

## **EdReNe - Educational Repositories Network**

A gap exists between users, who ask “where are the learning resources” and the content providers, who ask “where are the users”. Repositories address this missing knowledge about opportunities and resources. They are key disseminators of information of available learning resources. In repositories users search or browse for relevant resources (text books, websites etc.) among the vast supply on the market. Therefore, in many countries ministries of education/authorities or professional organisations have established national repositories of educational resources.

The objective of this Thematic Network is to bring together these web-based repositories of learning resources with content owners and other stakeholders within education in order to share, develop and document strategies, experiences, practices, solutions, advice, procedures etc. on the organisation, structuring and functionality of repositories.

The overall goal is to improve the provision of and access to learning resources.

Issues to be addressed include:

- Policies and strategies
- Quality criteria and assurance
- Rights protection and management
- Standards and interoperability
- Development and harmonisation/mapping of application profiles
- Types of learning resources
- Involving commercial publishers and associated agreements
- Encouraging teachers' knowledge sharing
- Linking to reviews and evaluations
- Connecting to curriculum
- Ethics, screening and clearing, and
- Web-services bridging to other portals and local learning platforms.

The project will link to/collaborate with other cross-national and/or local repositories/collections/ catalogues, and publishers' associations.

The project will develop practical guidelines and recommendations, but most importantly, it will establish a lasting collegial network of European repository nodes and stakeholders.

The main output of the EdReNe project will be a comprehensive website with recommendations, documentation, templates, roadmaps and documents describing issues, state-of-the-art and offering possible solutions to the problems described

above. Existing repositories can cut some corners and new repositories may have a less costly and much less complicated path in life.

During a three-year period, from May 2007, the network will arrange 4 strategic seminars and 10 expert workshops. The EdReNe network will invite associated members to join the network.

### **Introduction to the EdReNe network**

Leo Højsholt-Poulsen continued with an introduction to the EdReNe thematic network.

The project is planned in three phases, see the presentation. The three main pillars are: strategic seminar, expert workshops and web forum (www.edrene.org has been registered - we will discuss with EUN whether they can assist us with the necessary tools for the web forum).

The minimum list of issues to be treated in EdReNe is (see also Description of Work - DoW):

- How to establish a repository of learning resources together with producers and users
- Day-to-day organization and management of a repository
- Optimising number of titles and users
- Quality frameworks and criteria
- Networking repositories
- Functionalities and features of a repository
- Pedagogical metadata and links to curriculum
- Management of IPR screening and clearance
- Role of repositories in the new web environment

More issues will be found in cooperation with the network members during this seminar and in the following period.

### **Page 4**

The work is organized in four work packages, work packages 3-6. WP3 and WP5 will be started in 2007.

### **Tommy Byskov Lund UNI•C**

PowerPoint:

#### **Expert-workshops- draftagendas.ppt**

#### **Planning future work – draft agendas**

Presented by Tommy Byskov Lund.

First of all, thank you all for the valuable input you gave us! It will be used in the future planning. Also thanks for the many offers on hosting a network meeting.

UNI•C have started the analysis of data by grouping and counting all the statements according to priority. Both feedback (numbers) from the group work and the individual member questionnaire were used.

Top issues selected from the two.

New issues were also suggested during the process and UNI•C will include them in the best way possible.

### **WP3**

The top issues from the workshops (the complete list can be found in Tommy's presentation)

Quality assurance strategies (editorial policies, technical quality assurance)

Connecting and cooperating with existing repositories

Other issues identified as important:

What are the additional benefits of repositories in a Google world

Identifying successful policy actions (government support, public-private partnerships)

Metadata only or content repository? Pros and cons of hosting content

Sustainability of a repository in the long term

Barriers to cooperation and interoperability = Language?

Comments:

- Barriers to cooperation and interoperability = Language? The members elaborated on this issue. Language should not be the only barrier discussed. "Identifying and discussion barriers ..." will be a better title.

- There might be too much work for a 2-3 days expert workshop. Perhaps parallel tracks or workshops are needed on some of the issues. UNI•C will look further into the draft agenda to ensure that the number of topics can be handled in the expert workshop.

