MINUTES

of the Fifth Management Meeting TEMPUS grant

145021-TEMPUS-2008-UK-JPCR

'New Masters Programme on Library and Information Science'

National Library of Uzbekistan 10 October, 2011 Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Present:

Alan Hopkinson – project contractor, Middlesex University, London
Tigran Zargaryan – project coordinator, Fundamental Scientific Library, Yerevan
Albert Sargsyan - Consortium member, International Scientific Educational Centre, Yerevan
Anna Maria Tammaro – Consortium member, University of Parma, Parma
Irakli Garibashvili - Consortium member, Georgian Library Association, Tbilisi
Veronica Korkla - Consortium member, Rezekne Higher Education Institution, Rezekne
Ian Johnson – Consortium member, the Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen.
Marat Rakhmatullaev – Consortium member, Tashkent Institute of Culture, Uzbekistan
Tamar Mosiashvili - Consortium member, Ilia State University, Tbilisi
Elli Georgiadou - Middlesex University, UK

Invited:

Monika Segbert – Project external expert
Barno Ganieva – Tashkent Institute of Culture, Uzbekistan
Arusyak Harutunyan - International Scientific Educational Centre, Yerevan
Alice Keefer - University of Barcelona, Spain
Vittore Casarosa - University of Parma, Italy
Maksim Savochkin - Lecturer Tashkent State Institute of Culture
Aliya Japarova Student, Tashkent Institute of Culture, Uzbekistan

Absent:

Simon Burnett - Consortium member, the Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen
Natia Gabrichidze - Consortium member, Ilia Sate University, Tbilisi
Mario Pérez-Montoro - Consortium member, University of Barcelona, Barcelona (represented by Alice Keefer)
Khalik Soatov - Tashkent University of Information Technology, Uzbekistan

1. Opening of Meeting (2 pm)

a) Welcome from hostsb) Adoption of agendac) Apologies for absence2. Minutes of previous meeting

a) A saves

a) Accuracy

b) Matters arising not covered elsewhere
3. Report (TEMPUS Activity 1.1/1.2)

3. Report (TEMPUS Activity 1.1/1.2) a) Acceptance of report overseen by RGU

b) General progress report (Alan Hopkinson)

c) EU recommendations on monitoring visits: recent reports including Uzbekistan

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): other materials

d) Co-financing (3.2)

5. Review of activities September 2010 to date

5.1 Develop curriculum document (TEMPUS Activity 1.3)

5.2 Review of Study Tour (TEMPUS Activity 5.3) (including QA, 5.2) to Italy and UK

5.3 Review of extra Summer School (TEMPUS Activity 2.2)

5.4 Dissemination at Crimea Conference (TEMPUS Activity 6.3)

6. Financial issues

a) Financial report (Alan Hopkinson)

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

7. Activities 2010-2011

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

a) Selecting subjects and lecturers (2 outstanding)

7.2 Pilot Master's programme (TEMPUS Activity 2.3)

a) Progress report (Partner country reporters should give a brief account of progress)

7.3 Implement LIS modules on VLE (TEMPUS Activity 4.2)

7.4 Final Conference (TEMPUS Activity 6.4)

7.5 Report on Sustainability (TEMPUS Activity 7.1)

7.6 Placements (TEMPUS Activity 2.5)

7.7 Consultant's comments (TEMPUS Activity 8.2)

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 Tashkent 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, and to work out other issues of the plan of work, relating to JEP 145021-TEMPUS-2008-UKJPCR.

- 1. The meeting began at 14:00 as planned.
- a) The director of the National Library of Uzbekistan Dr. Absalom A. Umarov welcomed Consortium members and other participants.
- b) The agenda prepared by Alan Hopkinson was adopted without changes. Alan Hopkinson and Tigran Zargaryan were appointed as Chair and Secretary respectively.
- c) Alan Hopkinson mentioned that Mario Pérez-Montoro was unable to participate in the meeting as he was currently in the USA and in his stead was Alice Keefer. Natia Gabrichidze is on maternity leave and Tamar Mosiashvili is representing Ilia State University. Elli Georgiadou from Middlesex University was attending to help in the management of the meetings as well as to contribute to the conference. Alan reported that Charles had left Middlesex University, and his duties as financial manager of the NMPLIS project had been taken on by himself.

