MINUTES
of the Consortium meeting
TEMPUS grant
145021-TEMPUS-2008-UK-JPCR
'New Masters Programme on Library and Information Science'

Ilia State University
6-7 October 2010
Tbilisi, Georgia

Present:
Alan Hopkinson – project contractor, Middlesex University, London
Charles Strouthos – Consortium member, Middlesex University, London
Tigran Zargaryan – project coordinator, Fundamental Scientific Library, Yerevan
Albert Sargsyan - Consortium member, International Scientific Educational Centre, Yerevan
Natia Gabrichidze - Consortium member, Ilia Sate University, Tbilisi
Irakli Garibashvili - Consortium member, Georgian Library Association, Tbilisi
Marat Rakhmatullaev – Consortium member, Tashkent Institute of Culture, Tashkent
Ahmed Yusupov – Consortium member, Tashkent University of Information Technology, Tashkent
Ian Johnson – Consortium Member, the Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen.
Simon Burnett - Consortium Member, the Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen
Veronica Korkla - Rezekne Higher Education Institution, Rezekne
Mario Pérez-Montoro - Consortium Member, University of Barcelona

Invited:
Arusyak Harutunyan - International Scientific Educational Centre, Yerevan
Tamar Mosiashvili - Ilia Sate University, Tbilisi
Barno Ganieva - Tashkent Institute of Culture, Tashkent

1. Opening of Meeting
a) Welcome from Ilia State University
b) Adoption of agenda
c) Apologies for absence
2. Minutes of previous meeting
a) Matters arising
3. Report (**TEMPUS Activity 1.1/1.2**)
a) Finalising of report overseen by RGU
b) General progress report (Alan Hopkinson)
c) EU recommendations on monitoring visits: sharing of materials, English language teaching
4. Purchasing of equipment
a) Hardware and learning centres: short report from each country about use of the computerized training centres: (problems and progress) **(TEMPUS Activity 3.1)**
b) Implement servers for VLE and repository and hire technician **(TEMPUS Activity 3.1)**
c) e-resources **(TEMPUS Activity 3.2):** Emerald offer; other materials
d) Co-financing (**3.2**)

5. Review of activities 2010

5.1 Assessment of Masters at RGU and follow-up (TEMPUS Activity 2.1)

5.2 Consultant's report from Georgia

5.3 Experience of countries on curriculum development and how they deal with the ministry and other officials

5.4 Assessment of summer school. (TEMPUS Activity 2.2)

5.5 Develop curriculum document (TEMPUS Activity 1.3) *needs to be progressed as is a key component: how?*

6. Financial issues

a) Financial report *(Charles Strouthos)*

b) Administrative regulations and procedures (travel, per diem, refunds, purchasing equipment)

7. Forthcoming activities 2010-2011

7.1 EU user services librarians to deliver courses in partner countries (TEMPUS Activity 3.3)

a) Selecting subjects and lecturers

7.2 Management meeting in Parma (TEMPUS Activity 9.3)

a) Dates (*Parma representative should suggest dates, not w/b 14 March))*

b) Programme

7.3 Pilot Master's programme (TEMPUS Activity 2.3)

a) Confirmation of this activity. *Partner country reporters should give a brief account of their plans*

7.4 Dissemination at Crimea Conference (TEMPUS Activity 6.3)

7.5 Forthcoming Consultant's Visits (TEMPUS Activity 8.2)

7.6 Implement LIS modules on VLE (TEMPUS Activity 4.2)

7.7 Develop and implement QA and enhancement system: proposal from RGU (TEMPUS Activity 5.1, 5.2, see also 8.1)

7.8 Study Tour (TEMPUS Activity 5.3)

7.9 Final Conference (TEMPUS Activity 6.4)

7.10 Report on Sustainability (TEMPUS Activity 6.1)

7.11 Placements (TEMPUS Activity 2.5)

8. Project administration tools

a) Website

b) Project handbook

c) Communications (e-mail, etc.)

9. Closure

a) Any other business

b) Date of next meeting

The Tempus Project representatives' Tbilisi meeting was organised to discuss activities proposed in the project, to detail possible ways for successful implementation of the LIS curricula in the partner country universities, to plan the exact dates of meetings for the year 2011, and to work out other issues of the plan of work, relating to JEP 145021-TEMPUS-2008-UK-JPCR.

October 6 meeting.

1. The meeting began at 9:30 as planned.

1. (1.a) Natia Gabrichidze, Director of Ilia State University Library welcomed colleagues

(1.b). The agenda was adopted and Alan Hopkinson appointed Chair

(1.c). Alan Hopkinson spoke on behalf of Dr. Anna Maria Tammaro who could not attend the management meeting. She sent her apologies by an email which was read to the meeting. Participants were also informed that Armenian colleagues would join the meeting later in the day as they had been unable to set off the day before due to an important meeting.

(1.c). Tamar Mosiashvili agreed to take the meeting minutes before Tigran Zargaryan's arrival who was appointed as Secretary in his absence.

2. The previous management meeting minutes were discussed with matters arising.

A. **Needs assessment report** - As indicated in the minutes the report was due to be finalised by Ian and Simon Burnett. The report was presented to the meeting and comments invited. The only problem with the report was the missing data about Armenia in item 7.3 (Reform of LIS Education) and 8.3 (Conclusion) and it was decided to return to the needs assessment report discussion when the Armenian colleagues had joined the meeting.

