

JISC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Project Document Cover Sheet

CD-LOR Progress Report 2, to 31 July 2006

Project

Project Acronym	CD-LOR	Project ID	
Project Title	Community Dimensions of Learning Object Repositories		
Start Date	1 June 2005	End Date	31 May 2007
Lead Institution	Glasgow Caledonian University (previously University of Dundee)		
Project Director	Prof. Allison Littlejohn		
Project Manager & contact details	Colin Milligan Centre for Academic Practice and Learning Enhancement University of Strathclyde, 50 George Street, Glasgow G1 1QE Tel.: +44 (0)141 548 4573 Fax: +44 (0)141 553 2053 E-mail: colin.milligan@gstrath.ac.uk		
Partner Institutions	University of Strathclyde and Intrallect Ltd.		
Project Web URL	http://www.academy.gcal.ac.uk/cd-lor/		
Programme Name (and number)	Digital Repositories (03/05)		
Programme Manager	Neil Jacobs		

Document

Document Title	Progress Report		
Reporting Period	1 Feb. to 31 July 2006		
Author(s) & project role	Sarah Currier, Colin Milligan, Project Manager,.		
Date	091006	Filename	CDLOR_Progress_Report_31Jul2006_v1p0_public.doc
URL	http://www.academy.gcal.ac.uk/cd-lor/progressreport310706.pdf		
Access	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General dissemination	

Document History

Version	Date	Comments
v0.1	23 July 06	First draft for CD-LOR Team feedback. Not entirely complete.
v0.2	31 July 06	Incorporating AM's comments and feedback; needs Intrallect dissemination activities and list of relationships with other projects.
v0.3	2 August 06	Incorporating PD's dissemination and remainder of stuff; submitted to Neil Jacobs 2 August 2006.
V0.4	18 August 06	Responding to Neil Jacobs' comments.
V1.0	09 October 06	Final version prepared, public version created

JISC Progress Report Template

Overview of Project

NB: There are a number of changes to the CD-LOR project noted in this report. Therefore v2.0 of the CD-LOR Project Plan is under development that will encompass and detail further these changes; it is not complete at the time of writing this Progress Report.

1. Grant Statement

In general CD-LOR is being conducted under the terms agreed with JISC in the letter of grant and the JISC Terms and Conditions, with the following exception: as of 1 June 2006, the CD-LOR Project Director and as of 1 July 2006 the Research Fellow moved from the University of Dundee to Glasgow Caledonian University. The two universities agreed that the funding for CD-LOR should move with them, hence the change of lead institution to Glasgow Caledonian. Both of the other partners are happy with this arrangement and a new Consortium Agreement is in the process of being drawn up and signed at the time of writing, with JISC agreement.

2. Aims and Objectives

While the overall aims of the project have not changed, there have been changes to three of the objectives listed in the Project Plan, as follows:

Objective 1 stated that CD-LOR would create a typology of learning communities, mapping their characteristics in relation to their use (or potential use) of LO repositories. The project team found that the landscape of learning communities and the contexts within which repositories may be used by them was too complex to be represented by a simple typology. Therefore a number of dimensions of learning communities and repository contexts were identified instead; it is these that are being mapped to use of repositories.

Objective 5 stated that CD-LOR would produce recommendations for institutional managers on wider policy, strategy, systems and workflow issues; *Objective 6* stated that CD-LOR would develop institution-wide use cases linking LO repositories to wider information management processes. These objectives and the related workpackages and deliverables were dropped, with the agreement of the Steering Group and JISC, when it was found that the current situation regarding strategy and policy around LORs in institutions is too heterogeneous and underdeveloped to allow robust investigation with the resources available.

3. Overall Approach

The *Overall Approach and Methodology* section of the CD-LOR Project Plan is still applicable, with the following exception:

“Further desk research and consultation will be carried out by CD-LOR in parallel to this work, to provide wider and deeper context, reviewing current institutional policy and strategy relevant to LO repositories, e.g. institution-wide knowledge management strategies, as well as investigating personal resource management strategies of individual stakeholders within institutions.”—CD-LOR Project Plan, p.4.

As noted above in **Section 2**, CD-LOR has dropped investigation of institutional policy and strategy (including development of institution-wide use cases) as related to LORs.

It is also worth noting that the project has adopted a much more explicit and clear emphasis on eliciting direct input at each stage from end users (and potential end users) of LORs, and on prioritising work that is directly relevant to the support of learning communities as noted in **Deliverable 1: Typology Report**. Both of these issues have already made an impact on the

development of the user survey, and particularly on the prioritisation and selection of use cases for implementation.

4. Project Outputs

Since the last Progress Report, the following progress has been made with project outputs. Outputs are listed by Workpackage number:

Work Package	Output	Due date	Status
WP1.2	Project Plan	31.07.05	This output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, amendments have been made since as noted elsewhere in this current Progress Report and an update document has been appended. This will be made available on the new project website.
WP1.3	Consortium Agreement	30.06.05	This output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, the lead institution has since changed from University of Dundee to Glasgow Caledonian University and a new Consortium Agreement is presently being negotiated. It is anticipated that this will be completed and signed by 15 September 2006.
WP1.5	Project Researcher in post	30.08.05	This output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, the Project Researcher has been appointed to a new post at the new lead institution, Glasgow Caledonian University (starting 1 July 2006), where she will continue in her role with CD-LOR.
WP1.6	Project Manager in post	1.08.05	This output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, the current Project Manager has resigned effective 18 August 2006; a new Project Manager is being recruited at Strathclyde University.
WP1.7	Project website; JISC web page	None noted in plan.	This output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, with the change of lead institution to Glasgow Caledonian University, a new project website will be created and hosted on a server there. This is under way, and it is anticipated that the new website will be available by the end of August 2006. In the meantime the website hosted at University of Dundee will remain in place. The new website URL will be: http://www.academy.gcal.ac.uk/cd-lor/
WP3.1	Final Typology Report	28.02.06	Draft report was discussed and final approach decided on at Steering Group Meeting, 6.02.06. The final report was completed 5.04.06 and disseminated widely. Available at: http://www.ic-learning.dundee.ac.uk/projects/CD-LOR/CDLORdeliverable1_learningcommunitiesreport.doc (NB: This URL will change when the new website is up).
WP3.2	Use cases	28.02.06	Use cases were collected from project partners during Feb. 2006. The full list of use cases is available at: http://www.ic-learning.dundee.ac.uk/projects/CD-LOR/CD-LOR-scenarios-final.doc (NB: This URL will change when the new website is up).
WP4.1	Prioritise use cases	31.03.06	Partners were asked to prioritise the use cases and a meeting was held looking at the results of this exercise, identifying not only the most popular use cases, but which ones were the closest fit to the remit of the project. Partners were then asked to survey users of their repositories to ascertain which use cases users prioritised. Once the highest priority use cases were identified from both of these exercises, partners were

