

IEEE P1484.20~~XXX~~TM/D01

January 14, 2004

Draft Standard for Information Technology – Learning Technology – Competency Definitions
Standard for a Reusable Definition of Competency or Educational Objective

Sponsored by the
Learning Technology Standards Committee~~<name>Committee~~
of the
IEEE~~IEEE~~~~<name>~~ Society

Copyright © 2004 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.
Three Park Avenue
New York, New York 10016-5997, USA
All rights reserved.

This document is an unapproved draft of a proposed IEEE Standard. As such, this document is subject to change. **USE AT YOUR OWN RISK!** Because this is an unapproved draft, this document must not be utilized for any conformance/compliance purposes. Permission is hereby granted for IEEE Standards Committee participants to reproduce this document for purposes of IEEE standardization activities only. Prior to submitting this document to another standards development organization for standardization activities, permission must first be obtained from the Manager, Standards Licensing and Contracts, IEEE Standards Activities Department. Other entities seeking permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, must obtain permission from the Manager, Standards Licensing and Contracts, IEEE Standards Activities Department.

IEEE Standards Activities Department
Standards Licensing and Contracts
445 Hoes Lane, P.O. Box 1331
Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331, USA

Introduction

(This introduction is not part of IEEE P1484.20XXX, Draft Standard for [Learning Technology Competency Definitions](#)~~a Reusable Definition of Competency or Educational Objective~~.)

Participants

At the time this standard was completed, the working group had the following membership:

~~Claude Ostyn, Chair~~ ~~Raghu Singh, Chair~~
~~Valerie Archangeau, Technical Editor~~

To Be Done.

~~Bob Banks~~
~~Adam Cooper~~
~~Kevin Donovan~~
~~Jon Mason~~
~~Mark Norton~~
~~Land Ormiston~~
~~Claude Ostyn~~
~~Dan Rehak~~
~~Robby Robson~~
~~Brian Taliesin~~
~~Tony Tait~~

The following members of the balloting committee voted on this standard. Balloters may have voted for approval, disapproval, or abstention. (To be provided by IEEE editor at time of publication.)

Acknowledgements

This document has its origins in IMS projects¹, without which this document could not have been created.

¹ <http://www.imsproject.org/>

Contents

Introduction	ii
Participants	ii
Acknowledgements	ii
Contents	iii
1. Overview	5
1.1 Scope	5
1.2 Purpose	6
2. References	6
3. Definitions and Acronyms	7
4 Data Elements	8
4.1 Ordering of Data Elements	10
4.2 Taxonomies of Competency or Objective Definitions	10
4.3 Smallest Permitted Maximum Values	12
Annex A: Bibliography	14
Annex B: Best Practice and Implementation Guide	15
Annex C: XML Binding	16

Draft Standard for Information Technology – Learning Technology – Competency Definitions

Style Sheet for Electronic Document Formatting Ver. 6.2

1. Overview

This ~~specification~~standard defines an information model for describing, referencing, and exchanging definitions of competencies, primarily in the context of online and distributed learning. The RDCEO standard provides a means to create common understandings of competencies that appear as part of a learning or career plan, as learning pre-requisites, or as learning outcomes. RDCEO provides unique references to descriptions of competencies or objectives for inclusion in other information models.

~~In this specification, the word “Competency” is used in a very general sense that to includes skills, knowledge, tasks, and learning outcomes. This specification standard gives~~provides a way to formally represent the key characteristics of a competency, independent of its use in any particular context. It enables interoperability among learning systems that deal with competency information by providing a means for them to refer to common definitions with common meanings. The information model in this standard can be used to exchange these definitions between learning systems, human resource systems, learning content, competency or skills repositories, and other relevant systems (The RDCEO that conform to this standard are intended for interchange by machines, but the information they contain is currently intended for human interpretation).

~~The core information in a Reusable Definition of Competency or Educational Objective (RDCEO) is an unstructured textual definition of the competency that can be referenced through a globally unique identifier. This information may be refined using a user-defined model of the structure of a competency.~~

~~The RDCEO specification provides a means to create common understandings of competencies that appear as part of a learning or career plan, as learning pre-requisites, or as learning outcomes. The information model in this specification can be used to exchange these definitions between learning systems, human resource systems, learning content, competency or skills repositories, and other relevant systems. RDCEO provides unique references to descriptions of competencies or objectives for inclusion in other information models.~~

~~The RDCEO that conform to this specification are intended for interchange by machines, but the information they contain is currently intended for human interpretation. This specification does not address the aggregation of smaller competencies into larger competencies (e.g., “throws” plus “catches” equals “plays ball”) and does not address how competencies are to be assessed, certified, recorded, or used as part of a process such as instructional design or knowledge management. It also does not specify how records of competencies associated with an individual are structured, stored, or exchanged.~~

1.1 Scope

This standard shall specify the mandatory and optional data elements that constitute a Competency Definition as used in a Learning Management System, or referenced in a Competency Profile. This standard is intended to satisfy the following objectives:

- Provide a standardized data model for reusable Competency Definition records that can be exchanged or reused in one or more compatible systems
- Reconcile various existing and emerging data models into a widely acceptable model
- Provide a standardized way to identify the type and precision of a Competency Definition
- Provide a unique identifier as the means to unambiguously reference are usable Competency Definition regardless of the setting in which this Competency Definition is stored, found, retrieved, or used. For example, metadata that describe learning content may contain a reference to one or more Competency Definition records that describe the learning objectives for the content.
- Provide a standardized data model for additional information about a Competency Definition, such as a title, description, and source, compatible with other emerging learning asset metadata standards
- * Provide a controlled vocabulary to express how competency definitions are semantically related.

