



Progress Report Template -

Project Name	MoDiP Digitisation Project, Arts Institute at Bournemouth
Project Website	www.aib.ac.uk/aboutus/museumofdesigninplastics/modipdigitisationproject.aspx
Report compiled by	Susan Lambert
Reporting period	Dates covered by report Oct 08-March 09
Section One: Summary	
<p>Reviewing practice was an important part of the project's set up and has led to considerable improvements in procedure and thus to the quality of the content created. However, this process has taken more time than anticipated and as a result not all targets have been met. We remain, nonetheless, reasonably confident that the project will be completed on time. The reasons for this are explained in section 4.</p> <p>The most important achievement of the project to date was not anticipated. After considerable consultation we found that a suitable object term list for 20th century and contemporary artefacts in everyday use was not in the public domain. We have therefore developed our own. This is work that will be made available on our website and hopefully others will find it of use. We have also made term lists for materials, production methods, condition statements, acquisition methods and locations, and constants for the recording of dates, and IPR and reproduction details.</p> <p>This development work will not only enable us to work faster in the future but also make a step change in the long-term value of our records.</p>	
Section Two: Activities and Progress	

Additional activities

The creation of term lists and constants are mentioned under section 1.

Work package 1 Project Management

The setting up of the project went well. The project plan was submitted by the end of October and agreed early in December. The Advisory Group and its way of working were established by the end of November. Project web pages were in place on the AIB's website and the project specific staffing in place by the end of December. Team meetings to tease out problems and check on progress take place weekly.

Work package 2 IPR

Please see section 9.

Work package 3 Digitisation

Our digitisation procedures were the subject of concern at the outset of the project. As a result we have changed our practice in the following ways: image size is now 3888 x 2590 pixels at 3.5 MB, all archive images are saved as Tiff files and all images are stored on the Modes Server. However we should have digitised 680 artefacts and we have only digitised 96. This is partly because of a change in the location where photography takes place (please see section 3) which has changed the order in which it is efficient for the work to be undertaken and partly because the person who leads on photography has been concentrating on the term lists (please see section 1). We are hopeful that the new facilities will enable us to work faster than anticipated thus enabling the project target in this area to be met.

Work package 4 Existing collection metadata

We have exceeded our target in this area. 710 as against 580 records have been improved. This is because of the re-ordering of the work mentioned as a result of infrastructure changes in section 3.

Work package 5 PHS loan metadata

Again our target has been exceeded. 205 written records against a target of 160 have been created.

Work package 6. Website specification

A paper on the requirements has been written, submitted to internal and external comment, and amended. It has been decided, with the approval of the JISC Project Manager, not to appoint a consultant but to appoint a web developer who will scope and specify a MoDiP website, including an accurate picture of costs with good, better and best scenarios and development of a demonstrator site, in return for payment of £5000. If funds are secured, the partnership will continue into phase 2: the building of the site. A shortlist of potential web developers has been drawn up and an appointment will be made in late April. A condition of the appointment will be the fulfillment of the specification within the life of the project.

Work package 7. Dissemination and sustainability.

A paper on on-line learning and teaching provision and potential partnerships has been written and discussion with the UKCME (please see section 3) and VADS is on-going. We understand we can submit all our learning packages to JORUM which we will do.

Section Three: Institutional & Project Partner Issues

Institutional

There have been no changes to the project management. There has, however, been a small change in terms of staffing. Our proposal was to appoint two people on overlapping 6 month contracts. Instead we have appointed one person on a nine month contract. This work is being supplemented by a PHS member providing documentation of the PHS collection at a rate of £5 an object. The same person is also providing consultation visits to check the quality of the records made by the MoDiP team.

There has also been a change in the management of the collection which has affected the project's workflow. New custom-built storage for the collection and better space in which to photograph the artefacts has unexpectedly been provided. As a result we have altered the order of aspects of the work. Instead of documenting and photographing the artefacts at more or less the same time, the artefacts are being taken from their current storage for documentation and then delivered to the new storage and photography area. As a result photography is happening later than we anticipated.

Partners

We have kept in regular contact with our project partners, the Plastics Historical Society (PHS) and the UK Centre for Materials Education (UKCME).

