

Projecting Quality

Stephen Downes, Hélène Fournier, Chaouki Regoui Presented at MADLaT, Winnipeg, May 7, 2004



Introduction

- Presentation of results from the Sifter Organizer project
- Collaboration with Mosaic Technologies, Inc.
- Selection of learning objects based on their metadata
- Filtering and sorting them according to their rated quality

IIT e-learning



Mosaic Technologies

- Created custom e-learning for corporate clients
- Employed instructional designers in production
- Required streamlined LO search and retrieval
- Ultimate objective: zero time of development

IIT e-learning



Our Proposal

- Describe learning resources using metadata
- Harvest metadata from various repositories
- Develop LO evaluation metadata format
- Employ evaluation results in search process



Previous Work

- Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching (MERLOT) http://www.merlot.org
- Learning Object Review Instrument (LORI) http://www.elera.net/eLera/Home/About%20%20LORI/
- Various definitions of evaluation criteria

•eg. DESIRE http://www.desire.org/handbook/2-1.html

•Nesbit, et.al. <u>http://www.cjlt.ca/content/vol28.3/nesbit_etal.html</u>



MERLOT

- Peer review process
- Materials 'triaged' to presort for quality
- 14 editorial boards post reviews publicly
- Criteria (five star system):
 - Quality of Content
 - Potential Effectiveness as a Teaching-Learning Tool
 - Ease of Use



LORI

- Members browse collection of learning objects
- Review form presented, five star system, 9 criteria
- Object review is an aggregate of member reviews



IIT e-learning



Issues (1)

- The peer review process in MERLOT is too slow, creating a bottleneck
- Both MERLOT and LORI are centralized, so review information is not widely available
- Both MERLOT and LORI employ a single set of criteria but different media require different criteria



Issues (2)

- Results are a single aggregation, but different types of user have different criteria
- In order to use the system for content retrieval, the object must be evaluated



What we wanted...

 a method for determining how a learning resource will be appropriate for a certain use when it has never been seen or reviewed

• a system that collects and distributes learning resource evaluation metadata that associates quality with known properties of the resource (e.g., author, publisher, format, educational level)



Recommender Systems

• "Collaborative filtering or recommender systems use a database about user preferences to predict additional topics or products a new user might like." (Breese, et.al., http://www.research.microsoft.com/users/breese/cfalgs.html)

• The idea is that associations are mapped between:

- User profile properties of given users
- Resource profile properties of the resource
- Previous evaluations of other resources

(See also <u>http://www.cs.umbc.edu/~ian/sigir99-rec/</u> and <u>http://www.iota.org/Winter99/recommend.html</u>)



Firefly

- One of the earliest recommender systems on the web
- Allowed users to create a personal profile
- In addition to community features (discuss, chat) it allowed users to evaluate music
- User profile was stored in a 'Passport'
- Bought by Microsoft, which kept 'Passport' and shut down Firefly (see http://www.nytimes.com/library/cyber/week/062997firefly.html)



Launch.Com

- Launched by Yahoo!, allows users to listen to music and then rate selections
- Detailed personal profiling available
- Commercials make service unusable, significant product placement taints selections http://www.launch.com





Match.com

- Dating site
- User creates personal profile, selection criteria
- Adds 'personality tests' to profile





Our Methodology

- Perform a multidimensional quality evaluation of LOs (multi criteria rating)
- Build a quality evaluation model for LOs based on their metadata or ratings
- Use model to assign a quality value to unrated LOs
- Update object's profile according to its history of use
- Identify most salient user profile parameters



Rethinking Learning Object Metadata

- Existing conceptions of metadata inadequate for our needs
 - Getting the description right
 - The problem of trust
 - Multiple descriptions
 - New types of metadata
- The concept of *resource profiles* developed to allow the use of evaluation metadata



Resource Profiles

- Multiple vocabularies (eg., for different types of object)
- Multiple authors (eg., content author, publisher, clissifier, evaluator)
- Distributed metadata (i.e., files describing the same resource may be located in numerous repositories)
- Metadata models
- Analogy: personal profile

See http://www.downes.ca/files/resource_profiles.htm



Types of Metadata

First Person	Second Person	Third Person
- Bibliographic - Technical - Rights	- Educational - Sequence and Relational - Interaction	- Evaluation - Classification
Created by the content author or publisher	Created by the content user (in the process of use)	Created by disinterested third parties



Evaluation Approach...