B. Purchase of equipment for classrooms. There is still a delay in Georgia in this matter but as had been decided during the summer school in discussion with Charles Strouthos, equipment for Georgia will be purchased in UK and Charles is taking care of that. According to him, the Middlesex IT department is working on the question at the moment and as soon as he returns to Middlesex University he will follow up the purchase procedures.

C. Purchase of e-resources – it was decided the consortium members would talk about the Emerald offer in more detail at item 4.c. in the Agenda. Marat Rakhmatullaev mentioned that for Uzbekistan it was important to have Russian databases as well. This was taken up at item 4.e in the agenda.

D. Implementing servers for VLE – it was agreed to return to this at item 4.b. in the agenda.

E. Uzbek students going to University of Parma – as Anna-Maria mentioned at the previous management meeting University of Parma can accept Uzbek students (under an agreement between the two rectors) so University of Parma can pay for the study and accommodation. Marat confirmed that they had signed an agreement with UoP and students can be sent to Parma. They have to discuss this issue with Anna Maria. Alan mentioned that this was outside the project but welcomed it because it would add value to the project.

F. The project website – it was repeated that if consortium members had any documentation to be mounted on the web page, they should sent them to Tigran who is responsible for the website.

G. Summer school – it was agreed to talk about summer school later under item 5.4. in the agenda. It was generally accepted that the summer school was very successful and useful for students participating in it.

The meeting participants accepted the Minutes of the Rezekne meeting as a true record of the meeting.

Immediately afterwards, outside the agenda, arrangements for the October 8 workshop were finalized – four project progress reports: Uzbekistan, Armenia, Georgia (Ilia State University and Georgian Library Association) and a public lecture by Alan Hopkinson. It was decided that presentations would be in Russian to be understandable for all the people attending the event. Translation could be provided for European colleagues and the language of the public lecture would be English.

3. I**tem 3 (Reports)**
3.a Discussion returned to the assessment report which was the responsibility of Ian and Simon. As mentioned before there is still some data missing and colleagues may add information. The data from Armenia should be added as soon as possible. The same kind of information should be given from all three countries to fill the picture. This document could feed into the report on sustainability which had been discussed already informally but was due to be discussed at item 7.10: questions relating to sustainability could be mentioned: how to sustain the courses afterwards and how to meet the market needs. Each person from each country should work on the report to make corrections. Ian suggested that the assessment report could be published in a scholarly journal to make it more accessible to the general public (3.a) and he would take responsibility for this. Alan said this would be good for dissemination.
3b Then colleagues moved to the **General Progress Report** prepared by Alan Hopkinson. The report was distributed by email before the meeting. Alan went through the report and attention was paid to the following questions:
Final meeting and conference in Uzbekistan – when should be it held and who should attend the conference? The approximate dates were decided – October 20-23, 2011. Uzbek colleagues gave an outline how they see the final conference; the conference will be at Tashkent University of Information Technology (2 days) and its branch in Samarkand (1 day). Marat will provide details of the final event: programme of the conference, papers to be presented, etc. Ian gave some good examples of final events from other projects he had participated in and promised to send a document from TEMPUS entitled *TEMPUS Final event guidelines*. He suggested organising the conference for wider audience, to invite people from other countries not involved in the project and the conference can be regional involving other countries from Central Asia. The proceedings of the conference will be published in English, Russian and Uzbek languages to be accessible for as large an audience as possible.
Financial issues about attendance on the master's course at RGU and visits of academics to 3 countries: "institutional costs" still needs to be paid to RGU. Alan had asked the TEMPUS office to calculate this. Students who were not there for 30 days did not earn any institutional costs for RGU. As far as the Summer School was concerned, since, unlike the original plan, the academics all visited Georgia and the courses took place only in Georgia, less was spent for staff costs and the surplus amount left could be used to defray the deficit in costs for the master courses in RGU.
Students' placement – RGU can offer full-time and part-time campus placements and online placements as well. Placements can be arranged in different consortia in different fields and not only in Information Technologies and not only in libraries. Alan reminded the meeting that we were talking only about library and archive placements. Placements will be organised by different institutions as well and not only by RGU.
E-resources - Purchase of Emerald license for three years. The consortium could negotiate to extend the license for more than the three years period but that was outside the scope of the project.
VLE training – will be discussed under the item 4.b.
Costs for different activities and finding ways of co-financing: it could be VLE - developing 15 modules; academic staff can provide the content of modules. 15 academics could be paid to work for two weeks on Moodle modules; there is availability for translation as well. The staff working on modules and translation should fill in the staff cost forms. Simon offered to be

responsible for work on the modules as RGU has already put much work in modules preparation. Simon will send the list of modules to consortium members and 15 modules will be chosen according to the interests of Georgia, Armenia and Uzbekistan.

Study tour – will be discussed later under the item 7.8.

Sustainability - the consortium should think about sustainability. The final report would be written by Ian in collaboration with Marat. The report goes to the local TEMPUS office in the three partner countries. Ian suggested it would be a good idea to have the report published in an academic or scholarly journal to have a permanent record of the project for posterity.

Expert's visit: Alan had responded to a suggestion by Monika Segbert that there was no need for her to go to Uzbekistan for monitoring since she would be going there for the final conference, by suggesting that she could attend the management meeting in Parma. It would be easy and inexpensive for her to come to Parma.