PHS

50% of the PHS collection is now with MoDiP and we expect to receive the rest of the collection shortly. Our PHS contact has made two visits to MoDiP during the course of the project and checked our records for quality. These visits have been important also for the development of the MoDiP team's expertise and our ability to document the collection to a high standard.

UKCME

The UKCME has recently undertaken a national profile for the discipline of Materials Science and Engineering in higher education, jointly with the Higher Education Academy (National Subject Profile for HE Programmes in Materials, 2008). This provided a definitive analysis of how, where and to whom Materials is taught at both undergraduate and taught postgraduate levels in UK universities – <http://www.materials.ac.uk/subject-profile/report.asp>. As a result we know that plastics as a subject is generally taught as a module within most Materials-related degree programmes – either focusing solely on the topic or linked to another topic, such as Plastics and Composites. Over recent years a number of specialist modules have evolved, for example (i) Sports Materials, and (ii) Environmental Materials.

Our contact confirms that the development of on-line learning packages on the themes of Plastics in Sport, as well as Plastics, Sustainable Design and Recycling, would be of use to academics in the design and delivery of relevant modular teaching in UK higher education, and would be of benefit to students in illuminating their learning of the subject. They are less interested in the learning packing on Plastics and creativity and we will review the value of this resource. In the next phase of work, UKCME will explore with the MoDiP Digitisation Project the development of these on-line learning packages. Academics and students from across the UK Materials community will be made available to pilot and evaluate the learning resources prior to their general release electronically.

UKCME has a Database of Resources with more than 2,500 on-line learning objects and learning materials freely available – <http://www.materials.ac.uk/search/result.asp>. The learning packages developed as part of the MoDiP Digitisation Project will be included within the Database of Resources, and a specific 'news' feature on the UKCME's website will highlight to users these resources. In this way, the on-line learning packages will be made available in general release format. In terms of targeted use, UKCME will also make available these on-line learning resources for a range of specific Plastics modules in a number of institutions, both from the HE and FE sector.

Our UKCME contact will visit us early in May to assess our collection and take these plans forward.

Section Four: Outputs and Deliverables

We are ahead against some targets and behind on others. Please see each work package in section 1 for details. Over all we are a little behind but against this is the achievement of the object term list.

At this stage we do not feel that we need to agree new targets but will review the situation once photography is underway. There are three factors which encourage us to believe we will be able to catch up:

- the Collections Manager has not managed to spend the allocated time on the project to date (please see section 5) and will be compensating for this over the quiet summer months.
- the term lists have increased the speed with which we are able to do the documentation.
- the new store/photography facilities will enable the photography to be done faster than we estimated.

Section Five: Outcomes and Lessons Learned

We have learnt two lessons both connected with time management:

- We did not allow enough time to do the work we found to be necessary to provide an appropriate infrastructure for the project after evaluation of our practices. In particular, the building of the term lists has been unexpectedly time-consuming.
- In planning the workflow we did not take account of the uneven flow of MoDiP's day to day work which is influenced by the needs of our students. The Collections Manager has only spent 30% rather than the predicted 50% of her time on the project to date. However term ends at the end of May and she will make up this time over the quiet summer months when she will not also be responding to students' needs.

Section Six: Dissemination and Communication

We have consulted four members of the AIB teaching staff about the needs of their students in respect of the resource. Their input affirmed our practices and will feed into the specification of the website. In respect of the latter we have also consulted four members of AIB IT and web staff. Consultation with students is envisaged as part of the website's development.

Both the MoDiPDiP Advisory Group and MoDiP's internal Steering Group have provided us with extremely useful advice and we have kept them informed of the project's progress.

We have communicated with UKCME (please see section 3 for details) and VADS about the dissemination of the resource.

There have been two articles about the project in the *Bournemouth Echo*, 24 September and 2 October 2008.

Section Seven: Risks, Issues and Challenges

No unexpected risks and none of the risks anticipated have become an issue except time creep. Please see section 5 for more detail. We are hopeful that it will not ultimately affect the achievement of the project's targets. It has been caused partly as a result of an unexpected project achievement: the development of an object term list as outlined in section 1.

We found the setting of standards at the outset of the project a considerable challenge. Many people did their best to help us and we read many articles also but it seemed at times as if there was an unbridgeable gulf between our knowledge and the technical language used. Please see section 8.