Arusyak Harutunyan disseminated to each meeting participant NMPLIS project booklets and posters,

and a pen drive with project logo stamped on them. Marat distributed a booklet 'New Master Programme on Library and Information Science in Uzbekistan'.

Tigran mentioned that publications have been released thanks to the funding coming from the 'Printing & Publishing Costs' budget heading.

2. The Parma management meeting minutes were discussed with matters arising. Alan presented the Parma Minutes, and asked for comments or suggestions. He went through the Parma Minutes looking for any matters to discuss that were not in the agenda.

Alan mentioned that student placements for Armenia had already started and two Armenian students were currently in London. 3 UZ participants would visit Rezekne during November. For Georgian participants student placements will start in March 2012.

Alan mentioned that it is necessary to pay institutional costs to Robert Gordon University which is still pending. Ian mentioned he would chase this up.

Regarding equipment purchase Alan mentioned that only Georgia has not yet purchased equipment, and that for e-resources or books we still have unspent money.

Alan mentioned that librarians' visits to partner countries are still on the agenda.

In 4.2 we have a mistake, the word 'academician' should be changed to 'academic'. Tigran will make this correction in the minutes.

Alan talked about the fact that we had expected from discussion at the last meeting somebody from RGU to lecture on repositories and pedagogy of VLE but that this did not happen in the end. Alan continued that during the Parma meeting Monica had mentioned that she will ask eIFL for help on Open Access. Monica mentioned that she is in touch with Natia regarding OA, and that Natia is the eIFL-OA programme coordinator in Georgia. Vittore mentioned that during the Tbilisi Summer School he had done a presentation on Open Access, which was well accepted by the participants. Project extension, final report and equipment would come up later.

Regarding purchasing of e-resources, Alan mentioned that during the Parma meeting Natia suggested if possible, to subscribe to RDA. Tamar mentioned that no progress yet on this issue, and they are still interested in that subscription through NMPLIS. Monica replied that she would check with ALA once more the possibility for a subscription. Alan suggested Monica check that and report back.

Ian mentioned that Alan also can ask RDA staff for this directly, and they will send an invoice for such subscription without any problems.

Then Alan mentioned that Simon had agreed to putting the UDC course on Moodle. Ian recorded this and said he would check that with Simon.

Regarding curriculum, Alan mentioned that we have agreed to mount 3 separate documents for this (one per partner country), and we will talk about this later.

Issue 6 'Financial issues' will come later.

Issue 7 'Forthcoming activities'. Alan will talk about this later, in the grantholder's report.

Alan mentioned that we still have one outstanding visit, and we will talk about this later.

Regarding issue 7.7 Alan mentioned that Ian has suggested to publish 'Modernising Librarianship and Information Work in Former Soviet Republics: Challenges and Opportunities' in an international journal. Ian mentioned that it is still on his mind.

Issue 7.8. Alan reported that two students from AM at the moment are in London. 3 people from UZ are going to Rezekne for student placement.

Alan mentioned that we had reached the end of previous Minutes, and asked for comments and suggestions. The Tashkent meeting participants accepted the Minutes of the Parma meeting as a true record of the meeting with minor alterations as agreed above.

Item 3 on the Agenda.

a) Acceptance of report overseen by RGU. Ian mentioned that we will submit that to Commission. The kind of problems we faced in countries is that the LIS services have stagnated for years. Alan suggested

putting the report on the web site. Ian mentioned that he will ask Simon to send the version to Tigran and Monica.

b) General progress report prepared by Alan. He mentioned that the main problem that he wanted to report is that Charles Strouthos has left his job, and as a result the project has been seriously inconvenienced by his departure; as a qualified accountant and with a team of administrative staff he was immensely valuable for the project. Some of the administrative fees were allocated to his work (150 euros a week for his work). Alan said that he was immensely grateful for his support, and suggested to send a 'best wishes for the future' card to him on behalf of Consortium, and all participants approved that idea.