- Development and definition of evaluative metadata
- Expanding evaluation schema to include user types with a set of relevant ratings at different levels of detail
- Quality evaluator for the assessment of perceived subjective quality of a learning object based on criteria specific to each type of object

IIT e-learning



Our Approach

- Quality evaluator using LO type-specific evaluation criteria with rating summary or 'report card'
 - information according to eight groups of LO users
 - weighted global rating
 - user-tailored weighting; user preferences of the evaluation quality criteria
- Combination of subjective quality values that are purposefully fuzzy



Sample Schema

Example Learner 1EVALSCHEMA

User type = Learner

extension		Huulo	Fideo	Text
Level 1_Overall	minimum quality index: 0-10 scale, 0.5 increments	AudioVideoTextminimum quality index: 0-10minimum quality index: 0-10minimum quality index: 0-10scale, 0.5scale, 0.5scale, 0.5incrementsincrementsincrements\u00ef{u}\u00ef	minimum quality index: 0-10 scale, o.5 increments	
Level 1.1_ 1Quality of experience	u	u	u	u
Level 1.2_ satisfaction	u	u	u	u
Level 1.3_interest	u	u	u	u



Sample Schema (2)

Example Instructor2EVALSCHEMA

User type = Instructor Set of relevant ratings = level 2

Cat Ratings Metadata	Image	Audio	Video	Text
extension				
Level 2.1_ Quality of content	minimum quality index: 0-10 scale, o.5 increments	minimum quality index: 0-10 scale, o.5 increments	minimum quality index: 0-10 scale, o.5 increments	minimum quality index: 0-10 scale, o.5 increments
Level 2.1.1_accuracy	u	u	u	u
Level 2.1.2_aesthetic appeal	u	u	u	u
Level 2.1.3_consistency	Increments Increments Increments Increments u u u u u u u u u u u u u u u u			
Level 2.1.4_readability	u	u	u	u
Level 2.1.5_Appropriateness of representation	u	u	u	u
Level 2.2;_Educational value	u	u	u	u
Level 2.2.1_clarity of				



Representing Evaluation Data

- Using the schemas defined, evaluation data is stored as XML files
- These XML files are aggregated alongside learning object metadata
- Evaluation data may then be aggregated or interpreted



The Sifter Harvester

Sifter Harvest	er - Microsoft Internet Explorer				
SEARCH CR	ITERIA	Harvest Re	esults		
Harvest From:	LO Repository	Harvest Tir	ne: O seconds		
	K22-TOM	Items Four	id: 2		
Keywords:	xml	Pedagogic Type	Initial Adjusted results results	Browse	Deploy
Granularity of		Program	0	Γ	
Learning		Course	1		
Object:		Unit	0		
Intended User:	Any 🗾	Lesson	0		
Learning		Component		-	_
Resource	Any 📩	Audio	0	_	
Type.		Image	ů N	-	
Cost:	None 💌	Webpage	1	Ē	
Copyright	None -	Text	0	Γ	
restriction:		Video	0		
Min Quality	0 -	Others	0		
Index:		All L.O.	2		
	Predict QI			Browse	Deploy
	Set QI Preferences				
	Reset Harvest				

http://sifter.elg.ca stephen monctonz



The Sifter Tagger

🥙 Sifter	Metada	ta Tagg	er - Micros	oft Inter	net Expl	orer						_	
Active	Stand	ard: Ca	ncore				Si	fter I	earnii	na Oh	niect	Тадде	
File	Edit	View	Search	Filter	Crawl	Config	Help		V	ERSION	: .78	10330	
File T	ype:im	age/w	mf			Update	e Metadata Stat	e		G	UID: 10	5752210	34
Learn Dubli	n Core	ject: /	MUSICU7 Cancore ⁴	1.gif	LOM	~	scorm	: 🍾	Fully ta	gged, 🔦	Partia	ally tagge	d)
<u>1. Gen</u>	<u>eral</u>	0	.1 Identifi	er		105752:	2104			_			
<u>2. Life</u>	<u>Cycle</u>		.1.1 Catal	loq		URI			•				
<u>3. Met</u>	a Metada	ata Ø	.1.2 Entry			105752:	2104						
		- 0	.2 Title			Speaker	r graphic						
4. Tech	<u>hnical</u>		.3 Langua	<u>iqe</u>		fr-CA			•				
<u>5. Edua</u> <u>6. Righ</u>	<u>cational</u>	- •	.4 Descrip	i <u>tion</u>		graphic	of an audio sp	eaker		▲ ▼			
<u>7. Rela</u>	ation	•	.5 Subject	<u>t & Keyv</u>	<u>vord</u>	speaker	cartoon,graph;	nic					
8. Ann	otation		.6 Covera			none							
			.7 Structu			Linear			~				
<u>9. Clas</u>	sification	<u> </u>	.8 Aqqreq	ation le	vel	1			•				
<u>10.Qua</u>	ality Inde	**	Add De	lete	Update	Web Ta	ags Export XM	1L	H	I ⊲ Recoi	rd 1	of 87 🕨	~



