

### What type of Learning Objects does your repository have records of?

All kinds	64.3 %
Text documents (URLs, HTML, pdf, etc.)	42.9 %
Video clips	21.4 %
Photos	28.6 %
Graphics	14.3 %

### Other types of content included / Comments:

- Streaming video  
Links to good websites and content  
Interactive online exercises
- All DLR held in the repository have support materials which demonstrate how the resource can be used to support the curriculum. A single object such as a photo or video clip would not be eligible however these may form part of a resource.
- Quaderns virtuals (virtual notebooks. See [http://clic.xtec.cat/qv\\_web/en/index.htm](http://clic.xtec.cat/qv_web/en/index.htm))
- - events  
- personal and institutional contact information
- The limitation is learning objects' aggregation level ("too big for reuse")
- We have learning resources and learning assets (small chunks)
- non-digital materials (like wall-maps, actual textbooks etc),  
access advise regarding WEB-based on-line materials,  
only for educational materials available for the Danish educational system
- The pdf and text could be used only as supplementary materials (like guidelines for use)  
devoted to teachers.  
The idea is to promote the use of interactive multimedia content (LOs) non single asset
- mp3
- We do not host content
- assessment 4%  
course 15%  
drill and practice 20%  
guide 6%  
lesson plan 18%  
presentation 30%

### Does your repository include multi-lingual resources?

Yes	71.4 %
No	28.6 %

### What is the total number of resources in your repository?

- 85392 (3.12.2007)
  - 1,500 resources  
7,500 links to resources
  - 1000s ?
  - 6000
  - Don't have a figure yet.
  - cca 6000
  - Links to 1290 LOs, incl. learning assets
  - 48 500 resources and assets hosted in 7 repositories.
  - as of 5th December 2007:  
publishers: 16.000  
teachers: 1.200  
assets (pictures): 3.500
  - Around 500.
- The project is in a test phase of two years.
- 6000 approximately
  - 4000+
  - Approximately 3000 from Estonian learning portal + 300 from LeMill
  - 5500

### How many of these resources have been evaluated?

- They have all been checked in quality, technical application and copyright issues as far as possible, but there is no standard evaluation procedure.
- Teachers have evaluated all the content provided. These teachers are paid to provide the review and categories.
- About 5%? undergo rigorous checks, the others are checked randomly for compliance to the repository guidelines.
- They plan to evaluate them
- We have several levels of evaluation.  
Around 4000 resources were checked at the basic level (correctness check of metadata).
- All of them
- Some may have been evaluated by the Ministries of Education, who have contributed to the repositories that are part of the federation. We do not have details on this.
- publishers: contractual agreement on terms, conditions and responsibilities,

## Extracts from the Quality Assurance survey

teacher produced materials: individual screening for copyright and metadata quality,

- none. It is up to the teacher to choose and evaluate the LOs, as it happens within the textbook market. In Italy there is no external control on the quality of the educational material. The teachers are free to choose what they want, the only constraint is that the material must be curriculum compliant.
- almost all
- All
- 100%
- All

## Comments:

- Once a content provider is a 'member' of Curriculum online and are an approved provider they are permitted to self certify resources. These are checked randomly or come to our attention through complaints from other providers.  
To properly evaluate all the products it would take about 6 full time evaluators.
- We provided framework for quality evaluation of materials described in  
  
Lokar, Matija, Jakončič-Faganel, Janja: Quality of electronic materials for math teaching, Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on the Teaching of Mathematics at the Undergraduate Level / Turkish Mathematical Society. - Istanbul : John Wiley & Sons, [2006]  
  
This framework is currently in implementation phase by subject advisors
- From Estonian learning portal [www.koolielu.ee](http://www.koolielu.ee) only the best resources are selected and metadata records are created. LOM from LeMill is transferred automatically to Estonian LOR. Transaction script is checking some quality criteria e.g. is the content published, does it have a cover image, ?

**What kind of policies does your repository apply?**

Intellectual property policy	71.4 %
Cultural diversity policy	21.4 %
Editorial policy	71.4 %
Accessibility policy	57.1 %
Interoperability standards	71.4 %
No policies	0.0 %

## Comments:

(if any of your guidelines/policies are publicly available, please provide URLs)

- Editorial policy is adhered to through work flow and checks - guideline is not publicly available. The Accessibility policy is at the reviewer (teacher) level where they provide details of the resource - if the content is created it must meet WAI-AA guideline.  
  