He said that the financial crisis has also affected his role and he was transferring to work on TEMPUS and NATO projects on a part-time basis. He informed that beside the NMPLIS project, he will also be working with a new TEMPUS project "RINGIDEA" based at Limerick in Ireland on promoting information literacy in the Balkans. Because of Charles's departure Alan reported that he was having to do the administration single-handed and is not up-to-date with the finances, mainly because he had to establish new mechanisms for making payments. Additionally Middlesex University library had had a refurbishment which had resulted in his moving office twice in two months (the latest at the end of September).

Regarding the extension Alan mentioned that 'the extension we had recommended was granted primarily to enable the project to be completed in Georgia where their pilot masters started later because of their academic year. Because of the extension, the project reached two thirds of its time at the end of August'.

Ian asked for the actual date of extension and Alan replied 15 January 2013 and final report must be on 15 March 2013.

Alan added that probably we should have another final meeting, but without any additional extra funding from EU. He reported that we have some savings and maybe we can use that amount for the final meeting. Alan suggested holding that meeting in Barcelona and suggested the date - September 2012.

Tigran posed a question. Should we ask Commission for permission for the extra meeting? Alan - I will ask.

Elli asked who would monitor the project. Alan replied that Monica is in charge of the monitoring. Monica said this was her fourth monitoring visit, and she will monitor also the Conference (which had been foreseen as another visit. Because one monitoring visit was in Parma, we will have some savings. Ian made an additional comment. During final meeting we all will evaluate what has been done by all 3 partner country Universities. So a meeting in Barcelona would be a good opportunity for all 3 countries to report on what progress is made. This is a reason not go to one of the Partner countries for the meeting but to hold that meeting in Europe.

Monica suggested to check which country is cheapest amongst EU ones and suggested maybe London. Alan rejected explaining that London is very expensive. He thought that the University of Barcelona has good accommodation: during an ELAG meeting he stayed in the University guest house. Tigran joined Alan's suggestion. Alice mentioned that she should check this when will be back to Barcelona. Attendees agreed to hold the final meeting in Barcelona. To determine the date, Ian asked Alice when classes start in UoB and she replied 3rd week of September. Anna Maria suggested 2nd week of September. Ian suggested to Alice that when she knows the schedule of the students' arrival she should e-mail Alan for the dates.

Alan continued his report.

Student placement. Alan asked when Georgia is expecting the student placement.

Tamar answered – Spring, 2012.

After short discussion Alan and Tamar agreed that March 2012 is the best time for placements.

After that Alan explained the mechanism of student placement in EU countries and in UK. He mentioned that we should ask EU for permission for giving extra money to the students, if the money allocated by Tempus is too small.

Alan asked Tamar how is she planning to organize the placement: in one country or in many, by one group or by separate groups? Tamar mentioned that the best solution for them is visiting London, but she should check that when will be back.

Alan asked for any further comments on the report.

Elli asked if we had mentioned anything about pedagogy and VLEs.

Alan referred to the item 4.1 of NMPLIS 'One week course conducted by EU academic staff member (ES) will take place in one partner country and attended by all academics undertaking Masters in that country as well as by librarians and by 4 people from other partner countries which should include one librarian'.

Alan explained that the idea was to train on Moodle partner country representatives, but after installations and set up we discovered that Moodle is very easy on use and there is no need for any training, we decided to go with the pedagogy training and someone was proposed from RGU. Staff from RGU were very busy and that didn't happen. Alan asked participants if we needed to revive this idea (training on pedagogy). The TEMPUS document proposed one staff member from UoB to visit Georgia for training of GE, UZ, AM'.

Alan continued to explain that the initial idea was to train partner country representatives on Moodle. Ian asked Elli if she know anybody from MDX to cover this topic. After short exchange of ideas Alan and Elli decided to investigate this and report back.

Alan asked Anna Maria her opinion. Anna Maria mentioned that from UoP they have a person. Alan posed a question - is that specialist a technical person? Anna Maria answered - yes, she is a technologist. Alan mentioned that once before the administration of UoP didn't give permission for a technologist to visit for training. Anna Maria mentioned that now the situation is much easier, so that such a specialist can travel.