			asked which of these they would commit to implementing, testing and evaluating. A document summarising this process and the chosen use cases, which are now under development, is attached as Appendix B: Use Cases.
WP4.2-4.5			These remaining Workpackages are under way as per the Project Plan.
WP5.1	Institutional Strategy and Policy Review Report	30.04.06	This Workpackage has been dropped as noted above in Sections 2 and 3 .
WP5.2	Personal Resource Management Strategies Report.	30.04.06	<p>CD-LOR worked in collaboration with RepoMMan to re-purpose their survey of researchers in order to elicit resource management strategies of teaching and learning materials developers. The survey was carried out and a final draft report on it, incorporating results from similar studies, has been completed and distributed to the Steering Group for feedback. Comments from the Steering Group are currently being incorporated into the final version, which will be publicly released and widely disseminated by 11 August 2006.</p> <p>In addition, CD-LOR carried out a small number of interviews with repository users, which resulted in an internal project report designed to inform remaining project work and publications. An executive summary of this has been released separately and made available on the project website. An executive summary of the interview report will be made available on the new project website.</p>
WP5.3	Policy and strategy recommendations for institutions on setting up LO repositories	31.01.07	This Workpackage has been dropped as noted above in Sections 2 and 3 .
WP5.4	Institutional use cases	31.01.07	This Workpackage has been dropped as noted above in Sections 2 and 3 .
WP6.1	Draft Structured Guidelines.		Current work will be the foundation of these guidelines.
Remainder of WP6			Begins 2007.

5. Project Outcomes

See **Section 4** above for detailed summary of progress on project outputs.

In addition, two outcomes of interest have been noted through the general development of CD-LOR so far. These are:

1. The extent to which it is the “curators” of repositories (repository developers and managers, learning technology enthusiasts, etc.) that still drive decisions about which new developments and innovations on LORs are implemented and tested. The CD-LOR team observed that this was happening within the project and made a concerted effort within the resources available to bring the focus back to (a) learning communities in general and developments that would support these (based on the findings of Deliverable 1: Report) and (b) directly involving actual end users of LORs in making decisions about implementation and testing of new features and services.

2. While CD-LOR hoped to do a fairly “quick and dirty” review of institutional strategy and policy related to LORs to provide a wider context to the other work of the project, this turned out to be clearly a much bigger job than was possible with the resources available. There are very few institutional documents that even mention LORs and those that do exist are extremely varied in which aspects of LORs they touch on, etc. A wide range of institutions would need to be surveyed, alongside possibly interviews with a large number of different institutional stakeholders. The project team would very much like to see this taken up as a specific area for a JISC study (i.e. specifically in the area of LORs, looking at their place in teaching & learning strategies, information/library strategy and policy, staff development, and e-learning and IT support).

6. Stakeholder Analysis

For CD-LOR, stakeholders have been represented primarily by the project Steering Group and representatives of the Associate and Collaborative Partners. However, it became clear during the recent six-month period that actual and potential end users of LORs, i.e. teachers, and in some cases students, should be considered as central stakeholders to CD-LOR’s remit, and effort has been put into engaging them directly in the project, with contacts made via the Steering Group and Partner reps. Institutional stakeholders (e.g. institutional managers, library managers) have become less of a priority, with the institutional Workpackages and Deliverables being dropped due to the complexity of the task and the need to concentrate on learning communities (see above under **Sections 2 and 3**).

Each stakeholder identified in the Project Plan is listed below with details of contact to date.

Stakeholder	Contact	Importance
Wider HE/FE e-learning community	CD-LOR has attended and presented at a number of events; see below under Section 19: Dissemination Plan .	High
JISC	CD-LOR has ensured that the project’s work is visible to the wider Programme and the wider JISC development community, through contributing use cases and other project outputs to the Programme wiki, and disseminating project outputs through the usual channels (mainly e-mail lists).	High
Project partners (Universities of Dundee and Strathclyde)	<p><i>Strathclyde:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning communities expert Christine Sinclair, based at the Centre for Academic Practice and Learning Enhancement, continues to take part in the CD-LOR Steering Group ensuring embedding of the project’s work into the University’s staff development work; - Educational consultant David Nicol, based at CAPLE, has worked with the project on developing Deliverable 1. - Informal links have continued with the University’s VLE Team and Institutional Repository team; it is hoped that this relationship may also result in Strathclyde signing up to Jorum. - CD-LOR presented on 2nd March 2006 at a Strathclyde Learning Enhancement Network event on Teaching and Learning Through Technology. 	High

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CD-LOR was discussed informally at a meeting between the Vice-Principal and CAPLE. - The CD-LOR survey distributed via university intranet to all academics and learning technologists. <p><i>Dundee:</i> The project has now moved from Dundee University.</p> <p><i>Glasgow Caledonian University:</i> The appointment of the Project Director to a Chair in Learning Technology, and her remit to set up and direct the new Caledonian Academy, means that CD-LOR will have a high profile in this university. Project Associate Partner Spoken Word Services is also based at Glasgow Caledonian and has already been working closely with the project.</p>	
Project partners (Intrallect Ltd.)	The technical development phase of the project has now started, with Intrallect working closely with the partners to collect, prioritise and develop use cases, which has enhanced their relationship with these particular customers. This has also informed wider developments in the company, and the ongoing good reputation of CD-LOR continues to give Intrallect positive publicity.	High
Project Associate and Collaborative Partners	<p>In the past six months the Project Associate and Collaborative Partners have enthusiastically taken part in CD-LOR in a number of ways. They were involved in development of Deliverable 1: Typology Report via email discussion and the Steering Group meeting on the Report held on Feb. 6th 2006. They then provided end users for interviews (one Associate Partner, Spoken Word Services, was commissioned to carry out interviews themselves), and distributed the CD-LOR survey to their users. Gathering and submitting use cases was an important task from the project's point of view and all partners took part in this process, including attending a meeting, distributing a prioritisation survey to their users, and committing to development of a one or more use cases. Informal feedback indicated that all of these activities were considered to be of value to the partners' own repository initiatives.</p> <p>Several partners requested CD-LOR's presence or presentation at their own events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - University of Ireland Galway/NDLR (Ireland) (Associate Partners) invited the Project Manager to speak at the launch workshop of the NDLR on 21 Feb. 2006; - WM-Share project (Collaborative 	High