3.c. EU recommendations - colleagues went through the intermediate report reply from EU. The following questions, given in the document, were discussed: **number of students** in master courses as EU would like to have more information about it to have a clear picture on the development of the programmes. **Information about formal recognition of the new curriculum** in the partner countries and accreditation is also important. As colleagues from the partner countries explained, the number of students in the three countries was only just becoming available: in Georgia it is likely to be 23 (students registered for the master course starting in March 2011), in Armenia 8, and in Uzbekistan 20 - 30. As Marat explained there is a lack of professional teachers of LIS in Uzbekistan. They have opened new courses but still don't have enough qualified staff.

The next EU recommendation was about the **development of communication between partners** and exchanging information. Consortium members find the communication between partners quite sufficient and helpful but they still could think about its development.

The response to EU recommendation about teaching material availability on website was that it was available on the Moodle platform. The partner countries are using Moodle for uploading courses and teaching materials. For example the Summer School courses are available on Moodle at Ilia State University.

Recommendation about **training and retaining of teaching staff**: this was partly answered when Uzbek participants mentioned about the need for staff training. Marat asked if it is possibly to send teachers to RGU or Middlesex, or teachers from partner countries could go to Uzbekistan to share their experience with Uzbek colleagues. They need more information and support for distance learning as well. Sending teachers to UK would be very useful as they have to work more on curriculum development, teaching methods. Alan said that there is still some money left so something can be incorporated. Simon stated that RGU would be happy to see visitors from Uzbekistan and they would discuss the options how they could help Uzbek colleagues. It is also possible to consult with Professor Robert Newton, who will go to Armenia to do the workshop on QA, e-learning and teaching methodologies. It would be possible for the Uzbek participants to have an extra day or two in Aberdeen at RGU before the study tour. Discussing teaching and learning methods Ian mentioned the problem concerning the language of teaching materials: using English reading materials or making translations? Attention should be paid to this point. It is also interesting in which language will be course material uploaded on Moodle. Talking about printed teaching or reading material Veronika Korkla shared the experience of Rezekne Higher Education Institution of producing small number of books just for student usage. With translation and publishing issues the problem of copyright arose. This has been a big problem for

a long time for partner countries. Irakli mentioned that was the reason why the Georgians decided to include intellectual property right in the programme of master courses. Talking about training or retraining staff Irakli mentioned that Library Association has already retrained Tbilisi State University librarians and they plan to work with school librarians as well. He thinks that if the modules developed within the project will be used for retraining library staff, it will add value to the project as a factor for sustainability.

Consortium members agreed that as a reply to the EU recommendation about teaching and learning methodologies, one could state that the team members visit to RGU already gave them ideas on changing teaching methods but for further development new methods could be introduced gradually and different methods could be used simultaneously. Ian underlined that changes should happen gradually and gave some examples from US and UK library schools.

As for **continuing English language training** it was not in the project, English language training was considered only for the students going to the EU universities (which at the Kick-off Meeting was agreed to be RGU) and the statement in the EU recommendations could be a simple misunderstanding. Also it can be answered that students who attend the masters course should be able to read English but making English a compulsory subject would be unwise as it would cut down the numbers of applicants.

About clarification and re-enforcement of the **roles of Barcelona and Parma** consortium members think their participation and support was clear and productive during the summer school. The EU advised to check similar projects and study the materials produces by these projects in the partner countries. According to Irakli Garibashvili there are no projects focusing on LIS in Georgia but other curriculum development projects could be sought out or other educational projects about teaching methodologies, introducing new methods, etc.

EU made a recommendation about continuing **dialogue with social partners**. In response to this the consortium members can say that they have already done much in this direction. The consortium is working with EIFL. Ilia State University has signed a partnership and cooperation memorandum with different education and research institutions in Georgia. It is important as well to note that representatives of other institution were involved in the summer school as well.

About the **reinforcement of the research component** of the programme, partners are working on developing that side of the programme as well. Developing good curriculum implies knowing the needs of the countries and that involves research as well. Programme preparation should be based on research about market needs. Considering the needs of organisation and experience of practitioners the consortium will know what managerial and technological level could be achieved. Paying attention to these points will help with sustainability as well and the project will have a real impact on making progress and will not have short term and isolated results.

Based on these discussions Alan will report back to EU.

Ian remarked that there was a need for the national TEMPUS offices not only to present the projects to their countries and ministries but also to show how they interrelate to moving the country forward. This involves the need for sustainability on the information side which could be provided by the people who are trained by the project.

4. a. Purchasing equipment and establishing learning centres - Partners from Uzbekistan equipped the centres in April and made a presentation in May. Two computer centres are used for Masters students (in general subjects) in Tashkent Institute of Culture and Tashkent University of Information Technologies (TUIT). The latter is using the centre for retraining postgraduate students. They have developed an intranet for local databases as well. Next year the centres will be used for Masters courses; the reason for not starting the courses this year in TUIT

is lack of experienced teachers and professionals as was mentioned above. Both institutions are starting to use Moodle and have joined the programme for Moodle interface translation. There are electronic textbooks on the intranet as well.

Equipment for Georgia has not been purchased yet, and as it was discussed above it will be bought in UK and Charles is taking care of that. Irakli had a suggestion to reallocate money from technician expenses to purchasing equipment for Georgia Library Association (4.a. 4.b.).

Armenia has established 3 computer classrooms, and has installed a VLE server with Moodle system.

Purchasing e-resources: purchasing Emerald – when will this start? In fact it had started from the beginning of the year? There was a question as to whether one invoice should be prepared for all the institutions or not. It is necessary to buy Russian databases on library science (IVIS company) for Uzbekistan as most librarians ask for Russian material. The Georgian partners need books but the list will be provided after the curriculum development document is finalised and then Charles can purchase the books in London. Georgian partners will need course material translation as well. So the money considered for books can be divided and part of it could be used for translation. To do this partners will need confirmation from EU; Alan will ask about it (4.c).