Elli and Anna Maria decided to collaborate and Alan recommended funding a travel for two lecturers. Alan asked partner country representatives when they think such a visit could take place. Arusyak suggested October. Alan and others mentioned that October is a study time, and everybody will be very busy. Alan mentioned that the original plan was April, also on October academics from MDX will be fully occupied. Irakli as a host of that event suggested June, 2012, for 1 week. This suggestion was approved.

Alan added that we should ask for permission for the travel of two lecturers instead of 1. Participants suggested using the distance learning environment during F2F meetings during training. Alan - when we will decide who are going then we will work out the schedule. We should check also the staff costs for two people.

c) Alan said that when we were talking about the monitoring visits last time we mentioned that EU is not giving monitoring reports for public view. This has now changed. Alan read comments from EU UZ National Tempus Office, and Marat agreed that the recommendations mentioned in the NTO monitoring visit report are easy enough to fulfil and implement.

Marat introduced the Consortium members, representatives from TUIT and TUC, who will introduce Monica to the new training centres and developed courses.

4. Purchasing equipment.

a) Alan mentioned that we do not need any reports from AM and UZ on this issue, as they had already ordered, received and mounted the equipment. Tamar should report about the situation in Georgia, as they still are trying to order the equipment. Tamar reported that they are planning to obtain the equipment from UK and are waiting for help from MDX. Alan mentioned that Charles was in charge for that and now he is not in the project, and GE can receive the equipment from other countries. Tigran

told that the equipment for Armenia was received directly from US, as a company from US was the tender winner. Tamar and Alan discussed VAT issues and Tamar said that they have permission for VAT exemption. Alan agreed that Middlesex would see about purchasing the equipment.

- b) Alan reported that the technicians are paid both in AM and UZ for setting up the server purchased in the project.
- c) Tigran reported that they have received the books, ordered in the range of Tempus NMPLIS project. Alan added that what we really need from each partner is a list of books to be ordered.

Tamar mentioned that GE has ordered literature and still waiting for the books. Tamar also mentioned that they have asked Charles for that. Alan suggested resending that list for GE once more to him, as now he is in charge for all that activities. The same for Armenia, as Arusyak informed that ISEC is also planning some extra orders.

The Extension documents from the Commission were disseminated amongst all participants. Alan mentioned that he had circulated also worksheet of activities (as a spreadsheet) for Extension. Monica mentioned that she does not have that document, and Alan promised to send that document via e-mail. d) Co financing. Alan mentioned that a great deal of work had been done by RGU which would qualify as co financing, and that he will send to Ian the forms to be filled in. Tigran mentioned that according to the project AM, GE, and UZ should present a co financing letter from EBSCO, as all 3 countries are subscribers of that resources, and subscription to EBSCO is mentioned in the project as co financing. It was agreed that AM, GE and UZ should prepare such letters and send to Alan's attention.

5. Review of activities September 2010 to date

5.1 Alan mentioned that we don't need to have a common curriculum document for all partner county Universities. Arusyak replied that she has added AM LIS curriculum documents to the pen drive, which she had already disseminated amongst Management meeting participants. The same documents are also available from the project Web page. Tigran suggested that colleagues from GE and UZ prepare similar documents and send to him for mounting on the project web page.

Tamar mentioned that GE is ready and will proceed in accordance with that suggestion. Marat also supported Tigran's idea and mentioned that Maksim from TUIT will send their curriculum for mounting on the Web.

Alan mentioned that 5.2 and 5.3 became joint events, closely related to each other. Were there any comments on study tour?

Arusyak mentioned that during AM specialists study tour to IT and UK, two ISEC academics travel was covered from the project budget (as indicated in the project) and one extra participant travel was covered by ISEC. She reported that Mario has opened a Moodle space for them, and that during the stay in UoP they have uploaded all their materials in that space. She also mentioned that in the UK, the AM team made a series of presentations, and that all 3 participants gained much useful knowledge during study tour visit. It was suggested that Arusyak should upload those presentations into the Tempus page. It was agreed that Arusyak will pass those presentations to Tigran to be mounted on the Tempus page (in parallel with the one which is already mounted on the UoP Moodle).