	<p>Partner) invited attendance of team members at their dissemination conference on 18 May 2006; the Project Manager attended and took part in a panel discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UCEL (Collaborative Partner) invited the Project Manager to be a keynote speaker at the Cambridge Collaborative e-Learning Symposium 22-23 June 2006; - Jorum (Associate Partner) requested the Project Manager to sit on their Enhancement Committee as an e-learning community/expert member; she attended the first meeting on 10 July 2006. 	
Institutional managers	While the institutional aspects of CD-LOR have been dropped, it is anticipated that some institutional managers will still be made aware of the project's work through general dissemination activities: see below under Section 19: Dissemination Plan .	Low (was previously High).
Library managers and staff in UK HE and FE	While the institutional aspects of CD-LOR (including library context and library managers as stakeholders) have been dropped, it is anticipated that some library managers and staff will still be made aware of the projects work through general dissemination activities: see below under Section 19: Dissemination Plan .	Low (was previously Medium).
Wider repositories community (e.g. institutional repositories; research data repositories, etc.)	Some interaction with mixed projects Rights and Rewards; RepoMMan; see below under Section 11: Project Partners .	Medium
Software development community	No contact yet.	Medium
Technical standards development community	No use cases developed yet.	Low
End users of LORs	End users have been engaged through interviews, a survey, and through requesting their help with prioritising use cases for development.	High

7. Risk Analysis

Problem	Mitigating actions
1. Unanticipated move of 2 team members and lead institution from University of Dundee to Glasgow Caledonian University.	Close and open communication between all partners and JISC is ensuring a smooth transition with minimal disruption, which is nearly complete.
2. Unanticipated resignation of Project Manager, effective 18 August 2006.	Swift action on the part of the Project Manager and her employing department at Strathclyde University, with close and open communication with the Project Director and JISC, utilising existing networks, has ensured that two possible candidates at Strathclyde University have been identified. The benefit of this is that there should be little gap between the Project Manager leaving and her replacement starting. However, this process is not yet complete, so there is still a risk that external recruitment may need to take place, extending the gap before a new

	<p>person is in post. This is being monitored closely by all concerned. Additionally, because the Project Manager is moving to a post with project partner Intrallect Ltd., she will be available to offer support in the transition period, ensuring a smooth handover.</p>
<p>3. It was noted in the previous Progress Report that there was “a concern that the development of a typology of learning communities (and hence a mapping of issues to the typology) is a more complex and challenging task than anticipated. This has been exacerbated by the fact that some of our named Associate Partners do not yet have a functioning repository or active user community, although it should be noted that the reason they have joined CD-LOR is to ensure that they start with a good grounding in understanding their potential users’ needs. However, the team has been working hard together on this issue, and are bringing together the partners and Steering Group to assist in finding a useful way forward; the Steering Group Meeting planned for Feb. 6th 2006 is expected to achieve resolution.”</p>	<p>The meeting was held and was very well attended, and actively engaged in, by members of the Steering Group and some representatives of associate and collaborative partners. It was felt by the project team to have been very useful and a definite direction for the Deliverable 1 Report was agreed, with the final version subsequently approved by the Steering Group and widely disseminated. In the end the report summarised <i>dimensions</i> of learning communities and the context within which they operate, rather than providing a discrete <i>typology</i>.</p>
<p>4. An issue arose with the Workpackages and Deliverables related to institutional strategy and policy relevant to LORs. An initial call went out to the Steering Group and associate and collaborative partners, as well as more widely to the e-learning community, for people to provide their own institutions’ strategy and policy documents with relevance to LORs. The sparse response indicated that there was very little in existence at present, and that what there is, is very diverse. It was clear at that point that these deliverables would constitute a much larger and more complex task than originally anticipated, and that project resources would not be able to produce anything robust enough to be of value to the educational community.</p>	<p>The project team summarised the issues and made a proposal to the Steering Group and to JISC that the Workpackages and Deliverables related to institutional strategy and policy be dropped from the Project Plan. This was agreed by all parties.</p>
<p>5. An issue regarding direct consultation with repository users and potential users has arisen at each stage of the project so far. The team felt that, given the project’s emphasis on learning communities rather than on technical implementation, it is vital that the project directly investigates the viewpoint of repository users as a top priority. Some of the project Associate and Collaborative Partners do not have communities of users yet, and most of those involved have been accustomed to some extent to utilising repository “curators”, and their knowledge of their user communities, as intermediaries. It was decided to put concerted effort into gaining direct input from users.</p>	<p>The project team carried out the following measures to involve users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Carried out/commissioned interviews with a small number of repository users, with an internal report produced. b. Carried out a survey of teachers and other developers of teaching and learning materials. c. Surveyed users of associate partners’ repositories to ascertain which of the CD-LOR use cases they would prioritise for development within the project.

8. Standards

No changes from Project Plan.

9. Technical Development

No changes from Project Plan.

10. Intellectual Property Rights

Not currently applicable.

Project Resources

11. Project Partners

As previously noted, the lead institution for CD-LOR has changed, as of 1 July 2006, from the University of Dundee to Glasgow Caledonian University, with the two Dundee project team members moving to the latter institution. This is necessitating a certain amount of administrative work, including negotiating, drawing up and signing a new Consortium Agreement, setting up new budgetary procedures, and all that is involved in moving staff and setting them up in their new workplace. However, to date all of these activities have gone as smoothly and swiftly as can be expected, and the good working relationship between the three partners is ensuring that the process is not unduly disrupting the project schedule.

Apart from the above change, there have been no changes in partners since the last Progress Report. To date, the LAMS Community¹ has not been approached by CD-LOR to become a Collaborative Partner, although this was noted as a possibility in the last Progress Report. It is now an action on the Project Research Fellow to contact a representative of LAMS and invite them to sit on the Steering Group, which will be completed by the end of September 2006. Sarah Knight will also be approached regarding the possibility of someone in the new JISC e-Learning Programme with an interest in communities and sharing of learning designs sitting on the Steering Group. The COLEG project² was also approached to become either a Collaborative Partner or to offer representation on the Steering Group. It was felt that they would provide valuable experience as an existing community sharing teaching and learning resources within FE; however, despite a meeting with the Project Manager, they have not responded to this request.

12. Project Management

As noted previously, the Project Director, Prof. Allison Littlejohn, and the Project Researcher, Dr. Anoush Margaryan, have both moved institution, taking CD-LOR with them. This has not unduly disrupted the project schedule.

The Project Manager, Sarah Currier (based at the University of Strathclyde) has resigned her post effective 18 August 2006. Recruitment to replace her is currently under way, and it is anticipated that disruption will be minimal, particularly as there are potential replacements already working within Strathclyde.

13. Programme Support

- CD-LOR team have been utilising the wiki to share and disseminate project activities and outputs.