Currently investigating policies on IP and Interoperability.
- <http://register.curriculumonline.gov.uk/page.php?id=42>

## Extracts from the Quality Assurance survey

## Guidelines for eligibility

- <http://educasources.education.fr/AproposEduca.asp>  
<http://educasources.education.fr/AproposSites.asp>
- [http://www.eapc.cat/virtual/guies/manual\\_estil.pdf](http://www.eapc.cat/virtual/guies/manual_estil.pdf)  
(in Catalan)
- The judgment of the suitability of materials is made by editors (subject teachers).
- These policies are mainly implemented by Terms of Reference for LOs purchase / creation / evaluation. Template for LOs expert evaluation is available (in Lithuanian only)  
[http://www.emokykla.lt/lt.php/dokumentai/kiti\\_dokumentai/53](http://www.emokykla.lt/lt.php/dokumentai/kiti_dokumentai/53)
- Calibrate content is required to have a Creative Commons license. Partners are using LOM based Application Profile provided by EUN. As for the cultural diversity, contributing repositories have been asked to contribute resources that can be used cross border and linguistic barriers.
- IEEE LOM is the only implemented policy for interoperability
- regarding the accessibility policy it had been added in the LOM schema a field allowing to specify whether the Lo are accessible or not to disable people taking in account the W3C Accessibility guidelines

**Is your repository networked with other repositories?**

Yes	71.4 %
No	28.6 %

## Comments:

- We have a cooperation with Tiroler Bildungsservice using the repository for Primary Schools together:  
<http://content.tibs.at/vs/index.php?menuNo=133>
- Currently no. But as a member of MELT we aim to achieve this in 2008.
- Yes in respect to the fact that external partners can use a proprietary web service to search the repository. There were plans to redevelop this to use open standards and provide a wide networkable interface.
- By the means of another service called Murene - <http://murene.cndp.fr/>  
  
Murene is a federated search engine including different educational metadata databases, for the primary and secondary school level.
- We plan to set up a network of schools with the same aims and interests within the Spanish, South America and some European countries.
- Connected to LRE and Melt.  
So far, one direction only (our repository is accessible from the federation).
- Lithuanian LOM repository is federated member of EUN Learning Resource Exchange
- We are a federation of repositories.
- Yet, linking to providers included in metadata records

- With Spindeln, the Swedish brokerage system for the Federated search
- Connected to LRE federation supporting OAI-MHP
- It harvests minor collections.

### Which metadata profile is implemented in your repository?

IEEE LOM	78.6 %
SCORM	0.0 %
UK LOM Core	0.0 %
Dublin Core	7.1 %
MARC21	0.0 %
<b>Not answered</b>	<b>14.3 %</b>

Other scheme / Comments:

- We have our own metadata scheme.  
The ministry of education in Austria has developed its own scheme:  
[http://www.bildung.at/static/bmbwk/de/elearning/metadatenmodellversion1\\_3\\_2.pdf](http://www.bildung.at/static/bmbwk/de/elearning/metadatenmodellversion1_3_2.pdf)  
This scheme is being adapted, but we don't have a final version yet...
- Working as part of MELT project to enrich all resources with IEEE LOM.
- It is an application profile of IEEE LOM.
- We use the French national application profile : LOMFR
- Our own metadata format (Trubar).  
  
It is semiautomatically converted to LRE LOM for federated search and OAI-PMH harvesting.
- It is planning to approve Lithuanian IEEE LOM Application Profile based on LRE AP v3.0
- The Application Profile is being used in Calibrate and in the MELT project. Several MoEs have adopted the AP also.
- Danish application profile is a subset of IEEE LOM
- The LOM application profile is also SCORM compliant and includes the DOI as the recommended identifier for the LOs in order to foster interoperability with other platforms and exploit the peculiar advantages of DOI in terms of persistency and online action ability
- Actually, based on IEEE LOM we developed our own metadata profile
- It's LRE LOM application profile.

**Can your repository import metadata from any XML schema?**

Yes - implies mapping system between schemas is available

No - implies only handling of specific schema, please indicate which

Fill in any other relevant comments.

- No, we have our own old scheme.
- No.
- No - all metadata conforms to the application profile of IEEE LOM.
- Metadata is produced by a relational database and then converted to the LOM or LOMFR formats. XML schemas are only used to validate the conversion.
- Yes, it is part of our present development, but cannot give you details yet.
- No.  
We can import data in Trubar format.
- Only LOM-compliant XML import / export schemes are available
- Yes - implies mapping system between schemas is available.
- Manual mapping necessary (XSLT)
- Yes
- yes
- No
- NO  
We have mass upload functionality from tab separated text file
- No,

**Does your repository include a metatagging tool?**

Yes	71.4 %
No	28.6 %

If yes, please indicate URL.