5.3 Tamar mentioned that all Summer School participants found it useful. 3 public lectures were presented. In addition Tamar mentioned that she will send the Summer School documents for uploading on the Tempus page. She also informed the meeting that now we have more public lectures for the visitors, and that Web pages for both Summer Schools are active and during the conference she will be talking about the outcomes of the Summer Schools. Participants mentioned that this was a good dissemination tool.

Vittore added that the 4 week training on Digital Libraries was very interesting for participants, and that people from various libraries also participated in these training session.

Arusyak mentioned that in Yerevan two important events were held, and ISEC participated in both for disseminating purposes. One was 'Europe Day' and another was 'DigiTec Expo 2011'. The exhibition

had an educational part where several higher education institutions including ISEC delivered information on various educational programmes. A separate booth was allocated to National Tempus Office in Armenia where ISEC presented its posters, flyers, booklets about NMPLIS project. Arusyak informed that many people were interested in the NMPLIS.

Tigran added that for the educational year 2011/12 the faculty of LIS had accepted 9 students, which is a good result as it means that year by year the number of students accepted is growing. Tigran mentioned he was pleased to report that one of their students was already appointed as a University librarian.

Arusyak mentioned that for publicity purposes they have published an article about NMPLIS in the journal 'The World of Science'. Alan demonstrated the copy of that article. Tigran suggested that GE colleagues become more active in publicity, as no any articles from Georgian colleagues are mounted on the Tempus web page.

5.4 Alan reported about his visit to Crimea conference. He said that during the visit he had given a presentation about the project. It was interesting for the people, and very well received. The main question was 'how we can participate'. Alan informed that he had explained the nuances of Tempus calls, and that much interest had been shown.

Ian mentioned that the financial situation is making conference participation more difficult.

6. Financial issues.

a). Alan informed that he had to do work on the finances to be sure of the balance. He informed the meeting that we have lost some money due to the fact that some participants didn't manage to receive visas and as a result didn't manage to travel and participate in the meetings. He explained that there are two rules: cheapest tickets and you should buy a ticket when you know that everything is OK with the visas.

Ian commented (for the future) that non-refundable tickets usually have an option to change them (the dates of travel) paying an extra fee. And in the project with Syria he has already such an experience. We changed the dates on the tickets with extra charge for Syrians, and the Commission accepted such a change.

b) Alan once more reminded participants to return travel ticket stubs. Also he informed that he needs as much information as possible while we are here, to make financial reporting more accurate. Monica asked a question - do you need scanned versions? Alan replied – no, only originals.

7. Activities 2010-2011

7.1 Alan mentioned that Richard Gartner was amongst the Conference participants, and he was giving a talk. Nazlin came twice to Summer Schools and Elena Corradini once, and they came under 'EU user services librarians' visits' activity. So we still have two visits. Simon Francis could be one of them. Alan mentioned that we have already fulfilled two such visits to UZ and two to GE, and none to AM. We haven't spent as much for this activity, and encouraged participants from PCs to write him for suggestions for possible lectures. We can invite Elena and her specialty is 'Information Literacy'. Tigran suggested sending Elena to AM for 'Information Literacy' lectures.

Simon Francis, whose speciality is 'Higher Education Libraries Management' can visit both countries. It was decided that Alan should check his availability.

7.2 In AM we are in third year of teaching, and that was a criticism form the Local Tempus office - why ISEC has started courses so early in the project?

Tamar mentioned that in the case of Georgia, the first year of LIS study was free of charge (the Ilia State was paying), but for the second year they would charge the students.

Monica posed a question - what will be the outcome when you start to charge the students?

Ian asked a question regarding to the PC academics: were they evaluating the courses? Had they evaluated them in Armenia?

Arusyak mentioned that they had done changes to the curriculum on accordance to the students' feedback. But there had been no formal input in writing.

Irakli reported that in RGU he had seen very sophisticated evaluation methodologies, and asked Ian if they could share those documents with the project group.

Elli explained how evaluation is done in MDX.

AM, GE and UZ agreed that course evaluation is important, and Elli promised to send those forms. Ian stressed that everybody should understand that we are not blaming the people by evaluation, but gathering opinions to improve the process.