¹ <http://www.lamscommunity.org/>

² <http://www.coleg.org.uk/>

- The CD-LOR Project Manager attended the Programme Meeting in Warwick, 27-28 March 2006, and found the e-Learning Cluster session very useful.
- Programme Managers Neil Jacobs and Amber Thomas have been extremely helpful with regard to the changes that have taken place in CD-LOR in the last reporting period, notably the changes in the Project Plan, and the move from Dundee to Glasgow Caledonian. They have also provided detailed and useful input to the various project research activities to date. The CD-LOR team is very grateful for this assistance.

14. Relationships with other projects' activities

- CD-LOR has worked closely with the RepoMMan project to create, carry out and analyse a survey of personal resource management strategies of those creating and sharing learning resources.
- CD-LOR has communicated with and incorporated results from the WM-Share project in developing the report on the survey.
- CD-LOR has representation from a large number of related projects and initiatives within the Associate and Collaborative Partners, and on the project Steering Group, as outlined in the Project Plan. Those that have directly engaged in CD-LOR's work so far include (as well as the two previously mentioned):
 - * DIDET (JISC/NSF Digital Libraries in the Classroom)
 - * Spoken Word Services (JISC/NSF Digital Libraries in the Classroom)
 - * Jorum
 - * SIESWE Learning Exchange
 - * IVINURS and IVIMEDS
 - * LionShare and SPIRE
 - * TrustDR
 - * National Digital Learning Repository, Ireland
 - * HEA Subject Centres

15. Budget

[Information removed from public version.]

Detailed Project Planning

16. Workpackages

See above under **Section 4**. Current Workpackages are on target. The next reporting period will involve the following Workpackages:

Work Package	Output	Due date	Notes
WP1.1	Progress Report 3	31.01.07	None
WP1.3	Consortium Agreement	Original due date: 30.06.05 Due date for new Agreement: 15.09.06	This output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, the lead institution has since changed from University of Dundee to Glasgow Caledonian University and a new Consortium Agreement is presently being negotiated. It is anticipated that this will be complete by 15 September 2006.
WP1.6	Project Manager in post	Original due date: 1.08.05 Due date for new appointment:	This output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, the current Project Manager has resigned effective 18 August 2006; a new Project Manager is being recruited at Strathclyde University. It is hoped that this post will be filled by the beginning of September 2006.

		01.07.06	
WP1.7	Dissemination activities	Ongoing.	See Section 19: Dissemination Plan . Regarding the project website, this output was complete at the last Progress Report. However, with the change of lead institution to Glasgow Caledonian University, a new project website will be created and hosted on a server there. This is under way, and due for completion by the end of August 2006. In the meantime the website hosted at University of Dundee will remain in place. The new website URL will be: http://www.academy.gcal.ac.uk/cd-lor/
WP1.8	Budget	Ongoing; Budget Report in Progress Report 3.	None.
W1.9	Communications	Ongoing.	See Section 12: Project Management .
WP4.2	New LO Repository services, workflows and procedures.	1.04.06 – 30.09.06	Possible new software development. Currently under way.
WP4.3	Evaluation of above; refine use cases.	1.06.06 – 30.11.06	None.
WP4.4	Case studies	30.11.06-31.01.07	The Associate Partners will be commissioned to write these.
WP4.5	Documentation and technical recommendations	30.11.06-31.01.07	None.
WP5.3	Policy and strategy recommendations for institutions on setting up LO repositories	1.03.07-30.04.07	This Workpackage and Deliverable have been dropped from the Project Plan.
WP5.4	Institutional use cases	1.03.07-30.04.07	This Workpackage and Deliverable have been dropped from the Project Plan.
WP6.1	Draft Structured Guidelines.	31.01.07	Work has begun on the foundation for these guidelines, namely the Typology Report noted above under WPs 2 and 3.

17. Evaluation Plan

Formative evaluation is built into CD-LOR's methodology, which involves the testing and evaluation of outputs of the workpackages with stakeholders. Summative evaluation will be achieved through the evaluation of the final outputs by the wider educational community and/or the JISC as appropriate. For this reporting period, three deliverables were completed and evaluated as follows:

Timing	Factor to Evaluate	Questions to Address	Method(s)	Measure of Success
Oct. 05 – Feb. 06	Deliverable 1: Report (including literature review) on current LO repository models and practices, with a mapping of types of learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does report cover all known repository issues and research findings? - Does report adequately describe existing learning community types? 	Workshop; Project Partners' email list; Steering Group email list	Approval of Associate and Collaborative Partners and Steering Group. The Steering Group, along with representatives of

	communities to drivers, barriers and enablers to uptake and embedding.	- Is mapping of community types to repository issues complete?		the Project Partners, met on the 6 th Feb. 2006 to give feedback and advice on direction after which the Final Report was completed and distributed, with final approval given.
Dec. 05 – Nov. 06	Deliverable 2: Use cases describing use of LO repositories within learning communities and mapping potential enablers and solutions to barriers, with prioritised use cases refined through testing of solutions.	- Do use cases conform to good practice in use case presentation (as defined in JISC requirements for use cases)? - Do use cases describe an adequate number of usage scenarios, covering known uses and desired uses for LO repositories?	Associates' email list; Steering Group email list; JISC DigRep Programme Support Team.	Use cases were submitted by Associate Partners, collated, and prioritised with input from the Associate Partners, the Steering Group, the project team with reference to Deliverable 1, and end users of the partners' repositories. They are currently being developed, so the final refined use cases are not yet complete. Approval for the use cases and their prioritisation was achieved through this close collaboration across all of these stakeholders.
Apr.- Jul. 06	Deliverable 7: Report on institutional and personal knowledge management review. NB: This deliverable now consists solely of the Personal Resource Management Strategy Review.	- Does the report adequately describe a useful range of institutional and personal knowledge management strategies relevant to LO repositories?	Project Associates' list; Steering Group; JISC DigRep Programme Support Team; dissemination to wider e-learning community via presentations and email lists.	This report now consists of a report on the CD-LOR / RepoMMan survey of developers of teaching & learning materials, incorporating results of similar surveys also. The final draft of this report is currently under evaluation by the Steering Group and changes are being made according to their comments. Approval of Associate and Collaborative Partners and the wider e-learning community will be

				established with the final release of the report.
--	--	--	--	---

Objectives for the next reporting period are:

1. Prioritising, developing, implementing and testing a range of potential solutions to barriers in live test-beds with real learning communities;
2. Producing *final* use cases, case studies and a *draft* set of structured guidelines on LO repository implementation within learning communities.
3. Finalising all matters related to the move of lead institution and the resignation of the Project Manager, namely:
 - a. New Consortium Agreement signed by all three project partners.
 - b. New CD-LOR website in place on Glasgow Caledonian server and widely disseminated.
 - c. All budgetary transfer matters up-to-date.
 - d. New Project Manager in post.