4. d. will be discussed later.

5. Review of activities 2010. 5.1. Georgian students went to RGU for MA and two of them are going to get the postgraduate diploma. Natia and Irakli explained how useful their visit to RGU was for developing curriculum. Natia mentioned that Peter was involved in this process very actively. He was not keen to travel hence he could not participate in management meetings. RGU staff were giving advice about issues like quality assurance, accreditation etc. Now the curriculum is ready in Georgia, already accepted by accreditation services and ready to be launched. The curriculum document is in English and Georgian. Georgian members prepared the curriculum considering the Georgian situation.

Uzbek students used their RGU experience as well to develop their curriculum and they will use the new curriculum at the Institute of Information Technologies. Some learning material has already been translated into Uzbek. Marat said Uzbek partners plan to start a programme for retraining teachers and it will support the sustainability of the project. The material prepared during the project could be put in the VLE to be used later.

Alan informed the meeting that Armenian participants had arrived and were joining the discussions.

Alan mentioned that we had not completed the discussion about the 'Needs Assessment' document and Tigran reported in brief on it. Alan suggested the Armenian participants add missing data to the report. Ian pointed out that the information from the three PC countries varies considerably. It would be helpful if ALL the partners reviewed the draft needs assessment, and sent to Simon and himself enough information to ensure that the situation in each country is fully described so that the differences can be compared.

Tigran reported about the VLE situation in ISEC. He mentioned that 2nd year LIS students are studying a new subject named 'Introduction to distance learning'. He also said that 'MARACANDA: University libraries towards the new millennium' project, mentioned in the assessment document prepared by EU experts, is still not explored in details. Alan added that his emails have not been answered. Participants suggested that this was a project to improve preservation and conservation of old Arab materials and to reorganise a traditional library before

the digital era. The libraries in our project are already in advance of this situation so would learn nothing from it.

Regarding the issue 'Working with stakeholders', Tigran mentioned that Peace Corps volunteers from Lori and Shirak regions are cooperating with him to involve librarians from these regions in the 2011 educational process.

After this clarifications Alan suggested to continue the meeting Agenda. Tigran started to act as a Meeting secretary.

4. d) Co financing. Tigran said that the project is already having a co-financing of 20,000 euro from the NATO project which provided the infrastructure for the network to link the classrooms to the internet. Armenia, Georgia and Uzbekistan have subscribed to the EBSCO databases and they are paying for this, so they must ask from EBSCO confirmation letters about subscription to the e-resources and the amount of co-financing. It was agreed that Tigran and Alan will prepare a draft letter for all the republics. Alan mentioned about the co-financing done by professors from the EU Universities as consultancies.

Ian asked about Russian translation of prepared e-learning courses and about putting these courses in the Open Access domain, which will increase the impact of those courses. Marat mentioned about the possible copyright restrictions for these courses. Irakli suggested that if any copyright restrictions will be present then it was necessary to restrict access by IP address to the copyrighted courses.

Tigran replied that some of e-learning courses developed in ISEC will be on Open Access domain. He also mentioned that these courses will be translated into Russian and the beneficiaries could be all Russian speaking LIS communities from any of the eIFL partner countries.

5.2 Alan informed the meeting about the monitoring report by Monika Segbert on the Georgia visit. He introduced the report which is mounted on the Tempus website. The conclusion is that Monika did not have anything special to criticise as the project is going so well.

5.3 Marat explained why he had asked for this item to be put on the agenda. He asked for advice how other countries (EU and PC) are working with their Ministries to approve the new curricula by the Ministries and by the University Boards. Marat said that they have a lot of bureaucracy for approving the courses and will be happy for any advice and ideas.

Alan suggested RGU and UoB talk about their experience, which could be helpful on this. Ian suggested Marat described the system which exists in Uzbekistan. Marat and Ahmed reported that when the curriculum is developed it is presented to the University Board and to the Ministry of Education. The programmes then pass the peer review process. If both structures support the programme then we can implement that. Unfortunately for some courses this is becoming a circular process, and the curriculum is only passed after a long time.

Ian asked about the financial issues, staff and equipment. How all three components are approved. He mentioned that in Scotland some 20 years before the Ministry of Education often did not approve the curricula due to financial reasons.

Ahmed mentioned that in Uzbekistan the faculty may change around ca. 15 percent of the content of programmes without difficulty. For more extensive changes they needed permission from the Ministry of Education.

Irakli asked a question to Uzbek representatives as to how the Ministry gives permission. Marat reported that for changes less than 15% no permission is required. Irakli and Natia then reported on the Georgian experience. In Georgia everything is done in accordance with the Bologna requirements. When a new curriculum is developed, it is introduced to the faculty members and

after their approval the programme is presented to the University Academic Board. There is no bureaucracy and the approval process goes fast. Georgian colleagues mentioned that they have a national accreditation agency for final approval. Armenia also has a national accreditation agency for approval.

Veronika added that in Latvia the Universities must receive a license for each subject. This is valid for 2 years after they pass accreditation, and after that they receive a license for 6 years.