Alan asked Marat about his comments on 7.2: how were the new courses are progressing. Maksim and Aliya answered to this question in details.

Marat informed that during the Conference they will give also a presentation. UZ colleagues explained that TIC has prepared two new courses on 'Automated Library Systems' and 'Electronic Libraries'. All documents on new courses were submitted for consideration and approval to the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of Uzbekistan, but this didn't happen. Marat mentioned that we hope that for the next year these courses will be accepted, and during study process we will be able to improve them.

Aliya from TUIT presented new courses developed in that University for the LIS faculty students, which they hope to accredit for year 2012.

7.3 Alan explained that the idea was that people will have modules mounted on the Web. In the project we have allocated a funding for that, RGU has put a lot of work on this as a co financing. RGU has done training at the beginning and later UoP continued this (again as co financing). Alan introduced activity 4.2 'Staff costs' section from the project, and recommended PCs to ensure that academics were involved in developing modules so they could be paid under staff costs.

7.4 Marat reported about financial expenditures regarding the Conference. He informed that the Conference team consisted of 15 people. They had sent invitations to all 33 universities in Tashkent, invited the directors of all libraries. The Ministry of Education had sent an invitation letter to the regions as well and as yet it was not known how many people would attend. Also they had invited around 20 of the best students from Masters and Bachelors LIS faculties (TUIT and TIC). Two rectors support our conference and also the rector of TUIT is the Minister of the Agency for Telecommunication & Information, and he promised to organize dissemination of the Conference all over UZ and this would be a good demonstration of using IT.

Marat informed that during 2011 the majority of Universities in UZ (in total 67 Universities) have been connected with each other through the fibre-optic network. They had published proceedings of the Conference, and all members of this group had received them. Maksim had set up that information on the Web Site. Marat mentioned that conference proceedings are also on CDs with multimedia design, this is done by students, graduates from the LIS faculty. He informed that we would visit also Samarkand where the Conference would be continued. They would make short reports about the results of our Tempus project. This is a good opportunity for dissemination of project results in the far regions of Uzbekistan, and useful information for doing new projects and for further cooperation. Marat mentioned that they had good cooperation with Goethe Institute (Germany), and a library director from Berlin would be in Uzbekistan during Conference. On Tuesday, during the Conference she will make a short presentation and for the next day she will organise a master class on 'Reader Oriented Library Management'. Marat invited colleagues to join the master class. She will visit also Samarkand and will organise master courses for Samarkand librarians, and we will have a joint round table inviting also Goethe Institute librarian.

Alan mentioned that the project can provide funding for interpreting, and Marat replied that he had invited the interpreter for the Conference, who is fluent in the library related terminology.

Monica asked if that was simultaneous or consecutive interpretation and Marat replied consecutive. Marat reported that Conference papers were already translated into Russian, and later these materials would be passed to the interpreter, which would result in time saving.

7.5 Ian informed that as we have the project extension this report can be worked on for another 6 months. The comments are based on the evidence which we are able to gather, our knowledge is not complete, and is based on reflections. We (Ian and Marat) are open to comments and suggestions to finalise it over the next few months. This is a still work in progress.

Alan mentioned that for completion we will need to receive complete information from GE after their pilot finishes.

Elli commented that it would be useful to have a feedback from the graduates and from the students. We should follow to the feedback. We could have examples, success stories, all of that will go to the web site, and this will assist course improvement

Marat mentioned that the UZ NMPLIS team has got two new projects. One is from UNESCO (to develop e-library of scientific and technical information, and we plan to finish this on November 2011), He mentioned that NMPLIS team members and LIS students are involved in this project, and we have used knowledge received from Summer Schools.. This project is only for TUIT staff and students, the main server is in TUIT. The Agency on Telecommunication & Information helped us to connect the branches of TUIT through fibre optic. Another 2 year project 'Tashkent Universities Corporate Information Library Network' was received from the Committee on Science and Technologies Development under the Cabinet of Ministers. The project goal is the creation of a system to support the research and educational process with information on the basis of the corporate network of Tashkent universities and operative information exchange between the Universities. The main server will be in the National Library of Uzbekistan. The grant is coming from the Republic's Science and Technology Committee.