Section Eight: Standards - Technical and Processes, and Quality Assurance (QA)

Standards were a major issue at the outset of the project and we soon realised that in terms of image digitisation our practice needed changing. Resolving the standards to adopt was however much harder. The advice we received in person and from web papers approached the problem from what seemed to us an overly technical stand point. We would have found it helpful to have been able to consult a document presenting examples of things of different scale from, for example buildings to teeth, digitised with an explanation of the pros and cons of the different standards used, written in non-technical language. Our current practice is described under work package 3 in section 2.

There was discussion also about our use of Spectrum although once it was understood that we were in the main improving existing records rather than starting from scratch its use was sanctioned. Nonetheless, we remain confused that this part of our practice was questioned. Spectrum is the specified standard for accredited museums. Could it be that there is an issue of communication between the museum profession and those responsible for collections within the HE sector?

Please see section 3 for an explanation of how new storage and photography facilities have affected the project's workflow.

Each record will be checked for quality by someone not involved in its initial creation. The PHS consultant is playing an important role in this respect. The UKCME (please see section 3) will also test our learning materials.

Section Nine: Intellectual Property Rights

Report on progress in clearing any third-party rights and licences, with reference to work packages if relevant.

Our IPR procedures were the subject of concern at the outset of the project however our existing practice, once properly explained, was approved by the JISC Programme Officer.

We have requested copyright clearance for 608 more artefacts and received clearance for 584. The majority of the 400 objects on loan from the PHS do not require copyright clearance. We are therefore ahead of our target against this aspect of this objective.

We are also in the process of asking IPR owners who have in the past given permission for the use of images on the AIB website to extend the permission to other educational sites. We are behind with this target but the work is now well underway and we are hopeful that the necessary permissions will be in place well before the end of the project.

Section Ten: Collaboration and Support

What areas of work would you like to discuss with other projects?

It was disappointing that when we met at the beginning of the project the planned short informal presentations about each project were dropped. It would be good to hear from those working on the projects what they are doing and to share experiences of what has gone well and what has been difficult.

Is there anything that you would like advice and support on? Do you have any specific training needs, requests or suggestions for supporting workshops for the programme?

We would be grateful for support over developing the web functional specification and are attending training relevant to his need on 30 March.

Section Eleven: Exit and Sustainability Plan

Report on any changes or issues in the project's approach to its exit and sustainability plan.

There are no changes.

Section Twelve: Next Steps

In this section you should very briefly list the activities planned and/ other information of relevance for the next stage of the project.

This is a simple project. Now that all our procedures are approved and we have good term lists the priority is to continue with the documentation and make real headway with the digitisation. Progress will be monitored carefully. We also need to enter the documentation for the PHS objects on the system. In addition it is important that plans for developing learning materials from the resource are formalised.

Section Thirteen: Financial Statement

In this section you should detail the expenditure of the project so far. Against the budget headings you should set out the expenditure for the reporting period, noting any significant over/under spend giving reasons for this. You should also state the total expenditure to date against each budget heading. The table below is designed to help this reporting process. Additional budget headings may be added to fit an individual project's budget. Projects may find it more appropriate to use a spreadsheet to report financial information.

Total Grant	£79,732	Duration of project	1 Year
Reporting Period	1 October 2008 to 31 March 2009		

Budget Headings	Total budget allocated	Expenditure this reporting period	Total expenditure to date	Further information
Staff	55,717	21,226	21,226	New post appointment delayed by 2 months

				(Dec 08)
Consultants	9,500	3,000	3,000	Additional consultant employed to supplement new post
Travel & Subsistence	1,000	238	238	
Equipment	2,000	2,404	2,404	Computer and camera equipment
Dissemination activities	2,000	0	0	
Evaluation activities	1,000	0	0	
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	
Directly Allocated Estates costs	12,551	6,276	6,276	
Indirect Services Costs	74,697	37,378	37,378	

Checklist:

Before you return this report:

- Ensure that your project webpage on the JISC site is up to date and contains the correct information. Attach details of any required amendments to this report. Project webpages can be found from:
http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_digitisation/projects.aspx
- If there have been any changes to the original project plan and/or work packages, ensure that amended copies of the relevant sections of your project plan are attached to this report.