Arusyak and Albert introduced Armenian experience. In Armenia they have a national accreditation agency. They send the draft curriculum to them, which they study and return opinions about the new programme. In the case of ISEC we start the new curriculum only after the relevant national Academy institutions have approved. There are no problems of bureaucracy at the faculty level. Right now all Universities in Armenia are passing accreditation in the National Quality Assurance Agency. Arusyak mentioned also that Armenian Universities are eligible to change 15% of curricula without any permission from QA Agency. She also mentioned that philosophy, foreign language and informatics are mandatory subjects to be included in all programmes.

Alan asked Arusyak if ISEC was implementing QA. She answered – yes. She also mentioned that in ISEC the amount of students for admission is limited by the Ministry of Education.

Natia mentioned that in Ilia State University they also are implementing QA, and Alan mentioned that during the fact finding visit in Tbilisi they met with those specialists.

Ian again raised some financial aspects of the problem. He mentioned that in Scotland, some 20 years ago, the Government was approving the curricula based on financial constraints, now the University is the body itself to approve new curricula.

Ahmed asked a question to Ian on how they are deciding how many credits to give to each subject. Ian mentioned that they have 2 models: older Universities had particular approaches which still have not been changed. Now due to joining the Bologna process, we are using credit values and the Universities are deciding how many EU credits to give to each subject. After this Simon and Ian described in more details the Scottish and EU credit systems.

Mario expressed his views on the role of the Ministry of Education in Spain.

Marat mentioned that he was satisfied with the explanations given and that the discussions were helpful.

5.4 Assessment of Summer School. Mario presented his report, introducing all the items. He mentioned that unit 6 was not taught as the lecturer Alexeis Zorins missed his flight. He mentioned that the Summer School program had been structured in 7 units:

Unit 1 Users and usage	Prof Anna Maria Tammaro
Unit 2 Access to digital libraries	Prof Vittore Casarosa
Unit 3 Marketing Library and Information Services	Prof. Tony Olden
Unit 4 Information Architecture	Prof Mario Perez-Montoro
Unit 5 Digital Preservation	Prof. Alice Keefer
Unit 6 Implementation of Digital Libraries with MS Visual Studio	This unit was not delivered because Prof. Alexeis didn't arrive
Unit 7 Document Management and Systematization	Prof. Vita Kravchenko

On behalf of educational team of the Summer School Mario presented reflections about achievements, constraints and further improvements:

- **Reflections about Achievements**:
  - In general, professors felt and conclude that the main learning outcomes were met
  - Due to the last minute cancellation of the classes of Prof. A. Zorins of Latvia, the three remaining professors rescheduled some class time to allow for more personalized work on the curriculum development aspects of the Summer School.
  - Each of the professors worked with a country group to help them develop their final project. The effort was quite successful, allowing for more in-depth discussions regarding the topic chosen as well as its relevance to the participants' own national educational framework. Also, some Bologna-related concepts were explored to a greater degree than would have been possible otherwise. As a result, it was felt that the participant presentations and course descriptions were better focussed and more fully developed.
- **Reflections about constraints: time, equipment, accommodation:**
  - The main constraint was time: three half-day sessions meant that the content was very condensed:
  - In this way, the major problem was cutting down the material originally planned for a 20-hour class to less hours
  - The professors teaching on the first few days of the Summer School had to deal with hot and noisy classrooms
- **Reflections about other improvements needed:**
  - Professors would have preferred a longer Unit length in order to have done more in-depth work with the participants, including a project that they could have worked on outside of the class as well.

Tamar mentioned that she had prepared a questionnaire and all summer school students had sent their feedback. She also mentioned that the questionnaire was disseminated via e-mail amongst Consortium members.

Tigran suggested mounting the assessment and questionnaire on the Tempus page.

Ian raised a question – who where the students? Are they teaching Masters in their schools?

Natia mentioned that the Georgian students were practitioners, teachers and librarians who will teach in LIS. She also mentioned that they expanded the group to involve not only Tempus project participants but also specialists from the National Library, Manuscripts Library, the library of the National Academy of Sciences and the Parliament Library. In total in the Summer School 35 participants were invited from Armenia, Georgia and Uzbekistan.

Marat reported that all Uzbek participants were teachers.

Tigran mentioned that Armenian team was composed of ISEC teachers and 2 LIS students.

5.5 Develop curriculum document. Alan mentioned that each partner country is developing its new curriculum. We have 2 options: to prepare 3 separate documents for Armenia, Georgia and Uzbekistan, or to have one joint document with relevant introductions. Ian and Simon presented their views on this.

Ian – For the Spring meeting in Parma we must have ready 3 documents, and after examination of those documents we will be able to decide how to proceed.

Arusyak mentioned that in Armenia we already have the curriculum and we will introduce that to the Consortium members. Alan suggested to send the materials to Ian. It was decided that the persons responsible for this will be Arusyak, Natia and Ahmed.

6 Financial issues. Charles presented a financial report to date. He mentioned that we have reached the next point to ask a money from EU. He reported that equipment for Georgia will be purchased from London. He asked all participants to pass him travel documents and stubs for including in the financial report. The financial report was approved by all Consortium members. Alan started to explain in details the CONVENTION for Staff Costs He pointed to the Staff Costs table from the EU document. He mentioned that fee/hour amount must be filled in correctly, in accordance with the EU regulations.

7. Forthcoming activities.

7.1 Alan mentioned that we need to select subjects and courses for PCs for organising EU user services librarians visits to PCs. He suggested representatives from Armenia, Georgia and Uzbekistan to suggest preferable subjects. Alan mentioned that Nazlin has already travelled to Uzbekistan. We also have an offer from Elena (UoP), and she is ready to organise a course on Information Literacy. She participates in IFLA meetings and he had met with her there.

