

**Professional Development Scheme 2.0 Submission Sample:
Academic Librarian (8 to 15 years)**

SECTION 1 — Applicant Information

1. Full Name

Bubbles

2. LAS Membership Number

[To be inserted]

3. Employer / Organisation

Academic Library in Singapore

4. Sector

☒ Academic library

5. Current Role / Job Title

Senior Librarian

6. Years in Current Role

☒ 8–15 years

7. Current Curriculum Vitae

[Insert link to your CV]

8. Contact Email

[To be inserted]

9. Eligibility Declaration

☒ I confirm that I am a personal professional member of LAS.

☒ I consent to the collection, use and disclosure of my personal data in accordance with the Singapore Personal Data Protection Act 2012.

SECTION 2 — Evidence of Professional Development

10. Evidence of Professional Development

[Insert link to online folder containing course certificates, teaching materials, project documents, presentation slides, participant feedback and evidence of service improvements.]

SECTION 3 — Reflections

Reflection #1

11. Foundational LAS Competency

☒ Commitment to Professional Excellence

Level of Proficiency: Proficient

In 2026, I led the review of an information literacy programme delivered to postgraduate students. The existing session covered database searching, source evaluation, citation management and access to research support services. Although participant feedback was generally positive, attendance patterns

and consultation enquiries suggested that students still struggled to translate what they had learnt into their own research workflows.

My role was to review the programme, consult teaching colleagues and redesign selected components. I examined feedback from previous cohorts, spoke with librarians who delivered the sessions and met faculty representatives to understand recurring student difficulties. A major finding was that the programme attempted to cover too many tools within a limited period. Students could follow the demonstrations but had insufficient time to practise applying the techniques to their own topics.

I therefore restructured the programme around a research scenario. Students developed a search strategy, selected appropriate databases, evaluated sample results and documented their search decisions. Tool demonstrations were shortened and supporting videos were provided for independent viewing.

The experience reinforced my belief that professional excellence requires the willingness to question established practices, including programmes that appear to be working adequately. It also reminded me that experience can create blind spots. I was familiar with the content and initially underestimated how cognitively demanding the session was for students encountering the tools for the first time.

Following the redesign, students participated more actively and asked more focused questions. Faculty members reported that the scenario-based approach aligned more closely with assignment requirements. The revised materials also gave teaching librarians greater flexibility to adapt examples for different disciplines.

I learnt that quality improvement is strongest when it combines professional judgement with user evidence and colleague input. Next time, I will establish clearer learning outcomes and assessment measures at the beginning rather than relying primarily on post-session feedback. I also intend to develop my expertise in learning design and authentic assessment. Support from educational developers and access to learning analytics would strengthen future reviews.

Reflection #2

12. Foundational LAS Competency

☒ Information Ethics & Governance

Level of Proficiency: Proficient

I was involved in developing guidance for students and faculty on the responsible use of generative artificial intelligence in research and academic work. The rapid adoption of these tools led to questions about data privacy, copyright, transparency, source verification and the reliability of generated information.

My role was to represent the library in a cross-functional working group and contribute an information-professional perspective. I reviewed institutional policies, relevant professional guidance and examples from other universities. I also gathered questions received by librarians during consultations and teaching sessions. These questions revealed that users often focused on whether they were permitted to use a tool but gave less attention to what information they entered, how outputs were produced or how claims should be verified.

The working group produced practical guidance covering the handling of confidential information, verification of generated content, acknowledgement of AI assistance and the need to consult course or publisher requirements. Within the library, I developed case examples for teaching sessions, including

fabricated citations, biased responses and situations in which users might unintentionally disclose sensitive research information.

This experience mattered because it highlighted the library's role in supporting ethical judgement rather than simply promoting new technologies. I learnt that ethical guidance must be practical and contextual. Broad warnings are unlikely to influence behaviour unless users can recognise how the risks arise in their own work.

I also became more conscious of the limits of my expertise. Some questions required legal, data-governance or academic-integrity input. Rather than presenting the library as the sole authority, we worked collaboratively and clearly identified when users should seek specialist advice.

The guidance improved consistency across library consultations and gave staff greater confidence in discussing AI-related issues. Next time, I would involve student representatives earlier so that the language and examples better reflect actual use. I will continue monitoring emerging practices and reviewing the guidance regularly. Further development in AI literacy, copyright and research ethics would support this work.