Fill in any other comments.

- Resources have metadata added when they are uploaded. There is a tool used to create this data. But this is not creating standard LOM.
- [http://www.curriculumonline.gov.uk/SupplierCentre/Tagging\\_Tool.htm](http://www.curriculumonline.gov.uk/SupplierCentre/Tagging_Tool.htm)
- Educasources metatagging tool needs an authentication.  
  
CNDP has also worked in the production of a public metadata editor and converter called Educameta : <http://www.educameta.cndp.fr/>
- It will, but it's not ready yet (mid 2008).

- <http://sio.edus.si/katalogi/input1.htm>  
An online form for metadata creation (in three levels: resource registration, detailed description, complete description).
- It is planning to implement metadata tagging in future
- Calibrate users can upload resources through LeMill (lemill.net), certain formats are not accepted (.doc, .ppt). Users can add own keywords to resources that are saved in collections of favourites.
- Via URL and protected LOGIN,  
[https://materialeplatform.emu.dk/materialer/private\\_frontpage.do](https://materialeplatform.emu.dk/materialer/private_frontpage.do)
- For the Editors (teachers and librarians) we have tool but only available through login.

### What type of search options does your repository offer?

Keyword and free text	100.0 %
Thesaurus	35.7 %
Metadata	85.7 %
Classifications	92.9 %
Questions	7.1 %
Federated	14.3 %

#### Comments:

- Scoilnet can be searched through a free text search function. There is also a classification search which uses the age, subject and material types.
- Partial metadata search - based upon Special Educational Needs, Evaluations or priced/free filters.
- Advanced search interface  
<http://educasources.education.fr/RechAvanc.asp?>
- <http://sio.edus.si/katalogi/search.htm>
- There is (additional) browsing possibility (by subjects)

### How is information about content communicated to the user and stakeholders?

Newsletters	42.9 %
Events and news in the interface	78.6 %
Newsgroup	0.0 %
<b>Not answered</b>	21.4 %

#### Comments:

- Fortnightly newsletter to teachers (primary and post-primary).  
Events are available in local education centres.  
The Interface highlights new resources and groups them for ease of use.
- The main communication actions are made by email. Some presentations are made during

## Extracts from the Quality Assurance survey

educational forums.

- Lists of additions in last (day, week, month)  
<http://sio.edus.si/bin/trubar/search.exe/sio?mode=all&max=20&template=seznam.tmt&new=1n>  
<http://sio.edus.si/bin/trubar/search.exe/sio?mode=all&max=20&template=seznam.tmt&new=7n>
- It is planned to provide additional Newsletters and RSS feed services through educational portal
- RSS about to come this year (2007)
- None. We plan a RSS feed in the next version.
- No communication at the moment.
- RSS

**Is any special information (metadata profiles, other projects, etc.) or training offered by the LOR?**

Yes	64.3 %
No	35.7 %

Comments:

- There is a module carried in an online ICT course for teachers.
- Training is offered to new librarians in our network that want to participate in the selection and cataloguing of resources. There are 2 or 3 training sessions per year.
- Online help for using and metatagging  
<http://www.educa.fmf.uni-lj.si/trubar/>  
<http://sio.edus.si/trubar.htm>
- Metadata profiles only. All additional information (incl. training possibilities) are available through portal
- Pilot schools within the project have received training in each country and by coming together as a group in a summer school.
- on-line and telephone support for providers
- The overall project provided a set specific training course for teachers aimed at
  - illustrate the features of the platform
  - train on the use of digital content in the class
  - support the teachers during the experimentation phase
- We hope to create a user tutorial and a teachers' guide
- [utdanning.no/wiki](http://utdanning.no/wiki)

## QUALITY ASSURANCE PROVIDED BEFORE INCLUSION IN THE REPOSITORY

During LO development, which type of quality assurance strategies does your LOR propose to potential LO authors?