Identify, as far as is possible, the measurable outcomes from the project that might reasonably be evaluated one year after the end of the project, along with the metrics that could be used to do this.

CD-LOR Deliverable 9: Structured Guidelines, which are

“for those setting up or evaluating LO repositories, based around a set of questions designed to elicit the relevant drivers, barriers and enablers for the particular learning community type as identified in *Deliverable 1: Report*” – CD-LOR Project Plan, p.7.

are intended to be of ongoing use to the wider educational community. In the community evaluation stage of the CD-LOR project, the following criteria will be looked at:

- *Simplicity and accessibility* – guidelines should be clear and readily understandable by the stakeholders;
- *Breadth* – should sufficiently cover the major issues/considerations that could be identified;
- *Utility and usability* – must be usable by those they are aimed at and must be able to be read at different levels of sophistication, i.e. must make sense from the point of view of both those who are familiar with the research, concepts and practice of LORs and those who are not;
- *Generalisability* – are the guidelines sufficiently generalised beyond the project/project partners’ LORs and institutions;
- *Stakeholders general satisfaction* with the guidelines
- *Fitness for purpose* as a tool enabling actual implementation and evaluation of LORs.

Because the guidelines are to be presented through an electronic tool (e.g. a decision support system) as well as in a document, the tool itself should be evaluated separately, and metrics should be developed for that separately (e.g. accessibility, usability, effectiveness, etc.).

However, evaluation of the guidelines one year after the project would be extremely beneficial. Metrics to be used could include looking at whether they had actually been used, who by and what for, and whether they improved practice.

18. Quality Assurance Plan

The Project Plan states that for most of the project deliverables (i.e. reports, use cases, case studies, guidelines and recommendations), their quality will be determined by their fitness for purpose as outlined in the evaluation plan, which details how the stakeholder communities will be consulted for review and comment throughout the life of CD-LOR. Further quality assurance for any software outputs is also mentioned, but as these have not yet begun (they will be reported on in the next Progress Report), please refer to **Section 17: Evaluation Plan** above.

19. Dissemination Plan

Report progress against plan, noting dissemination done, whether you feel it was successful, and any publicity the project received during the reporting period.

As stated in the Project Plan, CD-LOR has disseminated news of its activities, findings and outputs to, and called for input from, the appropriate sectors of the UK and international HE and FE communities through: production and distribution of flyers; newsletter announcements; attendance and presentations at relevant meetings, conferences and workshops; a project website; and announcements on the Programme wiki and relevant email lists, as noted in the table below. All of the dissemination activities noted below have been successful and resulted in an increase of CD-LOR's profile as well as many useful contacts and resources coming our way.

Since the previous Progress Report, the following dissemination activities have taken place:

Timing	Dissemination Activity	Audience	Purpose	Key Message
Feb. – July 2006.	Project website; dissemination of project outputs and activities. New website based at Glasgow Caledonian currently under development, due for release August 2006.	Wider educational community.	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details; request input into project activities, e.g. survey; disseminate project outputs.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities.
Feb. - July 2006.	Updated flyer.	Various educational communities; see below for details.	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details.
Feb. - July 2006.	JISC DRP wiki.	JISC DRP; wider educational community interested in repositories in general.	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details; request input into project activities, e.g. survey; disseminate project outputs.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities.
Intrallect User Day, Edinburgh, 13 Feb. 2006.	Attendance of Project Manager and a number of CD-LOR associate and collaborative partners alongside other Intrallect users; mention of CD-LOR and informal networking.	Users of intraLibrary LOR software.	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details; network and	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities;

			organise collaboration.	potential future collaboration.
National Digital Learning Repository, Ireland, Launch Workshop, Cork, 21 Feb. 2006.	Attendance of and presentation by Project Manager.	Education / e-learning community in Ireland (potential users of their national LOR).	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details; network and organise collaboration.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities; potential future collaboration.
Publication in D-Lib, Mar. 2006.	Margaryan, A., & Littlejohn, A. (2006). Community dimensions of learning object repositories. D-Lib, March: http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march06/03inbrief.html#LITTLEJOHN	International digital libraries community.	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details.
CETIS Metadata & Digital Repositories SIG Meeting, York, 1 Mar. 2006.	Attendance of and distribution of flyers by Project Manager.	UK e-learning community.	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details; network and organise collaboration.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities; potential future collaboration.
Strathclyde University Teaching & Learning Through Technology network workshop, Glasgow, 2 Mar. 2006.	Attendance of, distribution of flyers and presentation by Project Manager.	Strathclyde University lecturers.	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details; network and organise collaboration.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities; potential future collaboration.
JISC DRP Meeting, Warwick, 27-28 March 2006.	Attendance; informal dissemination/networking; co-ordination of meeting on personal resource management strategies; participation in e-Learning Cluster session.	JISC community	Raise awareness of project's existence, objectives and contact details; elicit contacts and resources; network and organise collaborative activities with other projects.	Progress on project.
Paper presented at	Project Director and Research Fellow presented: Communities of exchange:	International art & design	Early dissemination	Project's name, aims

Learning and Teaching with Technology in Art Design and Communication online conference, 27-30 Mar. 2006.	Issues in sharing digital learning resources for art, and design education: http://www.designsonlearning.net/index.php?section=1&item=2	e-learning community.	of project findings.	and objectives, and contact details; early findings.
Meeting with COLEG, Glasgow, 31 Mar. 2006.	Project Manager met with COLEG team to exchange information and assistance; requested that COLEG consider sitting on Steering Group or becoming a Collaborative Partner.	COLEG team (COLEG represents a large consortium of Scottish FE colleges sharing educational resources).	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources; network and encourage collaboration.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities; potential future collaboration.
Networked Learning Conference, Lancaster, 11-13 Apr. 2006.	Attendance of and presentation by Research Fellow at symposium entitled Repositories for Teaching Materials & Learning Objects: Enablers And Barriers To Use.	UK HE/FE e-learning community.	Early dissemination of project findings.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; early findings.
CD-LOR survey disseminated and available on web, 25 Apr.-26 May 2006.	Survey announcement e-mail and website included details of project.	International educational community.	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit assistance with survey.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details.
WM-Share Conference, Kidderminster, 18 May 2006.	Attendance of and panel participation by Project Manager; dissemination of flyer.	West Midlands e-learning community.	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources; network and encourage collaboration.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities; potential future collaboration; early findings.
JISC Information Environment and Digital Repositories Workshop (satellite workshop to WWW2006 Conference), Edinburgh, 22 May 2006.	Attendance of and presentation by Peter Douglas (Intrallet Ltd), dissemination of flyers.	International community interested in WWW.	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities.

