

Meeting Minutes May 17, 2006

Subject: Working Group "Organization / Finance"

To: All working group members,
project management

Author: André Redard at rete ag

E-Mail / Tel: andre.redard@atrete.ch / 044- 266 55 65

Wiki: <http://www.edutech.ch/wiki/pmwiki.php>

Date: May 17, 2006 **Time:** 14:15 - 16:30 **Place:** CRUS, Bern

Participants:

Christian Schmid	CS	BFH
Eva Seiler	ES	UniZH
Jacques Monnard	JM	UniFR
Martina Harrer	MH	UniSG
Sonja Gisler	SG	PHTG
Stefano Tardini	ST	USI
Urs Gröhbiel	UG	FHNW
André Redard	REA	at rete ag

Absent:

David Aymonin	DA	EPFL
Patricia Gamberoni	PG	HES-SO
Benedetto Lepori	PL	USI

#	Subject	I ¹ T D	Who	Date
1. Introduction				
1.1	Minutes of the last meeting: All participants agree with the minutes.	D	all	
2. Hot topics				
2.1	JM and UG present the hot topics of all working groups so far: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content management / repository Integration of major LMS with surrounding tools No need for a nationally hosted open source LMS for 2007-2011 	I	JM, UG	

¹ I : Information / T : To-Do / D : Decision

#	Subject	I T D	Who	Date
2.2	<p>The participants agree that there is no need for a nationally hosted LMS in the short term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UniSG could be interested in a national platform after 2009, if the platform fulfills at least the functionality of today's LMS • BFH uses moodle and is interested in sharing their experience with other moodle users, but has no need for a nationally hosted LMS. • UniZH recommends starting now with a national OSS LMS in order to be ready in a few years to migrate from the commercial platform WebCT Vista to the OSS LMS. OLAT e.g. could be used also as a repository. 	D I I I	MH CS ES	
3. Repository				
3.1	<p>Use Case:</p> <p>The repository has to support primarily the following two scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Storing e-learning objects <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. modularize e-learning courses b. convert objects in a standardized format and store them within the repository² c. make them retrievable d. define conditions of usage (access rights, license, fees,) 2. Retrieving e-learning objects <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. search for e-learning objects b. select e-learning objects of interest c. download selected objects d. integrate downloaded objects within the own courses on LMS <p>However, the repository does not have to support the process of course development, e.g. the provisioning of a collaborative workspace for a virtual team of course developers. There exist other tools to support these kind of tasks, like BSCW, etc.</p>			
3.2	<p>Real demand for a national repository?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The big question is whether authors will store their content in a repository and re-use objects created by others. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the benefits for an author storing his/her content in the repository? ○ Books can be sold. How about e-learning objects? ○ What kind of incentives is necessary so that authors re-use stored learning objects instead of creating their own objects? 	I	all	

² Whether learning objects are stored in a central repository or kept locally and downloaded/converted on demand depends on the repository system, see section 4.

#	Subject	I T D	Who	Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The participants agree that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Content should be stored in small modules, not complete courses. It is more likely that such modules are reused. ○ It is important to separate learning content and learning instructions because teachers often would like to reuse learning content but give their own instructions ○ Users are interested in reusing complex, sophisticated modules, e.g. simulations; not simple objects (e.g. Power-Point slides) ○ UAS Master studies are one driver for sharing and re-using e-learning objects. Also small institutes are forced to reuse existing content due to economical constraints. ○ Ease of use is a must! Otherwise content is neither stored nor reused. Browser-based file uploading e.g. is not user friendly enough. 			
3.3	PHTG has made the experience that it needs a lot of motivation and coordination by CSPC's. Otherwise, authors do not reuse content created by others.	I	SG	
3.4	Commercial content: The repository could also include commercial learning objects.	I		
3.5	National / international Sharing of learning objects is not limited to national boundaries. Therefore, the repository should support the exchange of learning objects with institutions in other countries.	I	ES	
4. Repository models				
4.1	Rolf Brugger, edutech, has prepared an overview of existing OSS repositories. There are four different scenarios.			
4.2	<p>Learning object repository system (LOR system)</p> <p>Despite the fact that such systems are available out of the box (e.g. Ariadne), they are not widely used. Participants believe that they are too complex.</p> <p>USI has developed its own OSS LOR, based on SCORM, but much simpler than Ariadne. The next step will be to integrate it with moodle. Their system has a good acceptance by their authors, e.g. for SVC courses. It could be a candidate for a national repository (scalability on a national level would have to be proven).</p> <p>OLAT contains also a "lightweight" repository.</p>	I I I	JM ES	

#	Subject	I T D	Who	Date
4.3	<p>Learning object repository federation</p> <p>The idea of storing only the meta information in a central repository and keeping the objects in local LMS would be attractive.</p> <p>For the authors of learning objects, it might be easier to add a link to a repository pointing to their content than to upload their content.</p> <p>Features like rating, peer reviews, commenting, etc. help to improve the quality of the available content.</p> <p>These features (and Amazon-like hints, e.g. "The downloaders of this learning object have also downloaded the following objects....") are also improving the quality of a search result.</p> <p>With a central search engine indexing the content of local repositories and LMS's, the need for adding meta-tags to content would become redundant. But it might be technically too complex to implement such a search engine which would have to access different types of LMS and to index learning objects stored in different (LMS specific) formats.</p>	I	all	
4.4	<p>Web content management and file version control system</p> <p>Web content management systems (e.g. Drupal) are rather generic, but a LOR could be built on top of it.³</p> <p>File version control systems like CVS are used by software developers and might be used by a team of developers of learning objects; but do not support the use cases described in 3.1.</p>	I I	JM REA	
4.5	<p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Learning object repository federation" seems to be the most feasible of the four models • LMS (e.g. OLAT) have built-in repository functionality and could be part of a distributed LMS 	I	all	
5. Requirement catalog				
5.1	A few of the requirements of the catalog provided by the project management has been discussed during the meeting (see below). All participants are asked to prioritize the requirements (must, optional, not important), to comment / answer the questions and to complement the catalog.	T	all	2.6.06
5.2	<p>Requirement 1 (import/export functionality)</p> <p>Integration with major LMS is important.</p>	I		
5.3	<p>Requirement 8 (free/anonymous access)</p> <p>The repository should support access restrictions like</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free for everybody • free for members of Swiss universities • free for members of a closed user group (virtual team) 	I		

³ see e.g. <http://www.darcynorman.net/2006/05/04/drupal-as-learning-object-repository>

#	Subject	I T D	Who	Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> retrievable, but accessible only after having fulfilled special conditions (e.g. license agreement signed, license fee paid, etc.). 			
5.4	<p>Requirement 12 (Compliance with SCORM and other standards)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The repository should allow sharing content in many formats; but special features, like import/export/conversion will be limited to a few standardized formats. Not only the exchange of SCORM packages but also the exchange of single files (e.g. flash) should be supported. IMS-QTI is an important format for sharing tests 	I		
6. Next meeting				
6.1	<p>The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, June, 7, 08:30-10:30: This will be a virtual meeting using Breeze!</p> <p>Starting at 08:00, there will be a test session for Breeze novice. Instructions will follow.</p>	I	all	

To Do

Nr.	from	Subject	Who	Date	Status
3	17.5.06	Add your comments to the requirements catalog (http://numsum.com/spreadsheet/show/21579)	all	2.06.06	new
1	19.4.06	Have a closer look at related initiatives mentioned in section 9.1 (meeting minutes of April 19 2006)	all	17.05.06	done
2	19.4.06	Review minutes of all groups, send feedback and discuss new ideas on wiki	all	17.05.06	done