Ian – what is the connection between these 2 projects and NMPLIS?

Marat - all participants are from the NMPLIS team.

Alan mentioned that the success is coming from participation in Summer Schools and in NMPLIS. Marat added that we have very few teachers who knew library specific topics, and Barno has developed a new subject 'Electronic Archives', but for success they need qualified specialists. There were no more comments on sustainability.

7.6 Placements: Alan mentioned that we have discussed this when going through the grantholder's report.

7.7 Monica gave a report and said she would be very short. She was very enthusiastic and saw a great deal of great activities and the impact is great. She remarked on what was outstanding: hardware procurement for GE, which is urgent; activities that we have discussed should be put on the place; aspect of finances, as are we on the right way, and what is spent: Alan should report on this. Thus there were two major aspects for this time. Fortunately an extension was granted and this should involve dissemination, conference presentations, papers in English and Russian, dissemination is a tool for sustainability on the National level to attract new young people.

The Web site should remain active and include live stories from the students and Summer School participants should be visible on the web-site. She said she liked very much the suggestions about success stories, this would be good advocacy and strategy for sustainability. Monica mentioned that during her AM and GE visits she had already interviewed students and staff from those countries, and will do that during the Conference. As a final remark Monica mentioned that she was very positive about the project.

Alan reiterated that Monica was contracted to participate in the Conference and evaluate it.

8. Project administration tools

- a). Tigran suggested those present should send him as much data as possible. Ian mentioned that UZ colleagues had printed Conference proceedings and they are also on CDs. It would be good to mount the Conference presentations on the Web. Ian suggested to Marat to send to Tigran's attention an eversion of the brochure for mounting on the Web.
- b). Alan mentioned that he must work on the project handbook, as Charles had left.
- c) Communication was going normally. Marat informed that they had published 10 articles having connection with NMPLIS. Ian mentioned that all 10 publications should be published also on the Web. Alice Keefer suggested organising a group photo and to share that with participants.

Anna Maria promised to prepare an article. Veronica informed that they have mounted information about the project on Rezekne Higher Education Institution web page, and also published an article in the 'Latvian Archives'. Tigran suggested she send the bibliographic description of that article for mounting on the project Web page.

Monica gave an idea that later partners can translate the pages into local languages and make them accessible to larger community members.

Alan mentioned that he should prepare a resumé about the achievements so far. He would add it to the grantholders report.

Monica asked Alan if he was planning to submit a paper for IFLA 'Library Education' section. Anna Maria informed that for 2012 IFLA Conference will be held in Helsinki, and for 2013 in Singapore. Also there will be a pre-conference on education. Participants agreed that for Helsinki it will be good to prepare a joint article.

Elli asked if there were any plans for applying for other grants. Alan informed her that Georgia is planning for doctorate project in LIS. Elli informed that she is interested in the grant for doctorate on LIS. She explained the situation with doctorate degrees in different countries.

Ian explained in details research methodologies which exist in RGU.

Alan and Anna Maria commented and expressed views on this.

9 Closure.

a. Any other business. Anna Maria expressed that the VLE module should be probably shared between the participants, and the project could develop materials for sharing on digital libraries, digital curation etc, In USA they had developed a model WISE, and universities share the modules with each other. Their is an agreement between universities and fee sharing mechanisms are developed. This is a way for harmonising curricula and for recognition.

Alan asked a question. When you said shared, did it mean you can mount the courses on different VLE servers?

Ian replied that UNESCO tried to do this 20 years before, but that didn't' succeeded, maybe it was to early for that idea. But now we can try that, as technology is well developed.

Elli mentioned that for the current project everything which is produced should belong to all participants, and we will be able to do different mixes. In future, if we want to do a new project all materials belong to the Universities, and could be used easily. She promised to give some of programme handbooks and teaching materials which are prepared by her and belong to the University. Anna Maria will prepare a document for circulation as a first debate by 17th October.

b. It was decided to hold the next Consortium meeting on the second week of September, in Barcelona, on condition there was funding available.

Alan Hopkinson (Chairman)

Tigran Zargaryan (Secretary)