

# Survey of Educational Metadata Use

Number of returns: 23

## About the respondent

### Role

#### **Sector**

Higher Education	21	Further Education	7
School Education	2	Commercial	1
Other	1		

full remit of the Learning and Skills Community

#### **Area of Expertise**

Library	7	Learning Technology	15
Computer Science	5	Learning & Teaching Support	6
other	4		

Web Design

#### **Type of Work**

Research	12	Teaching	3
Management	3	Resource Description	14
Staff Development	4	Programmer	5
Other	2		
	Project officer, national support for practitioners in post 14 education re use of ILT, Training, content management, Web Design and Support		

Note: some people gave an "other" type of work without checking the "other" box, hence the difference between the last two items.

#### **Experience**

1 have no knowledge of metadata issues

3 are Aware of basic metadata issues

4 are contributing to a developing implementation of a metadata schema for the first time

11 have contributed to an implementation of a metadata schema

4 have made a significant contribution to a successful implementation of a metadata schema

**Note:** this question changed between testing and final version.

## Details about the project/service

### Main concerns of project

#### **Area of Work**

8 produce learning materials  
20 describe learning materials  
16 produce tools for describing learning materials  
16 produce tools for discovering learning materials  
6 others

#### **Motivation**

12 provide service / product      17 do research

#### **Number of resource descriptions**

1 Less than 10	0 10-99
6 100-999	4 1 000-9 999
1 More than 10 000	2 not applicable

#### **Level of Granularity**

13 describe single files (e.g. single image, web page or simulation).  
8 describe single lesson (i.e. about 50 minutes worth of learning material)  
6 describe 2-5 lessons at a time  
7 describe 5 or more lessons at a time

#### **Use and Reference to IMS/LOM/SCORM**

15 make reference to IMS/LOM/SCORM, 5 don't and 2 don't know what these are.

#### **Reasons for doing so:**

Of its educational elements

useful for describing searching lessons

I'm working with digital repositories

promoting the reuse of learning content across multiple environments

Wanted to benefit from work which had been put into these initiatives instead of re-inventing the wheel. Hoped they would provide route for interoperability.

IMS/IEEE LOM are producing a standard, which is how interoperability is made possible. Interoperability will be good for our audience in that it will cut down on the number of different places they will have to visit in order to discover resources that they are interested in. It is also good for products like our database because sharing records is a very quick and cheap way to populate the database. However we have no one to interoperate with at present.

seem to be standard for describing educational resources such as we are collecting, and for inclusion in MLEs

we we're going to buy an IMS compliant VLE - but it turned out that it wasn't compliant at all!

Used IMS Learning Resource Meta-data as it is designed to describe educational materials.

For interoperability with the Dublin Core which is used in the website.

Ferl had its CMS system built to our stated specifications, which incorporate IMS and IEEE LOM see 2.5, and IMS Meta-data Specification 1.2 contains reference IEEE LOM

it helps with the initialisation

We have matched our database fields to corresponding IMS v.1.2 fields and describe these matches as 'conformant'.

### Reasons for not doing so

We use Dublin Core Metadata (with local qualifiers) and have not yet attempted to map it to IMS.

Yes and no. Follow concepts but implementations have to be implemented to budgets and timescale

schema mapped to modified Dublin Core, DC-Ed

### How do you use the Metadata schema?

8 stores records in this format.

4 stores records which can be converted to this format.

### What proportion of the schema is used?

3 Less than 25%

1 50-75%

1 all of it

4 25-50%

1 75-99%

2 don't know

### Importance of Groups of elements to project/service

	General	life-cycle	meta-meta	Tech	Edu	Rights	Relation	Annot	Classific
Not important	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	6	1
Fairly important	2	3	5	1	2	2	4	3	4
Important	3	5	2	4	3	6	1	0	0
Very important	2	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	4
Essential	4	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
Don't know	6	7	8	6	7	8	8	8	6

### Exchanging IMS Records

2 exchange records, 15 don't.

### Are you aware of or using any of the following Specifications?

IMS Enterprise	1 Using	13 Aware of	4 Not aware of
IMS Content Packaging	5 Using	14 Aware of	1 Not aware of
IMS Question and Test	2 Using	15 Aware of	2 Not aware of
IMS Learner Information	1 Using	14 Aware of	3 Not aware of
IMS Competency Definitions	0 Using	12 Aware of	6 Not aware of
IMS Accessibility	0 Using	15 Aware of	3 Not aware of
DC-Ed	6 Using	15 Aware of	0 Not aware of
Ariadne	0 Using	14 Aware of	0 Not aware of