- It was also suggested that the discussions were started with a definition of the language/terminology, what is our common understanding of the issue, etc. Some issues might even be merged (e.g. sustainability might be coupled to "which learning resources should be included").

In the coming period UNI•C will be contacting you to make the agenda more precise. All of you indicated that you have expertise on WP3 and wish to participate.

Page 45

#### **WP5**

Focus will be on the daily life/the operational area. The top issues were:

User feedback: evaluations, reviews, collaborative filtering, tagging/qualifying metadata

Web 2.0 and repositories? (shared queries, social bookmarking, tagging...)

Other issues identified as important:

Building your own content from repository resources (allowing teachers to combine content from

different producers)

Ensuring ease of use (usability, wizards, help and support)

My repository - the need for personalization (profiles, reviews, collections...)

Comments:

- It was suggested that more innovative aspects should be included in the discussions – looking further ahead. Visions for the future. It was suggested that the future could be discussed later in the strand. We cannot discuss everything from the start.

- There might be issues that are required to be solved at e.g. the political level hidden within these topics. We should identify and handle them as well – in which case they should be discussed in WP3.

- Important to discuss the outcome of each of the two work packages in the other (WP3 and 5), e.g. to pass topics between them. Something might have a simple technical solution. However, it could be complicated on a strategic level.

- Very practical topics might be missing in WP5, e.g. how do you enter metadata?

Tools/editors? Tommy answered: That should be discussed under e.g. ease-of-use.

- A new topic was suggested: what should be stored and for how long?

- Narrow the focus in the two work packages instead of trying to cover all the aspects within the three days.

The workshops will provide input to e.g. the strategic workshop and the overlapping issues can be discussed on these.

#### **WP4**

As with the first two work packages we have made a shortlist based on your feedback.

Metadata standards (application profiles, strategies for vocabularies, curriculum mapping)

Providing best practice examples of the use of standards with proven benefits - and examples not to follow

Other issues identified as important:

Facilitating exchange of metadata across repositories

Rights management (Digital Rights Management, Creative Commons, identity management...)

Facilitating exchange between repositories and VLE/LMS

Page 46

Comments:

- UNI•C - It is not the purpose of this network to be a standardisation network – time consuming topic (endless discussions) – hope we can share our common knowledge on this topic and give suggestions etc.
- Some plain explanation on certain topics for the end user is relevant. The stakeholders (teachers etc.) should understand the existing standards and how they are evolving in the Google world today. They should take this into account in the long-term perspective.
- Current use of standard – an initial analysis could be made based on existing documents on the standards used. BECTA has a few that might be used.

The comments show that it is “how do we use standards”, what should we not do, etc. The debate could perhaps be continued in an online forum as this WP is not the first one to be held.

### **WP6**

On the top of both lists were “providing guidelines for users/teachers/producers”, “ownership”, “Creative commons... etc.

Providing guidelines for users/teachers/producers

Creative Commons

Other issues identified as important:

Ownership of repository data (database/collection, metadata, content...)

Protection of rights: Identity management

Rights clearance practices

Strategies for providing copyright cleared material for education

Defining/examples of fair use

Protection of rights: Digital Rights Management

Comments:

- Creative Commons is not the only licensing initiative which should be included.

### **Understanding new issues**

- “Rip-proof repositories” – making content available in a way that other people could not copy.
- “Learners entitlement – access to important knowledge”: If you are not entitled to access certain information you are violating human rights – fair use is defined in the UK. If policy makers attend the network meetings, this topic could perhaps be discussed. Not a high-ranked topic for the network.

Page 47

- “What, where and how – establishing a resolution service”

Not about establishing, more “have people done it, does it solve the problems” etc.

### **General comments on the EdReNe strategic seminar**

The members had a few suggestions:

- Could we organize the work in smaller groups and rooms? Plenum discussions with 30-40 people are not easy to follow.
- Should there be an open forum on the EdReNe website? In the beginning discussions in closed forums are important. Perhaps we could open up later or have both. UNI•C will take this into consideration.

### **General information**

Costs including tickets and other bills should be addressed to:

**Jeanette.Lindhardt@uni-c.dk, +45 89 37 66 03**