Collaborative e-Learning Symposium, Cambridge University, 22-23 June 2006.	Attendance of and keynote presentation by Project Manager; dissemination of flyer.	UK HE/FE e-learning community.	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources; network and encourage collaboration; dissemination of project findings so far.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; outputs and activities; potential future collaboration; early findings.
Jorum Enhancement Committee Meeting, Manchester, 10 July 2006.	Participation of Project Manager.	Various interested parties to Jorum.	Network and encourage collaboration; dissemination of project findings so far.	Project outputs and activities; potential future collaboration; early findings.

CD-LOR dissemination plans for next reporting period:

Timing	Dissemination Activity	Audience	Purpose	Key Message
Aug. 2006 onwards.	New project website at Glasgow Caledonian University; ongoing development.	Educational community.	Raise awareness of project's aims, objectives, activities and outputs; contact details for project.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; project outputs, deliverables, documents, etc.
Aug. 2006 onwards.	New project flyer with new contact details for move to Glasgow Caledonian plus new Project Manager.	Educational community.	Raise awareness of project's aims and objectives; contact details for project.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details.
Aug. 2006 onwards.	Intrallett will continue to feature articles in their newsletter when there is something of interest to report, such as major new public deliverables.	Intrallett customers.	Raise awareness of project's aims, objectives, activities and outputs; contact details for project.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; project outputs, deliverables, documents, etc.
Aug. 2006 – May 2007.	Press releases: no press releases have been sent out; this will be reviewed by Project Management Group and Steering Group to ascertain optimum time to do this.	Wider educational community	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; public deliverables.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details; project outputs, deliverables, documents, etc
Aug. 2006 –	Announcements on	Educational	Raise	Project's name,

May 2007.	relevant email lists: will continue to be sent out.	community interested in e-learning, interoperability, pedagogy, learning communities, etc. depending on list.	awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources, feedback, discussion on project's activities; promote events and outputs.	aims and objectives, and contact details; project progress; interim project outputs; public deliverables.
Sept. 2006 onwards.	Project details on Strathclyde's Centre for Academic Practice and Learning Enhancement new website; flyer in CAPLE noticeboard in public foyer.	Strathclyde University.	Raise awareness of project's aims, objectives, activities and outputs; contact details for project.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details.
ALT-C 2006 (Sept. 2006)	Attendance; collaboration with other Repositories Programme projects on symposium (has been accepted); Intrallect stall with newsletters/flyers.	UK HE/FE e-learning community	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources; disseminate and discuss findings so far.	Project progress; interim project outputs.
LORs as Digital Libraries Workshop (workshop at ECDL), Alicante, Spain, 22 Sept. 2006.	Attendance and dissemination of flyers by Peter Douglas (Intrallect Ltd.).	International e-learning / LORs community; possibly international digital libraries community.	Raise awareness of project's aims, objectives, activities and outputs; contact details for project.	Project's name, aims and objectives, and contact details.
2006-2007	JISC DRP and other relevant programme meetings.	JISC DRP and development communities.	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources; disseminate and discuss findings so far.	Project progress; interim project outputs.
2006-2007	Journal articles and papers (e.g. ALT-J; JIME; information science journals etc.)	E-learning and information management academic communities.	Disseminate findings.	Interim outputs and findings; Final outputs and findings.
2006-2007	Project deliverables	UK HE/FE, international HE/FE	Disseminate outputs and findings.	Interim outputs and findings; Final outputs and findings.
ALT-C 2007	Attendance; possible poster; possible submission of paper (depends on acceptance); possible	UK HE/FE e-learning community	Share project's outcomes with community.	Project outputs and findings.

	demonstration of software			
Relevant CETIS SIG meetings and JISC-CETIS conferences throughout life of project (2006-2007)	Attendance; presentations on progress and interim and final outcomes on project; project flyers.	UK HE/FE e-learning community with interest in interoperability	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources; disseminate and evaluate outputs; feed into wider repository developments.	Project progress; project outputs.
Publication in press.	Littlejohn, A., & Margaryan, A. (in press). Cultural issues in the sharing and reuse of resources for learning. Research and Practice in Technology-enhanced Learning, Special issue on cultural diversity in learning.	International e-learning community.	Raise awareness of project findings.	Project findings re cultural issues and LORs.
Presentations, posters, workshops and demonstrations at other relevant fora as identified throughout life of project, e.g. conferences, workshops, working meetings.	Attendance; presentations on progress and interim and final outcomes on project; project flyers; informal dissemination through conversation	Communities with interest in e-learning; repositories; learning communities; pedagogy and repositories; information and knowledge management in HE/FE etc.	Raise awareness of project's existence and objectives; elicit resources; disseminate and evaluate outputs and findings.	Project progress; project outputs

20. Exit/Sustainability Plan

There is nothing yet to report under exit/sustainability. Project outputs are being made available on the project website and disseminated as widely as possible. There are no anticipated changes to the exit/sustainability plan as noted in the Project Plan.

Appendixes

Appendix A. Project Budget

[Information removed from public version.]

Appendix B. Use Cases

CD-LOR Core Use Case Scenarios

Peter Douglas (p.douglas@intrallect.com)

As a result of the meeting held in Glasgow on April 6th, 2006, we were able to identify 10 use case scenarios from the original 24. Some of those scenarios were the result of combining original scenarios together. Simplified descriptions of the 10 scenarios were then given to users (or potential users) of Learning Object Repositories to rank in order of importance. As a result of that prioritisation exercise we have discarded 2 of the 10 use case scenarios.

From the remaining 8 scenarios we would like CDLOR partners to express an interest in the ones that they would like to help develop further and, most importantly, be prepared to trial towards the end of the year. Not all of the scenarios in this document will necessarily be developed/implemented, but it is our intention that all of them will be discussed further in order to better specify the work needed to implement them.

It may interest you to know that the scenarios which follow in this document were ranked by LOR end-users (80 responses) in the following order:

1. Informing users of new resources (CDLOR25)
2. Disaggregating complex resources (CDLOR03)
3. Web-based public search of repository (CDLOR26)
4. Training users of repositories (CDLOR07)
5. Community support for learning resource adaptation (CDLOR12)
6. Bulk upload of resources (CDLOR02)
7. Reflective practice when embedding learning resources (CDLOR28)
8. Managing access to content (CDLOR27)

Evaluation

Use Cases

Do the use cases conform to good practice in presentation

Do the use case describe an adequate number of usage scenarios

Solutions

Usability

Does it address the need it was designed to address

How sustainable/scalable across communities (easy to roll out and adopt)?