Ian mentioned that he knows her and has a high opinion of her professional skills. Alan also suggested it was necessary to decide very quickly the subjects to finalise this issue, as we are behind schedule. Ian suggested that it will be useful to organise lectures mostly for students and academics. Alan and Marat mentioned that Nazlin during her Uzbekistan travel visited 3 cities and lectured for academics and students. Marat said in detail about Nazlin's visit.

Veronika mentioned that it could happen that Alexis would visit PCs for presenting missed lectures which they would fund. Also they are ready to deliver lectures on archives and records management.

Natia mentioned that Georgia is interested in a visit of a reference librarian, as that service is not well developed in Georgia.

Alan mentioned that in European countries this is usually named subject librarian, and in the Middlesex University such a person is called school (i.e. faculty) liaison librarian.

Alan suggested to send Nazlin to Georgia such as she is a good candidate for subject librarian role. Marat replied that Nazlin could be a good candidate for such a visit. Alan asked Georgian partners to decide the visit time. It was agreed that the best time could be April or May, 2011. After this Alan mentioned that the project can send an extra person to Uzbekistan. Tigran addressed a question to Alan. Do you see any good candidate on library management for Armenia? Alan answered that general management is not so attractive a topic for a week's seminar for librarians, and suggested instead to host Elena, who is ready to deliver a lecture on Information Literacy.

Ian suggested to present short description of lectures on Information Literacy.

Alan replied that he is having some material prepared by Professor Rosemary McGuinness and he circulated amongst participants the document named 'Transferring Information Literacy'.

Ian and Alan discussed several aspects on organising Information Literacy courses for librarians, academics, and end users.

After examining course description and discussions, Armenian participants suggested that they will be happy to host Professor McGuinness in Yerevan to lecture on Information Literacy.

Irakli mentioned that they have 2 vacant places for lecturing and they will be happy for a visit of a school librarian.

7.2 Management meeting in Parma. Alan informed that Anna-Maria is suggesting 2 alternate dates for the Parma meeting.. Consortium members agreed that 27-30 March is acceptable for everybody. 27th of March is Sunday which will be the arrival date. Alan mentioned that the hotel accommodation as reported by Anna Maria would be around 70 euros

per person which was within the costs of stay regulations. Ian replied that UoP has a guest house, with small apartments and a kitchen.

Simon mentioned that he will have to be back on 29th of March, due to an appointment on March 30.

Alan informed the meeting that Anna Maria had told him that in Florence they are holding an international conference and Consortium meeting participants can participate in that event as well. She is also offering internships which would be discussed later.

The dates were agreed of 27 – 30 March.

Alan mentioned that the final conference agenda, which will be held in Uzbekistan, will be prepared and discussed in Parma. Marat will in the meantime decide definitely about the dates of the Uzbekistan conference.

7.3 Alan informed the meeting that partner country representatives must report about piloting of Master Courses on LIS. Tigran reported that starting from 2009 they have started piloting, and now they have 6 part time students admitted in 2009, and 8 part time students admitted in the LIS School in 2010. Piloting is going well, students who are professional librarians are satisfied with the level of studies in the classes. Natia reported that in Georgia they will start piloting in March. And after that she explained the mechanism of piloting and why the course will start in March. In Georgia students apply for admission in March. The results of preliminary admissions are announced in June, then internal exams begin and by the end of November the final results are announced.

Ahmed reported that in Uzbekistan they will start the pilot in TUIT from September 2011. Marat mentioned that Tashkent State Institute of Culture had already started to use the masters Course on LIS since September 2010.

Ian mentioned that since Armenia has started piloting earlier, at the end of the project they will be able to present and evaluate Master thesis of LIS students.

Simon mentioned the importance of measuring of impact of the project during piloting.

Ian expressed an idea that it will be useful during Parma meeting to have feedback from Armenia on their experience on teaching, what aspects they have changed for the 2nd year students, and during the final management meeting in Uzbekistan to have feedback from Georgia and Uzbekistan.

Natia mentioned that at Ilia State they have a research department, and they are evaluating courses, so we will have evaluation results for academics and for students.

Alan informed that now the time is 18.00, and we must think about our second day working schedule. It was agreed to start the October 7th meeting at 9.00am.

October 7 meeting.

7.4 Alan reported that he cancelled his participation in 2010 at Crimea Conference for dissemination purposes due to the volcanic ash problem. He is planning to be present at that event in 2011 when there will be more to report.

7.5 Alan reported that Monika has already visited Armenia and Georgia and will visit Uzbekistan for the final conference. Instead of making a special monitoring visit there she will merely attend the final conference. She will be invited to the Parma meeting instead since she lives near.

7.6 Alan started discussion on implementing LIS modules on VLE. He mentioned that in the JEP we have talked about preparing 15 modules. We have an allocation of 2 weeks (activity 4.2 of the project) of academic staff time in PCs, with relevant staff costs. We also have allocated money for 25 days work of academic staff from UK and Spain. This is scheduled to the months

16-21. Simon mentioned that EU academic staff must be sure to decide their approach for this. What should be done and who will lead this work. It was agreed that Simon will coordinate activities for this task. We need also some planning for translation some of LIS modules. It was mentioned that we already have some modules mounted on the Georgian Moodle server.