List of quality criteria	57.1 %
Evaluation forms	21.4 %
Instructional design method	14.3 %
Media principles	14.3 %
Specialized editors*	7.1 %
Peer review process	14.3 %
End-user review or validation	28.6 %
Production tools	14.3 %
<b>Not answered</b>	21.4 %

Comments:

(if publicly available, provide link to editors)

- In projects where content is produced there is always evaluation at the peer-peer level or as external evaluation. In the development of content there are guidelines.
- None
- List of quality criteria and evaluation model is published in:  
Dinevski, Jakončič-Faganel, Lokar: Model ocenjevanja kakovosti elektronskih učnih gradiv (A model for quality assessment of electronic learning material) Organizacija, ISSN 1318-5454. Vol. 39, 2006 ; no. 8. - P. 498-503.
- MS Power Point templates to create lesson plans / ideas are used. CALIBRATE LeMill learning toolbox is localised to create / reuse LOs, methodical guidelines will be available till the end of 2007
- None, as we are not creating any content, but federating existing content.
- 20: no advice on content production.
- Some of the authors are using eXe tool for SCORM compliant content creation and LeMill for creating content in collaboration.

**Which of the following dimensions are covered/considered by your LO design and production quality criteria?**

Pedagogical	64.3 %
Ergonomical (interface presentation and navigation)	57.1 %
Cultural	42.9 %
Accessibility	50.0 %
Technical (e.g. interoperability)	50.0 %
<b>Not answered</b>	<b>28.6 %</b>

Comments:

- In projects where there is production of resources the quality criteria would always include pedagogical, ergonomical and accessibility.  
There are currently some cultural guidelines for content to be available in Irish (as Gaeilge).
- NO production quality criteria are used currently. We have developed a set of quality principles to guide suppliers which have not been integrated into the repository yet.  
[http://partners.becta.org.uk/index.php?section=sa&catcode=\\_sa\\_cs\\_cf\\_03](http://partners.becta.org.uk/index.php?section=sa&catcode=_sa_cs_cf_03)
- Technical evaluation criteria to be reviewed
- We encourage contributing repositories to provide resources that have the potential to be used in different countries, we call them "travel well" resources.
- like 20
- All the aspect are considered and defined by each content provider under their autonomous decision.
- LO design is not managed by LOR holders. It's based on authors (teachers) needs.

## QUALITY ASSURANCE PROVIDED DURING INCLUSION IN THE REPOSITORY

### Is membership obligatory to search your repository?

Yes	14.3 %
No	85.7 %

#### Comments:

- Everybody can use the repository. The resources are also available.
- Although Calibrate is closed to about 80 schools at present, Calibrate content will be made available in 2008 publicly accessible Learning Resource Exchange for schools.
- The content providers must apply as certified supplier for the platform. In order to become supplier there is formal procedure to be followed.

### Is membership obligatory to contribute content to your repository?

Yes	57.1 %
No	42.9 %

#### If yes, what are the criteria for becoming a member?:

- Currently you can upload photos to the site but you have to be a member.  
Only contracted teachers can upload content to site.
- Content providers must submit one product to undergo checks for eligibility. Their organisation also undergoes financial checks.
- To belong to the CNDP network composed of librarians and teachers distributed in all parts of the country.
- It will be obligatory in the new version. Everybody will be able to become a member (but there will be different levels of membership).
- Social metadata tools are available only for approved members (single sign on authentication is made through portal)
- Currently you need to be a member of Calibrate. Content is also being contributed by Associate Partners as long as they can provide content with CC license.
- registration of identity.  
Accept of responsibilities for professional providers.  
Accept of conditions for non-professionals.
- Anyone may suggest content to the review process
- At the moment membership of LOR is limited. Only the administrator of the LOR can upload the new LOM information.

**How is content accepted?**

Any content is accepted	21.4 %
Only validated content is accepted	78.6 %
Following submission to an internal review committee	21.4 %

## Other criteria / Comments:

- Teachers are paid to find, evaluate and categorise content for inclusion on the site.
- Only approved content providers can upload content. This is checked periodically for eligibility.
- Content is considered as validated if it is produced by educational institutions or by the network members.
- Inappropriate materials are removed in periodical checks.
- Any content Ministries propose is accepted, as long as it has a CC license.
- Validation for non-professionals e.g. teachers,  
Contractual agreement for professionals assuming that they validate themselves.
- We have 8 editors (teachers and librarians) and one coordinator
- Content and metadata is created by teachers  
Content is previewed accepted by subject moderators  
Metadata is previewed by LOM expert  
LOR administrator uploads the content to LOR.

**Does the repository have a built in Digital Rights Management system?**

Yes	7.1 %
No	92.9 %

## Comments:

- The Federation is capable of supporting a variety of DRM approaches. DRM may be applied in the Learning Resource Exchange (LRE) in 2008. No final decision has yet been taken on this.
- There is DRM intended as licence management not as technical protection measure. The other protection of piracy is that the LOs are not downloadable.
- For this reason we only store LOM about LO that have some copy left.

