

**Professional Development Scheme 2.0 Submission Sample:
Senior Librarian in a Special Library**

SECTION 1 — Applicant Information

1. Full Name

Blossom

2. LAS Membership Number

[To be inserted]

3. Employer / Organisation

Special Library in Singapore

4. Sector

☒ Special library

5. Current Role / Job Title

Senior Librarian

6. Years in Current Role

☒ 4–7 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 links to online folder containing training records, search strategies, anonymised work samples, current-awareness products, process documentation and stakeholder feedback.]

SECTION 3 — Reflections

Reflection #1

11. Foundational LAS Competency

☒ Information Ethics & Governance

Level of Proficiency: Competent

I received a time-sensitive request from an internal professional who needed information to support an organisational decision. The request involved sensitive subject matter and included details about an internal project that had not yet been publicly announced.

My role was to clarify the information need, conduct a structured search and present relevant findings within the required timeframe. Before beginning, I considered which details were necessary for the search and which should not be entered into external platforms. I used approved subscription databases and internal resources, stored working documents in the designated secure location and limited the final distribution to the individuals identified by the requester.

During the search, I found a potentially relevant report hosted on a website whose authority and data-handling practices were unclear. Although downloading the document would have been convenient, I decided not to access it through that route. I located an authorised version through a trusted database instead.

This experience reinforced that information governance is embedded in everyday professional decisions. It is not limited to formal policy compliance. The tools I choose, the information I record and the way I communicate results can all affect confidentiality, licensing and organisational risk.

I learnt that time pressure can make convenient options appear more attractive. Having clear procedures and trusted sources helped me maintain appropriate standards without significantly delaying the work. I also learnt to explain these considerations to users. When I informed the requester that I would provide the verified version rather than the quickest available copy, the explanation strengthened confidence in the service.

The request was completed on time, and the requester commented positively on the reliability and clarity of the information. Following the experience, I reviewed my personal workflow and created a checklist covering confidentiality, authorised access, source verification and distribution.

Next time, I will discuss information-handling requirements explicitly at the start of sensitive requests. I would benefit from further training on licensing, data governance, copyright and the responsible use of emerging AI tools in specialised research environments.

Reflection #2

12. Foundational LAS Competency

☒ Commitment to Professional Excellence

Level of Proficiency: Competent

I undertook subject-specific training to improve my ability to support users working in a specialised professional area. Although I was confident in using the subscribed databases, I sometimes found it difficult to interpret terminology used by experienced practitioners. This affected how quickly I could translate a broad request into an effective search strategy.

The training introduced key concepts, common document types and major sources used in the field. To apply the learning, I reviewed several past enquiries and considered how a stronger understanding of the subject would have changed my search approach. I also arranged short conversations with two internal users to learn more about their workflows and the decisions that our information supports.

One important lesson was that technical searching skills are not sufficient on their own. A search may retrieve relevant documents, but the librarian must understand why the information is needed, what degree of authority is required and how current the information must be. The same topic may require a

different approach depending on whether the user is conducting preliminary research, preparing formal advice or monitoring developments.

I became more confident in asking contextual questions instead of treating them as unnecessary delays. Previously, I sometimes worried that users expected me to understand their needs immediately. I now recognise that thoughtful clarification demonstrates professionalism and can prevent wasted effort.

I applied the learning by revising an internal search template to include purpose, jurisdiction or subject scope, required document types, date range, urgency and intended use. This led to more focused discussions with users and clearer documentation of complex requests.

The experience also made me feel more connected to the organisation's work. I could see how the library's contribution extended beyond retrieving documents to reducing uncertainty and supporting better-informed decisions.

My next step is to continue developing subject knowledge through current-awareness reading, professional briefings and direct engagement with users. I would also benefit from mentoring by a senior information professional who can review complex search strategies and provide feedback on professional judgement.

Reflection #3

13. Functional LAS Competency

☒ Information Organisation and Management

Level of Proficiency: Competent

I participated in a project to reorganise an internal collection of research reports, briefing papers and reference materials. The documents had accumulated over several years and were stored across shared drives using inconsistent filenames and folder structures. Staff frequently asked the library to locate documents that they remembered seeing but could not retrieve independently.