Reflection #3

13. Functional LAS Competency

☒ Information Literacy and Learning

Level of Proficiency: Proficient

I collaborated with a faculty member to embed information literacy into a research-methods module rather than delivering it as a standalone library session. The module involved students from several disciplines who were preparing literature reviews for a major assignment.

Previously, the library delivered a single database workshop near the start of the semester. Students responded positively but often sought help much later, when they had difficulty refining their topics, documenting searches or evaluating large numbers of results. I proposed a staged approach aligned with key assignment milestones.

I worked with the faculty member to map relevant information-literacy outcomes to the curriculum. We introduced an initial activity on defining information needs, a practical session on search-strategy development and a later consultation focused on evaluating and organising sources. Students submitted a brief search log, which allowed us to identify misconceptions and provide targeted feedback.

The experience deepened my understanding of the difference between presenting information and facilitating learning. Students needed opportunities to practise, receive feedback and revisit concepts as their research questions developed. The embedded approach also helped me understand the disciplinary context more fully and tailor examples accordingly.

The search logs revealed that many students relied on a single database and changed keywords without considering broader concepts or subject terminology. Based on this evidence, I revised the teaching materials to include concept mapping and database-selection activities. Students subsequently demonstrated more systematic search strategies and asked more analytical questions during consultations.

I felt that the project strengthened the library's relationship with the faculty because we were contributing directly to learning outcomes rather than offering an optional supplementary service. It also required negotiation, flexibility and a shared understanding of responsibilities.

In future, I would develop a clearer assessment rubric jointly with the faculty member and explore whether selected information-literacy elements could be incorporated into grading. I would also like to mentor colleagues who are beginning similar curriculum collaborations. Continued professional development in instructional design, assessment and disciplinary teaching practices would help me scale this approach effectively.

Reflection #4

14. Functional LAS Competency

☒ Information Service Design, Delivery and Assessment

Level of Proficiency: Proficient

I coordinated a review of the library's research consultation service after staff observed increasing demand for complex support involving systematic searching, publication strategies and research-impact questions. The service had developed incrementally, and there were differences in how consultations were described, assigned and documented.

I led a small team to map the existing workflow. We reviewed enquiry records, interviewed librarians and examined the types of requests received. We found that users did not always understand the scope of the service, while librarians sometimes lacked sufficient information before a consultation. Complex enquiries were also unevenly distributed among staff with specialised expertise.

The team redesigned the online request form to collect information about the user's research stage, discipline, intended outcome, deadlines and previous search attempts. We introduced broad service categories and developed an internal referral guide showing areas of staff expertise. We also agreed on documentation practices that protected user privacy while allowing the team to identify recurring needs.

This project taught me that service design involves balancing user convenience, staff capacity and institutional priorities. A longer request form might provide useful information, but it could also discourage users from seeking help. We therefore used conditional questions and plain language to keep the process manageable.

The revised workflow reduced the number of consultations requiring extensive clarification before the meeting. Enquiries were assigned more appropriately, and staff reported greater confidence about preparation and scope. The aggregated data also helped us identify demand for systematic-review support and informed a proposal for further staff development.

I learnt that successful change requires more than designing an improved process. Colleagues need to understand the purpose, contribute their experience and have opportunities to raise concerns. My role therefore shifted from proposing solutions to facilitating agreement and supporting implementation.

Next time, I would establish baseline measures before introducing changes so that impact could be evaluated more rigorously. I intend to develop a service dashboard covering demand, response time, user outcomes and staff workload. Support in data visualisation and service assessment would strengthen this work.

SECTION 4 — Feedback and Framework Improvement

15. The submission process feels manageable

Rating: 4 — Agree

The prompts are comprehensive and encourage meaningful reflection. However, completing four reflections of up to 800 words requires substantial time, particularly for applicants balancing operational and project responsibilities.

16. What improvements would you suggest?

Applicants could be allowed to submit reflections in different formats, such as a written reflection, recorded presentation or structured portfolio commentary, provided that the same learning outcomes are addressed.

It would also be helpful to clarify whether one substantial professional-development initiative may be examined from different competency perspectives, or whether all four reflections must cover separate experiences. A bank of anonymised examples across library sectors and proficiency levels would improve consistency.

The framework could include an optional peer-review or mentoring component. Discussing a draft reflection with another professional may deepen the learning and reduce the tendency to treat the exercise as an administrative submission.

17. What motivated you to apply for the PDS?

☒ Self-motivated

I applied to take stock of my professional growth and consider how my work has moved from individual service delivery towards programme development, mentoring and strategic contribution. The scheme provides a useful structure for identifying evidence of impact and planning the next stage of my career.