### Does the repository permit to apply a Creative Commons license?

Yes	78.6 %
No	21.4 %

#### Comments:

- On ImageBank area you can select a creative Commons licence.
- As part of tagging
- It is encouraged.
- It is planned to implement DRM based on Creative Commons licences
- The majority of MoEs seem to be opting for a non-commercial variety of CC licenses, which is causing some problems when it comes to adaptation of resources by end-users and for LeMill.
- included as metadata
- We stimulate the use of the CC license, but only a very few have licenses at the moment
- Licensing system is based on CC. Most of the content has license attribution share alike non-commercial CC: BY-NC-SA

### In terms of assuring metadata correctness and pertinence, what type of assistance is available in your repository?

Metadata reference guide for different types of content	50.0 %
Automatic metadata	21.4 %
Experts verifying metadata	71.4 %
Metadata mapping to other profiles	7.1 %
<b>Not answered</b>	14.3 %

#### Comments:

- In the MELT project Metadata has been verified by experts. Otherwise no.
- The metadata of this repository is a real value, because it is always controlled.
- Metadata mapping to other profiles is performed for LRE.
- As it is a federation, it the contributing members who apply the metadata. They might have a variety of approaches on this. EUN provides support on how to apply the LRE application profile.
- verification only for non-professionals
- We as Association supported content providers in the creation of the metadata compliant with the LOM/SCORM schema and on the use of DOI
- The first set of metadata was collected in Excel spreadsheet

### After using content, what type of 'evaluation' does your repository permit?

## Extracts from the Quality Assurance survey

Recommendations, Suggestions and/or Annotations can be added to the record	14.3 %
Star rating (or similar, e.g. 5 stars = best; 0 = not recommended)	14.3 %
Built-in review/evaluation forms	21.4 %
Social bookmarking	0.0 %
Tag clouds	0.0 %
Peer trust mechanisms	0.0 %
Collaborative tagging	0.0 %
<b>Not answered</b>	71.4 %

## Comments:

- We are not offering feedback to content by now.
- We would like to propose collaborative tagging functionalities and star rating in a next future.
- Star rating will be implemented in the new version.
- Users comments and star rating are under implementation
- The last four here will be available in the MELT repository in 2008, currently in beta.  
Our rating is on a scale of 1-5 on "usefulness" of the resource.
- none
- We are redesigning the "evaluation" from users
- We hope to include a Star rating system ++
- None of them at the moment.

**What type of reusability data does your repository provide for included content?**

Number of downloads	14.3 %
Numbers of views/visitors	50.0 %
Number of known reuses	0.0 %
Evaluations	35.7 %
<b>Not answered</b>	35.7 %

## Comments:

- We track the number of visits to each resource.
- 
- Number of downloads and views is recorded but is not publicly available.
- Ratings with comments are made available.
- nothing for end-users,  
internally registration of downloads and visits.
- Statistics are available for the overall use of the service
- None of them at the moment.

**What is the most frequent type of reuse of content from your repository?**

As is	42.9 %
By de- and re-composition (Lego model)	0.0 %
Adaption to fit a specific context	0.0 %
As an example	0.0 %
Don't know	57.1 %

## Comments:

- The content is used in the format that it is provided on the site.
- Once content is obtained we don't know how it is used
- There is no relevant information collected at the moment
- We will have a final evaluation report on how teachers have been using Calibrate in February 2008. The LOR itself does not have this information.
- We don't have information about that

## ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

What type of "technical quality control" does your repository include?

Link check	64.3 %
Malware check of uploaded files (virus, spyware...)	7.1 %
File size optimization (e.g. image reduction in ppts etc.)	0.0 %
Plagiarism check of uploaded texts	0.0 %
<b>Not answered</b>	<b>28.6 %</b>

Fill in any type of quality criteria we didn't include in this questionnaire:

- - pedagogical
- LO aggregation (granularity) level  
Pedagogical decontextualisation level  
LO internationalisation level  
LO architecture is layered in order to separate data, presentation and application logics  
Personalization
- In the future (MELT portal), we will use more social mechanisms to promote the learning material that teachers have bookmarked and collaboratively tagged. We will also promote the "travel well" concept, on which we will make some further evaluation work in the future.
- We need to sort out links that could be dangerous for kids (violence, pornography ++)