Sifter Tagger with Rater















The User Profile

• user description data: required or available for the user to enter via sign-in forms for example:

- user information: age, gender, occupation, education level...
- user preferences: language, topics of interest, choice of media...
- automatically collected user data (user platform: OS, connection bandwidth ...)



LO Filtering

- Content filtering: based on content similarities (metadata-based) with other LOs (data scenario 2)
- Collaborative filtering: used when only ratings of LOs are available, no metadata (data scenario 3). It is carried out in two steps:
 - finding other users that exhibit similar rating patterns as the target user (called user neighborhood) by means of clustering algorithms
 - recommending LOs that have not been rated by target user according to their ratings by his neighborhood users

IIT e-learning



Sifter Harvester (2)

	Tago	jed Learr	ing	g Ot	ojects	Bro	wser
Resi	ults 1 - 2 of 2					Pag	e 1 of 1
<u>Dow</u>	Inload Free Tools to View LO		Resul	ts per	• page: <u>10</u>	20	<u>50 100</u>
No.	Description	Type/Format	Size	Year	Owner	View	Report
1	XML Tutorial. prev next XML Tutorial. In our XML tutorial you will learn what XML i and the differe	^s text/html	17k	2003	W3Schools	9	F
2	The TopXML XSLT tutorial introduces you to the basics of XSLT concepts, syntax, and programming	text/html	34k	0000	abc	9	
	1						
	Close Window						

Results screen



Sifter Harvester (3)

e i	Report Card - Microsoft Internet Exp	olorer	<u> </u>
	Learning	g Objects Repo	rt Card
0	bject ID: 1060204268		Others
		(Rating: 1=Poor 10	=Excellent)
R	eport Group	Reports Avg.Rat	ing Detail
1	Learner	0	0
2	Teacher	0	0
з	Institution	0	0
4	Company/Business	0	0
5	Developer/Designer	0	0
6	Tester	0	0
7	QA Specialist	0	0
8	Administrator	0	0
۷	Veighted Rating:	0	0
	Close Window	Rate Me	2

Evaluation Report



Sifter Harvester (4)

Evaluator

Dbject ID: 1060204268										C	thers
Quality Rating Overall Quality	Poor 1 ©	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	Exc	ellent 10 C	NA
Clarity of Learning Objective(s)	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	o	œ
Level of Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
Navigation Aids	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
Content Quality		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
Writing Style Help System	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Graphics	õ	Ő.	õ	0	ō	0	0	0	0	0	œ
Animations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	œ
Simulations	0	0	\odot	0	\odot	0	\odot	0	•	\odot	۲
Exercises	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	۲
Questions/Problems	0	0	\odot	۲	\odot	\odot	۲	\odot	\odot	0	۲
Pre/Post Test Questions	•	0	•	۲	0	•	•	0	0	•	۲
Teaching Effectiveness	0	0	\odot	۲	\odot	\odot	۲	\odot	0	•	۲
Teacher/Tutor Quality	•	0	0	•	0	0	•	۲	0	•	۲
				-	-		-	-	-		



LO Quality Prediction

- Calculating object's similarity with other rated LOs based on their content metadata
- Calculating user similarity
 - clustering of the users based on their profiles (users with same preferences, competence and interests)
 - co-rated LOs (rating patterns)
- Predict quality value of the unrated LO by the target user using target user neighborhood rating of similar LOs



Part II: Recommender system

IIT e-learning

User similarity : User Space

User profiles Similarity



User space dimensions

User profile elements



Part II: Recommender syster

IIT e-learning

LO similarity : LO Space

LO profiles Similarity



LO space dimensions

- Ratings (a dimension for each quality evaluation criterion),

- Some descriptive Metadata (Author, publisher, Last update ...)



Part II: Recommender syster

IIT e-learning

LO quality prediction



Clustering (non-supervised classification) of LOs & Users