

## **Name of Organization/Company/Repository/Other**

Learning Registry project (jointly funded by Dept of Defense and Education, as well as volunteer efforts by a number of other groups)

## **Overview Description of what the above does**

include:

- Goals: Share information about educational learning resources as widely as possible, including not just “first class” metadata but also usage data shared by third parties about the original data.
- Methods: Use a peer-based, open data sharing network to exchange the information.
- Audience: Educational learning resource creators, curators and users, primarily system operators not end users.
- How metadata plays a role in the service: We are providing a metadata distribution network on the internet (for educational use cases).

## **Technical Infrastructure used by the above**

- (if willing) What powers the resource (eg: CMS, Repository, or some other software, including custom): We use a custom well-structured API, implemented with a CouchDB backend, and some python middleware. The architecture is such that there is no one platform, but a network of data sharing among multiple implementations.

## **Metadata Currently in Use**

- List the one or more public standards already in use
  - please include what subset of the vocabulary is in use
  - => We use activitystrea.ms in part
- (if willing) List the one or more non-standards (internal and/or home-grown) vocabularies already in use
  - please include the vocabulary, or the subset of the vocabulary relevant to Learning Resources
  - => We have extended activitystrea.ms to support more complex expressions such as “anonymous actions” and “aggregate/multi-user actions”

## **Benefits to current system after integrating the completed LRMI standard**

include benefits such as:

- benefits from web-scale/big-three search engine consumption
- => We clearly want the data being shared within Learning Registry to be consumed by major search engines.
- => We also want to maximize interoperability with other tools developers and vendors, as the purpose of Learning Registry is to share information, not just within LR but with anyone, so using LRMI would facilitate that.
- how might the experience of your users change from the richer metadata consumption by the search engines?
- => We believe that sharing activity/usage data about learning resources will provide the ability for data providers (such as PBS, NSDL, Pearson, OERCommons, Curriki, etc) to provide more relevant and personalized recommendations and services to their users.
- how might changes to your system take advantage and build upon that richer metadata consumption?

- => Since our system is designed to facilitate metadata exchange and consumption, using a more standard format, if LRMI creates one to support our needs, would permit a broader audience to engage with the metadata being shared.
- example success scenarios
- => Third party data analytic firms mine the LRMI format data being exchanged on Learning Registry. They provide recommendation engine services which they rent to content aggregators such as PBS or Pearson, which results in improved recommendation of relevant educational resources provided to end users on these sites.

### **Costs to current system after integrating the completed LRMI standard**

include costs such as:

- Time/resources needed to add LRMI support
- => We are currently developing a spec for usage data within LR. If we complete and deploy this (by Nov 2011), then it will require effort on the partners parts to re-implement using LRMI. Learning Registry itself is format agnostic, so if partners are sharing using one format today (activitystrea.ms) and wish to choose LRMI later, there is not cost for LR as all formats can be transmitted. The costs are in integration into services by consumers of data in the Learning Registry.