My role was to review the existing collection, identify common document types and propose a more consistent organisation and metadata approach. I interviewed several users to understand how they searched for materials. Some searched by project name, others by subject, date, issuing organisation or document type. This showed that a simple folder hierarchy would not support all retrieval needs.

I developed a metadata structure covering title, creator, date, subject, document type, project and access restrictions. I also proposed naming conventions and a controlled list of commonly used subject terms. Before implementing the structure, I tested it on a sample collection and asked users to locate selected documents.

The testing revealed that some of my preferred professional terms differed from the language used by staff. I therefore adjusted the subject terms to include familiar organisational terminology while retaining enough consistency for reliable retrieval. This taught me that information organisation should reflect both professional principles and actual user behaviour.

The reorganised sample reduced duplicate files and made it easier to identify the most current version of a document. It also supported more accurate searching and reduced reliance on individual staff members' memory. I felt satisfied because the improvement addressed a recurring problem rather than simply responding to individual retrieval requests.

I also learnt that governance is essential. Without assigned responsibility for adding metadata and reviewing outdated material, the collection would gradually become inconsistent again. We therefore documented responsibilities and introduced a periodic review.

Next time, I would define retention and version-control requirements earlier in the project. I would also collect baseline retrieval data to measure the improvement more objectively. Further training in taxonomy development, records management and digital preservation would support my development.

Reflection #4

14. Functional LAS Competency

☒ Information Service Design, Delivery and Assessment

Level of Proficiency: Competent

I reviewed the library's current-awareness service, which provided users with periodic updates on new publications, regulatory developments and professional news. The service had been running for several years, but the distribution list and subject categories had expanded gradually. Some users valued the updates, while others found the volume difficult to manage.

My role was to assess whether the service continued to meet user needs and identify practical improvements. I reviewed open and click patterns where available, examined the types of items included and conducted short interviews with representative users. The feedback showed that users wanted fewer general items and more targeted updates connected to their areas of responsibility.

I redesigned the service around several user-interest profiles. Subscribers could select relevant topics and choose between immediate alerts, weekly summaries and monthly digests. I also introduced brief annotations explaining why selected items might matter, rather than providing titles and links alone.

This experience taught me that a current-awareness service should not be measured only by the number of items distributed. Its value depends on relevance, timing and the user's ability to act on the information. More information does not automatically create a better service.

The pilot resulted in smaller but more focused updates. Users reported that the annotations helped them decide quickly which items required attention. The revised process also encouraged the library team to be more selective and to consider the organisational relevance of each item.

I learnt that user preferences can differ significantly even within a specialised organisation. A single format had been easier to administer but did not reflect those differences. I also became more confident in contacting stakeholders and asking direct questions about the usefulness of an established service.

In future, I will develop clearer measures, such as user-reported relevance, actions resulting from alerts and requests for follow-up research. I would also like to automate selected routine steps without compromising professional selection and quality control. Support in service analytics, stakeholder engagement and appropriate automation tools would help me improve the service further.

SECTION 4 — Feedback and Framework Improvement

15. The submission process feels manageable

Rating: 4 — Agree

The prompts provide a helpful structure, although it takes time to select suitable examples and describe impact without disclosing confidential organisational information.

16. What improvements would you suggest?

The guidance should address how librarians working in special, corporate, legal, medical or government libraries can provide meaningful evidence while protecting confidential information. Examples of acceptable anonymisation would be useful.

Applicants could also be allowed to indicate that certain supporting materials are confidential and provide a supervisor's verification instead of uploading the materials themselves.

A competency-selection guide containing examples from different sectors would help applicants distinguish between closely related competencies. An optional word-count planning guide would make the four-reflection requirement easier to manage.

17. What motivated you to apply for the PDS?

☒ Self-motivated

I applied because I wanted to reflect on how I have progressed from learning procedures to exercising greater professional judgement. The process helped me identify the contribution of specialised information work to organisational decision-making and clarify the subject expertise and stakeholder-engagement skills I need to develop next.