James Katte; Joycelyn Linh; Maureen McCarthy; Paul Creech; Sonya Hilberts; Vickie Irving.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

Abbreviations

ADHA: Australian Digital Health Agency

COVID-19: Coronavirus-2019

GCC: Gulf Cooperation Council

HIDDIN: **H**ealth **I**nformatics, **D**igital, **D**ata, **I**nformation, and **k**nowledge

n: number

HITCOMP: Health Information Technology Competencies

RMIT: Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

References

1. Butler-Henderson K, Gray K A glimpse at the Australian health information workforce: Findings from the first Australian census. *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics*, 2019; 264: 1145-1149. Doi: 10.3233/SHTI190405
2. Gray K, Gilbert C, Butler-Henderson K, Day K Pritchard S. Ghosts in the machine: Identifying the digital health information workforce. *Improving Usability, Safety and Patient Outcomes with Health Information Technology*, F. Lau et al. (Eds.), 2019: 146-151. doi:10.3233/978-1-61499-951-5-146
3. Butler-Henderson K, Gray K, Greenfield D, Low S, Gilbert C, Ritchie A, Trujillo M, Bennett V, Brophy J, Schaper LK. The development of a national census of the health information workforce: expert panel recommendations. *Stud Health Technol Inform*, 2017; 239: 8-13, doi:10.3233/978-1-61499-783-2-8.
4. Health Workforce Australia. Health information workforce report, Australian Government, 2013; <https://www.aims.org.au/documents/item/401>.
5. Butler-Henderson K, Gray K. 2021 global HIDDIN workforce census. University of Tasmania. <https://www.utas.edu.au/health/projects/hiwcensus/2021-global-hiddin-workforce-census>
6. Butler-Henderson K., Day K., & Gray K (2021) The Health Information Workforce. Current and future developments. Springer Nature: London, England. 978-3-030-81849-4.
7. Telstra Health. Understanding gender diversity in Australia's digital health sector. Special report 2021-22. 2022; https://www.telstrahealth.com/content/dam/telstrahealth/pdf-downloads/Understanding%20Gender%20Diversity%20in%20Digital%20Health_Report.pdf
8. Prommegger B, Wiesche M, Kremar H. What makes IT professionals special? A literature review on context-specific theorizing in IT workforce research. In *Proceedings of SIGMIS-CPR '20*, June 19-21, 2020, Nuremberg, Germany, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3378539.3393861>
9. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Metadata. Australian Government, 2023, <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/understanding-statistics/statistical-terms-and-concepts/metadata>
10. Australian Digital Health Agency. National digital health workforce and education roadmap. Australian Government, 2020; https://www.digitalhealth.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-11/Workforce_and_Education-Roadmap.pdf
11. Ritchie A, Siemensma G, Fenton SH, Butler-Henderson K. Competencies, education, and accreditation of the health information workforce. In: Butler-Henderson K., Day K., Gray K. (eds) *The Health Information Workforce*. Health Informatics; 2021, Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81850-0_5
12. Canadian Institute of Health Information. CIHI's health data and information governance and capability framework toolkit, 2020; <https://www.cihi.ca/sites/default/files/document/health-data-info-governance-capability-framework-toolkit-en.pdf>
13. Valenta AL, Berner ES, Boren SA, Deckard GJ, Eldredge C, Fridsma DB, Gadd C, Gong Y, Johnson T, Jones J, Manos EL, Phillips KT, Roderer NK, Rosendale D, Turner AM, Tusch G, Williamson JJ, Johnson SB. AMIA board white paper: AMIA 2017 core competencies for applied health informatics education at the master's degree level. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2018 Dec 1;25(12):1657-1668. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocy132. PMID: 30371862; PMCID: PMC7647152.
14. Australasian Institute of Digital Health. Australian health informatics competency framework (2nd ed), 2022; <https://digitalhealth.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/AHICFCompetencyFramework.pdf>

15. Digital Health Canada. Health informatics professional competencies, 2022; <https://digitalhealthcanada.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Health-Informatics-Professional-Competencies.pdf>
16. Almalki M, Jamal AA, Elhassan O, Zakaria N, Alhefzi M. Toward the development of the GCC Health Informatics career paths and matrix. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 2021; 205:105987, DOI:10.1016/j.cmpb.2021.105987
17. Davies A, Hassey A, Williams J, Moulton G. Creation of a core competency framework for clinical informatics: From genesis to maintaining relevance. *Int J Med Inform*. 2022 Dec;168:104905. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2022.104905
18. HITCOMP. 2023, <http://hitcomp.org/competencies/>
19. American Health Information Management Association. 2018 AHIMA Health Information Management curricula competencies, 2018: <https://www.ahima.org/him-curricula/>
20. Canadian Health Information Management Association. Career matrix. HIM core competency, 2022; <https://www.echima.ca/careers/career-matrix/>
21. Global Health Workforce Council. Global academic curricula competencies for health information professionals, 2018; https://ifhimasitemedia.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/20033722/AHIMA-GlobalCurricula_Final_6-30-15.pdf
22. Health Information Management Association of Australia. Health Information Manager (HIM) professional competency standard (4th ed), 2023; <https://www.himaa.org.au/our-work/competency-standards/#:~:text=HIMAA%20has%20developed%20the%20following%20competencies%20used%20for,development%29%20Clinical%20Documentation%20Improvement%20competency%20standards%20%28Under%20development%29>
23. Australian Library & Information Association (Health Libraries Australia). ALIA HLA competencies, 2018; <https://read.alia.org.au/alia-hla-competencies>
24. Medical Library Association. Professional competencies for health sciences librarians, 2007; <https://www.mlanet.org/page/competencies>
25. Radeva S. On-the-job training as a model for adapting to the working environment. *International Journal*, 2019 Jun. 5; 31(5), 1609–1614. <https://doi.org/10.35120/kij31051609r>
26. Grek A, Stanton A, Monnig B, Whitman A, Chaney A. Advanced practice nurse and physician assistant orientation program: A critical piece in the onboarding process. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*, 2022; 18, 6:653-659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nurpra.2022.02.028>
27. Mlambo M, Silén C, McGrath C. Lifelong learning and nurses' continuing professional development, a metasynthesis of the literature. *BMC Nurs*, 2021; 20, 62, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-021-00579-2>
28. Crawford J, Butler-Henderson K. Professional learning and development for the health information workforce. In: Butler-Henderson K., Day K., Gray K. (eds) *The Health Information Workforce. Health Informatics*, 2021; Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81850-0_714.
29. Ramsden R, Colbran R, Christopher E, Edwards M. The role of digital technology in providing education, training, continuing professional development and support to the rural health workforce. *Health Education*, 2022; 122, 2: 126-149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HE-11-2020-0109>
30. Randhawa GK, Jackson M. The role of artificial intelligence in learning and professional development for healthcare professionals. *Healthcare Management Forum*. 2020;33(1):19-24. doi:10.1177/0840470419869032