Ian suggested to Simon to start descriptions of the modules being in use in RGU for LIS students. Simon mentioned some of them, such as 'Research Methods', 'Information Governance', then he passed the URL for RGU courses to the participants, which is: http://www.rgu.ac.uk/information-communication-and-media/information-communication-and-media-study-options/postgraduate/information-and-library-studies

Alan mentioned that in each country we have representatives, who know the modules very well. It was agreed that during the coming 3 weeks Armenia, Georgia and Uzbekistan will prepare the list of final modules for translation. Alan mentioned that we have 25 days staff costs for EU, and RGU, UoP and UoB could contribute. He mentioned also that perhaps he should write to Anna-Maria and ask her what modules UoP is suggesting for inclusion. Simon mentioned that in fact PCs must translate 1 module into 3 languages, so we will have more than 15 modules.

Alan replied that we need some time to select the modules and to mount them on the VLE. Tigran mentioned that for Armenia they had already prepared 8 modules (in Armenian), and those are on Moodle.

Alan mentioned also that for each country we have 10 weeks of technician time, which could be spent for training purposes inside of PCs. We will need staff forms signed by people participating in the project.

Ahmed asked what is 'technician time'. Alan explained that this is time for adaptation of the software.

Ian raised one related point. What is a purpose for putting these modules on the VLE, and how these modules will be disseminated for use? Alan replied that PCs can incorporate these courses in their modules. Ian asked how academics from PCs will know about such opportunities? Alan replied that technicians can help on this, promoting it within the web based environment. Ian mentioned that besides Web what other old fashioned tools could be used in PCs to disseminate this information amongst professionals for example professional magasines, etc. Alan said that GLA, who runs several training courses, can disseminate information about this new environment. In other countries if we are going to introduce LLL we must think about awareness raising actions and PR activities.

Tigran mentioned that in Armenia they hold Library Week (April) and Librarians' Day (October). These are good places for advertising. Albert mentioned that ISEC is publishing a journal 'Gitutyun', and articles could be published here as well. Marat asked a question as to how to find a possible audience. Now LIS School are functioning only in TUC, and in this University we don't use Moodle. We need some time for localisation and adaptation of Moodle. We have all information about new courses on the Web pages of TUC. As a good place for advertisement could be a newly established magazine for librarians 'Kutubxona', which is accessible from the URL: http://www.kutubxona.uz)

Ian raised a question on who will update the content. Alan mentioned that this relates to sustainability.

7.7 – 7.8 Develop and implement QA and Enhancement system. Ian mentioned that he had discussed this topic with colleagues. As a conclusion he can suggest 4 elements:
- Papers and reports
- Workshop

- Study tours to EU on QA (2 week study tour)
- 1 week lectures by an EU academic in Armenia for all partner countries.
He mentioned that at the time of preparation of the project, he had contacted Professor Robert Newton, and that he had agreed to do this. He has worked in various libraries and is a good specialist. As an academic he teaches on the post- and undergraduate levels on QA. He also has experience in reviewing students' examination work. He took part in national review in the UK on QA for LIS. When we started preparation for the Tbilisi meeting he contacted Ian and is happy to undertake a one week trip to Armenia. Ian mentioned that Professor Newton didn't think that after this workshop, 2 weeks training in RGU is necessary. May be a shorter meeting at which the representatives from PCs will come and tell what they are planning to do in their Universities.

Participants mentioned that the workshop in Armenia is the best implementation schema, during which participants will discuss what systems must be implemented for sustainability of the new LIS curricula. Consortium members agreed with Ian that the study tour to EU Universities to examine QA systems in partner organisations would not be very useful. It was agreed that one week training in Armenia for all PCs, and after that a very short meeting (maybe together with the Parma meeting) on QA will be sufficient.

Alan said we must now agree when we are starting training in AM and who is participating: the previous dates had been changed, and we must inform Charles the names of participants from Uzbekistan to obtain air tickets. Participants from Georgia would go by car.. 3 people from each country. Workshop would take place from November 1-6.

Ian said that though it was not be a very long workshop, there was work to do after and participants must have sufficient level of responsibility in their Universities to continue the implementation of QA.

Alan said the next thing what to do with activity 5.2 from Tempus project. He suggested to Marat that senior staff wishing to visit EU partner universities to see what is going with QA could come from Uzbekistan on QA training, and after they can go to study tours to EU. He also said that his colleague Elli Geeorgiadou from MDX who is expert in EU practices and is involved in inter-Tempus coaching could meet the people from partner countries.

So we could have 1 day with Robert Newton who would come down to London and 2 days with Elli. Other places they can visit could be UoB and UoP. Mario answered that he must check with his University to see if he can arrange a visit.

Alan mentioned that he will ask Anna-Maria to check interest from UoP about that visit. Finally it was decided that 1 week in UK and 1 week in UoP for QA visits will be sufficient.

Alan asked to decide the best dates for EU visit for QA. He reported that Elli is suggesting May or June 2011, and this must be synchronized with Robert so they can tailor his visit with Elli's QA workshop.

Alan asked the views of PCs on QA visit to London and Parma.

Alan, Charles and Ian discussed some possible routes for travel of PCs to London and to Parma. So issues 7.7 and 7.8 were covered.

7.9 Marat started to discuss possible ways of organising the final conference. They would invite ambassadors from EU and PC countries, from different universities and are expecting about 100 participants in this conference. Also from the MoE the vice minister will attend. So we think that 2 days will be enough for Tashkent, and we will move to Samarqand for continuation and the conference, which will be a half day meetings with rectors, educators, and some presentations. Marat suggested that we will send all these ideas in more detail later for discussions. He

mentioned that they will invite participants from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan for participation. Consortium members discussed the list of possible sponsors. Alan suggested involving national Tempus offices. Marat asked what expenses are allocated for conference organisation. Alan listed expenses. Ian looking at the Commission guidelines noted that they suggest good interpretation can make or break a conference. We can prepare CDs for conference materials. Tigran suggested that they can mount conference materials on FSL OA server as a special repository and put a link from the Tempus page to that.