General satisfaction of all the stakeholders of the solution

- End users
- Curators
- Steering group

Title	Bulk upload of resources
Code	CDLOR02
Author(s)	Sarah McConnell
Problem	Takes too long to upload resources one by one if you have many resources
Category	Technology: usability
Scenario	Larry has hundreds of learning objects he wants to upload to the institutional repository, but doesn't want to have to upload them one at a time. He uses the bulk upload function of the repository to upload the objects all at once. The objects go into a holding area in the repository for either Larry or someone else to decide where (workflow) they should go so that things like rights and metadata can be assigned to the objects.
Partner(s)	University of Edinburgh
Notes	This was not discussed in detail during the meeting but was identified as being important

	enough to consider further. While useful for a number of projects it is certainly one of the less community-oriented scenarios.
--	---

Title	Disaggregating complex resources
Code	CDLOR03
Author(s)	Sarah McConnell
Problem	Users can't easily use just one part of a complex learning object.
Category	Technological: usability
Scenario	Edward is a learning technologist in GeoSciences. He is keen to get members of staff in his college using content packaging, repository systems and learning design. He is collecting learning resources from staff and building them into complex learning resources using RELOAD, and then depositing them as learning objects into the LORE system. Each object has metadata at asset level and at object level. He realises that staff in his college find it incredibly difficult to find the time and enthusiasm to do this kind of work, and he sees it as a critical part of his work. The repository system allows users to disaggregate the complex learning objects and users can export the smaller learning resource/assets in order to use them either in their own teaching or to develop a new complex learning object.
Partner(s)	University of Edinburgh
Notes	<p>From the comments gathered before the meeting there was some mixed opinion regarding the relevance of this functionality to digital repositories (e.g. "If the objects are designed appropriately, then it's a non issue. If they aren't I'm not sure the repository is the best tool for re-design?" and "Very important. This is the whole point of LORs.").</p> <p>Generally, it was thought to be interesting enough to pursue further. This is another technical scenario which doesn't have a great deal with communities as such.</p> <p>Strong pedagogical implications as teachers are more likely to be able to do what they want if they have control over the resources.</p>

Title	Training users of repositories
Code	CDLOR07
Author(s)	Mike Dodds, Jorum Outreach Officer & Catherine Fleming, Jorum Officer
Problem	The national nature of Jorum means the team are unable to promote and train end users directly. Users themselves find it difficult to attend organised events.
Category	Organisational: change management
Scenario	<p>Jorum have produced a range of promotional and training materials, available through the website, which users are able to access at their leisure.</p> <p>Intermediaries in institutions ('Reps') are given a Rep Pack containing a standard PowerPoint presentation, leaflets, posters, several fact sheets, training guides, and an automated demo. The automated demo is an animated introduction to the system. Reps can organise training sessions locally and pass on the information given to them to their users. Users can also access these materials directly from the Jorum website.</p> <p>Jorum delivers training and promotional events which are primarily aimed at potential Reps – it is intended that they will then champion use of the service locally as described above. This model works well for many other national JISC services who are used to disseminating information through intermediaries</p>
Partner(s)	JORUM
Notes	From the comments received, this was a very popular option. While this is a JORUM scenario, it was felt that a range of communities should be considered as the training/promotional needs would need to be tailored for each community. This scenario would probably not require any technical solutions to be developed, but a number of training options to be developed and trialed.

	<p>It would be interesting to review what people are currently doing on this front and perhaps make some suggestions based on community type?</p> <p>NDLR are actively doing awareness raising/training for their intended community. (I have been running the training sessions)</p> <p>Report on Learning Communities and Repositories – Table 1: enable acceptance and innovations.</p> <p>Geographical distribution</p>
--	---

Title	Community support for learning object adaptation
Code	CDLOR12
Author(s)	Neil Ballantyne and Ellen Daly
Problem	The practitioners may lack the skills to adapt a learning object for their own needs
Category	Pedagogical: user skills
Scenario	<p>An FE social care lecturer is frustrated that some of the LOs designed for HE students could also be used by FE students with some adaptations. She's heard on the FE Community of Practice discussion board that the Rehash project <http://www.etu.sgul.ac.uk/rehash/index.htm> are doing this in the context of health and medical education.</p> <p>She's identified ten LOs in the area of working with older people within the Learning Exchange that could be adapted in this way. She checks the terms and conditions of use for each LO and finds that seven of them can be 'modified'. However, she doesn't feel confident that she would have the technical skill to make the necessary adaptations.</p> <p>She visits the LO Development Community of Practice discussion area and posts her suggestion there. Within 48 hours three other FE lecturers have posted messages supporting her idea and offering to help, and the Learning Exchange LO development team have written stating that they may be able to provide technical support if she can gather some colleagues willing to draft content.</p>
Partner	SIESWE Learning Exchange
Notes	<p>Not highly ranked or discussed at the meeting, but has been left in due to the strong community focus of the scenario.</p> <p>What would the actual links between the two tools be? A link to the discussion from the repository. The discussion knows the URLs of objects. Single Sign-on. There is weak linking (just use object's public URL) or strong linking (using OAI).</p> <p>The discussion tool would just be some existing tool that we can pick up and use. Which tool would depend on the flexibility needed to "talk" to the repository.</p> <p>Less important for institutional – maybe more appropriate for subject based national repositories</p>

Title	Informing users of new resources
Code	CDLOR25 (CDLOR09, CDLOR13)
Author(s)	Neil Ballantyne, Ellen Daly, Mike Dodds & Catherine Fleming
Problem	A user does not have time to log in and search the Learning Exchange regularly to check for new, relevant resources
Category	Technology: usability
Scenario	A lecturer who is keen to stay up to date with new materials in the Learning Object Repository relevant to his specific teaching area. He's a regular contributor to his subject-based Community of Practice discussion area and very excited about the new functionality

	<p>of the Repository that allows him to subscribe to individual learning objects; particular taxonomy nodes; search criteria or specific collections.</p> <p>Every time an individual LO is updated, or a change occurs within a taxonomy node or collection, the system sends him a notification email giving him the URL location of any updated or new LOs.</p> <p>After receiving a notification he usually checks into his subject CoP to read and contribute to the inevitable critique of the new or updated material.</p>
Partner	Jorum, SIESWE Learning Exchange
Notes	<p>There was much enthusiasm for this combined scenario that would mean that users to not have to proactively check for new objects being added to the repository.</p> <p>The scenario mentions email and this is probably needed, but RSS Feeds would also be a suitable technology (but would users want to use RSS feeds?). Some investigation into what users are likely to use would be useful. RSS feeds could be set up for specific communities of practice.</p> <p>It was mentioned that the National Subject Centres would find this facility very useful.</p> <p>Differences between technologies used – RSS and email – are there specific properties of communities that would influence choice? Criteria might be different for different communities.</p>

Title	Web based public search of repository
Code	CDLOR26 (CDLOR9 & CDLOR24)
Author(s)	Jackie Proven, David Dripps, John Casey, Mike Dodds & Catherine Fleming
Problem	Promoting a repository's contents
Category	Information Management: metadata
Scenario	<p>End user conducts a search of the repository to view metadata records through a web-based public interface (access to learning objects is unavailable). Repository administrator controls the metadata profile revealed to the end user.</p> <p>Some web sites may display the results of a pre-defined search that are aimed at specific communities. For example, a subject centre may display a list of all objects in JORUM associated with their subject.</p>
Partner(s)	TrustDR, JORUM
Notes	<p>This scenario is about exposing the contents of a repository publicly in order to promote the use of the repository. This is similar in some regards to CDLOR25, but the purpose is certainly different and distinct enough to develop as a separate use case. It would be interesting to investigate how different communities would harness this feature; putting search results into a context that suits their need.</p> <p>Personal resource strategy survey – people usually search by key words. Two different scenarios “canned” searches and allowing the users to search. All sorts of different ways the searches can be embedded into web sites etc</p>

Title	Managing access to content
Code	CDLOR27 (CDLOR11 & CDLOR17)
Author(s)	Neil Ballantyne, Ellen Daly & Iain Wallace
Problem	Some contributors require their materials to be given limited access
Category	Information Management: DRM
Scenario	An agency-based Child Protection trainer wants to contribute a series of LOs developed by her agency to the Learning Exchange. However, because of issues around the sensitive nature of the material, she want to ensure that only a specific community or sub-group of

	<p>Learning Exchange users are able to access the content: agency based registered social workers.</p> <p>She contacts the repository manager who agrees to set up a special collection area that will only allow access to agency-based social workers. The repository manager agrees and when the content is submitted she places it in a special collection area. This collection requires an extra level of authorisation and is subject to additional license conditions effectively including only agency based social workers. Since the repository has been set up to recognise this group of users as a specific group any agency based registered social worker is automatically granted access.</p>
Partner	SIESWE Learning Exchange, Spoken Word
Notes	<p>The idea of collections is very closely related to communities and their different needs, particularly if they are using the same repository. Collections can be established for a number of different reasons – in this scenario the focus is access and rights. It is not just access to objects that is being proposed, but access to functionality. For example (from CDLOR17), Jock would also like to be able to see all content available to him; he may be able to view metadata records for educational-only content, but must not be allowed to access the objects themselves.</p> <p>There is an aspect of CDLOR17 which has been ignored when creating this scenario – that of guiding the users to the rights issues when repurposing or combining learning objects. It was felt that TrustDR would be the appropriate project to look at these issues.</p> <p>It was mentioned at the meeting that this is a core middleware problem for JISC. It was also suggested that Shibboleth could be looked at as a potential solution. It was strongly felt at the meeting that this scenario should be taken forward.</p>

Title	Reflective Practice when embedding Learning Objects
Code	CDLOR28 (CDLOR06, CDLOR10, CDLOR14 & CDLOR18)
Author(s)	Mike Dodds, Catherine Fleming, Neil Ballantyne, Ellen Daly, Jackie Proven, John Casey, David Dripps & Alan Masson
Problem	Need to encourage propagation of good practice
Category	Information Management: metadata
Scenario	<p>Creation of Best Practice: A social work practice teacher is searching for some material for a communication skills group she's planning to run three weeks from now. She discovers some excellent resources in the Learning Exchange and decides to download them. At download the system reminds her of the default option to send a feedback comments email one week from download. She deselects the default and, from a drop-down menu, selects the option to receive the email four weeks from download.</p> <p>Four weeks later she receives an email from the repository with a URL link to a feedback page. She clicks the URL and is offered a comments page with text fields for 'How the LO was deployed; 'The impact this had; and 'Suggestions to enhance the LO or it's deployment'. She completes the fields reflecting on what an improvement the reminder system is over the previous system that depended on users returning to add comments of their own volition.</p> <p>Exposure of Best Practice: A lecturer needs to select suitable Learning Objects for inclusion in a course of study that will enhance the student experience. The lecturer has access to a federated search of a set of repositories, both internal and external to the institution. Selection of content is to be based on feedback from previous use/reviews of the material</p>

	<p>The lecturer requires that the necessary evaluative information to make his choice is exposed at the search stage and that he can easily understand and act on that information to make an informed choice.</p> <p>Dissemination of Best Practice outside the repository: A university social work lecturer who teaches on a "working with offenders" module is interested in using a three minute video-based case study (the 'Jamie case study') he found in the Learning Exchange. The case study objective states it was designed to be used in teaching students about criminogenic needs but he's not quite clear how best to embed this piece of content into his module.</p> <p>He's interested in finding out how other educators have used this piece of content so checks the comments page. Although there are a number of comments made most are general impressions of the usefulness of the LO. The majority of the comments are very positive but he's none the wiser on how people have actually used the LO.</p> <p>He decides to visit the Learning Exchange 'Communities of Practice' section and locates the Working with Offenders CoP. He searches the discussion boards for information on the Jamie Case Study and finds one or two interesting remarks on how people have used the LO, as well as some comments on suggested improvements to the LO.</p> <p>These raise some specific questions for him so he sends an email to the CoP discussion board. Within 36 hours several comments come back from CoP members and the CoP moderator. These arrive in his normal email since he elected to receive comments in that way as well as being posted on the discussion board. There's a flurry of email over the next few days about the case study and how best to embed it. The CoP moderator has also commented on how helpful the discussion has been in suggesting ways to enhance the LO and she offers to send the comments back to the developers.</p>
Partner(s)	Jorum, SIESWE Learning Exchange, TrustDR
Notes	<p>This scenario (combining bits of 4 other scenarios) is all about how the communities can disseminate best practice with regards to using the learning objects within the repository. There are a number of ways this can be done; using functionality within the repository (CDLOR6, CDLOR14, CDLOR18) or using functionality outside of the repository (CDLOR10). Clearly a community-oriented scenario, this is a great candidate to take forward. The scenario needs to become more focussed than it is, perhaps dividing into a number of usecases.</p> <p>Community of practice tools – what would that constitute and how would it work with the repository (would it need to?).</p> <p>Might people want different kind of feedback depending on their community type/repository type. Would multiple community repositories have more than one CoP and what would the implications be if any?</p>