7.10 Report on Sustainability. Alan mentioned that we have already discussed that during our first day meeting. Input from the PCs will be coordinated by Marat. This document will be produced on the Web. We could have that document to discuss during final conference.

7.11 Placements. Alan - the idea is that this must happen in parallel with pilots. In the project activity 2.5 we have 15 mobilites (5 per country) and we had talked the day before about this briefly. Anna-Maria has offered 2 placements in UoP in her department – international library and digital library studies.

Ian mentioned that in UoP they have 2 Masters programmes and one is being discontinued. The international library programme is being carried out in cooperation with Northumbria University, and digital library programme is in cooperation with Oslo and Tallinn. Alan said that MDX also can host 1 or 2 people for this. Ian mentioned that the language aspect could be an issue and we must know the skill level of participants. Veronika mentioned that they have an agreement with State Agencies, and that they are introducing an electronic system for archives, and they can demonstrate this system to the students. 4 weeks will be enough for this.

Alan mentioned that course leaders must request placements for students.

Simon - RGU can suggest virtual places for the students, for the 3 week period, that wouldn't be a physical mobility but a virtual one. Alan said these would have to be additional as the EU wanted mobility.

Alan again mentioned about course leaders, who are responsible for running the courses, and must be sure that the students are doing the right work and going in the right direction.

Ian and Alan mentioned that we must think about extending the grant, for example Uzbekistan is planning to start the course after September 2011. Alan thought you could not extend beyond 6 months which might not achieve any advantage.

Simon mentioned that for the part time students they have a great selection of DL courses. Ian and Mario mentioned that for visiting EU universities the students must have communication skills in local languages: Italian, Catalan and Spanish, and Russian for Latvia, for communicating with the community members.

Natia mentioned that she is not sure that Russian could be a good communication language. She thought there would be around 5-6 students in their programme who are working in the National Archives, and they would be happy to visit Resekne.

Alan mentioned that we must be aware that archives also are part of this project and we must keep the balance. Sending some students to Latvia will be useful. Natia asked how many places are allocated per country. Alan mentioned 5. Mario mentioned that in UoB in his faculty only one person is lecturing in Spanish, all others are lecturing in Catalan. Mario mentioned that if in PCs we have persons with good Spanish skills then they can visit UoB. Otherwise it would be difficult.

Alan mentioned that during the Summer School we did not spent as much money as was allocated. If any of PCs is willing to invite a lecturers (3 persons) then we can pay for that, as we are having some savings from Summer School academics. He awaited suggestions for topics.

Simon replied that an idea of workshops in PCs (1 or 2) is useful and we must wait for proposals. Alan assumed that since we have money, we need 'demand driven' proposals from PCs. Ian raised one small point relating to the project. He mentioned that in the page 50, activity 2.3 – 'visits by academics' is in the plural. Alan confirmed that should be 'visit'. Ian mentioned that he is concerned how EU will look to the report with 'academics' in this activity. Alan mentioned that he will be clear during reporting on this.

Alan asked for additions for forthcoming activities.

8. Project administration tools

8.a Website. Tigran reported about the current state of the project Web Site. Natia mentioned that they have linked Summer School to the Tempus web page. People can get different ideas about the project activities,

8.b Handbook. Alan mentioned that this is Tempus internal documentation, and we have decided not to publish this. It is a project management document.

8.c Communication. Alan - is everybody happy with this? No rejections and criticisms. Tamar is sending many messages to the group, and nobody is left out.

Everybody is happy with the established communication system. Alan added that Veronika is helping Professor Pocs to read his messages, and she is acting as a member in the list.

Mario suggested including his e-mail in the communication list. Sometimes he does not receive messages from Tigran. Tigran replied that this will be corrected.

Alan mentioned that we were coming to the end of our meeting and it was unfortunate that Irakli was not with us now, and we can't discuss with him the role of library associations for organizing LLL courses for librarians and information workers.

Natia informed that they are starting specific courses for professionals and those will start from September 2011, and any librarian or archivist willing to receive additional knowledge on various subjects will be hosted by them.

9. a Any other business.

Natia suggested planning the following day. Natia and Irakli organised a gathering of librarians and IT specialists to attend the lectures of EU and PC specialists.

Arusyak presented the agenda and Natia said that Tamar will bring the revised agenda.

Alan must give a general welcome for 15 minutes, and suggested to have a translator for this. Natia and Tamar will do the translation into Georgian together. Next is Veronika, and she will present Rezekne Higher Educational Institution. After that Tigran will give an overview of LIS in Armenia, which will be continued by Marat, presenting situation with LIS in Uzbekistan. Irakli and Natia will introduce situation in Georgia.

After a break Alan will give two lectures, on bibliographic exchange formats and standards for global information.

9. b Next meeting. As laid down in the JEP activities, the next meeting is scheduled in Parma, Italy. It was agreed that this meeting will take place in March 28-29, 2011.

Closure. Alan expressed on behalf of all participants gratitude to colleagues from Ilia State University for hosting this meeting and its excellent organisation.

<div align="right">

Alan Hopkinson (Chairman)
Tigran Zargaryan (Secretary)

</div>