This standard specifically does not cover:

- A data format, bindings or coding, except as minimally required for the purpose of exchange between compliant implementations
- Quality and accuracy in the data itself, although it will describe recommended best practices. For example, this standard does not cover the quality or validation of the various parts of a learning objective statement.
- A competency model, or a taxonomy of competencies.
- How the relationships between competencies are stored in a database or learning management system.
- Certification data models. However, Certification records can reference Competency Definitions. For example, an accredited authority may grant certificates that acknowledge that an individual meets the requirements for a particular competency.
- Individual competency records, as would be found in the competency profiles of individuals or groups. However, such records can include references to specific Competency Definitions. For example, a competency profile for an individual may include a collection of certificates which in turn reference Competency Definitions, as well as a collection of references to the definitions for competencies to be acquired.

This standard does not address the aggregation of smaller competencies into larger competencies (e.g., “throws” plus “catches” equals “plays ball”) and does not address how competencies are to be assessed, certified, recorded, or used as part of a process such as instructional design or knowledge management. It also does not specify how records of competencies associated with an individual are structured, stored, or exchanged.

~~This document is the IMS Reusable Definition of Competency and Educational Objective Specification version 1.0. As such it forms one of a set that comprise the specification, each with distinct scope:~~

~~Information Model~~

~~Describes the core aspects of the specification and is normative for any binding claiming to use this information model. It contains details of: semantics, structure, data types, value spaces, multiplicity, and obligation (i.e., whether mandatory or optional).~~

~~XML Binding~~

~~Describes a binding of the Information Model to XML version 1.0 and is normative for any XML instance that claims to use this binding, whether by reference to the specification or by declaration of the namespace reserved by the specification. In cases of error or omission, the Information Model takes precedence. The RDCEO XML Binding is released with a control document using W3C Schema Language that should be used in implementations.~~

~~Best Practices and Implementation Guide~~

~~Provides non-normative guidance on application of the Information Model and XML Binding. This includes reference to existing practice in handling information that this specification seeks to support and guidance on practices that will promote interoperability and durability. It also includes examples to illustrate how the conceptual framework maps to practical uses and to identify the relationship between this specification and related IMS specifications. Implementers are encouraged, but not required, to follow guidance in this part of the specification.~~

1.2 Purpose

~~The purpose of this standard is to define a universally acceptable Competency Definition model to allow the creation, exchange and reuse of Competency Definition in applications such as Learning Management Systems, Competency or Skill Gap Analysis, Learner and other Competency profiles, etc. The standard is needed because there are currently many definitions of the terms "Learning Objective", "Competency" and "Skill", and very little agreement between how those definitions can be used to define reusable data models. This standard uses a general definition that can be semantically "tightened" or "loosened" in the data itself, while conserving the same data model regardless of how strictly a particular organization or institution requires the data to be formulated. This standard also addresses the following needs:~~

- ~~— A common data model that allows the building of various competency models, hierarchies and maps (however, the definitions for such applications are outside the scope of this standard).~~
- ~~— A standard that allows persistent, long lived Competency Definitions to be created, exchanged among systems, and maintained.~~
- ~~— A standard method by which Competency Definitions can be identified as globally unique among compliant systems and repositories.~~
- ~~— A standard method to mark a superseded or obsolete Competency Definition, and to point to a more current Competency Definition.~~
- ~~— A common data model for the meta data that give a reusable Competency Definition its value in a reuse environment, such as the source of the Competency Definition, validation information, and other meta information useful to locate an objective in a repository or collection.~~
- ~~— Correspondence with the Learning Objects Metadata Standard developed by a parallel group.~~

2. References

- ~~(A2A);—~~ <http://www.aligntoachieve.org> (Align to Achieve)
- ~~(ACRL);—~~ <http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilstandardlo.html> (Association of College and Research Libraries. Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education: Standards, Performance Indicators, and Outcomes)
- ~~(CASAS);—~~ <http://www.casas.org/>
- ~~(CPA);—~~ <http://www.cpavision.org/poll/corecomp.cfm> (Core Competencies for CPAs)
- ~~(HR-XML);—~~ <http://www.hr-xml.org/> (HR-XML Consortium)
- ~~(IEEE 1484-12:2002IEEELOM);—~~ <http://ltse.ieee.org/IEEE1484-12:2002;> ~~—~~ Standard for Learning Object Metadata
- ~~(IMSBUND);—~~ http://www.imsglobal.org/implementationhandbook/imspack_handv1p0.html (Using IMS Content Packaging to Package Instances of LIP and Other IMS Specifications)
- ~~(IMSMD);—~~ <http://www.imsglobal.org/metadata/> (IMS Meta-Data Specification)

- (~~IMSPLID~~), http://www.imsglobal.org/implementationhandbook/imsrid_handv1p0.html, IMS Persistent, Location-Independent, Resource Identifier Implementation Handbook version 1.0
- (~~LSDA~~), <http://www.lsda.org.uk/> (Learning and Skills Development Agency)
- (~~Mager~~), [Robert Mager, 1984. Preparing Instructional Objectives, 2nd Edition. Lake Pub. Co., Belmont, CA.](#)
- (~~NOCN~~), <http://www.nocn.org.uk/> (National Open College Network)
- (~~NOICC~~), <http://www.academicinnovations.com/noicc.html> (National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee: High School Student Competencies and Indicators)
- (~~O~~ —* http://www.access.gpo.gov/o_net/datadict/datadict.pdf) <http://www.onetcenter.org/> (or http://www.access.gpo.gov/o_net/datadict/datadict.pdf)
- (~~Ostyn~~), <http://ltsc.ieee.org/doc/wg20/CompDefInit.doc> (Base document from P1484.20)
- (~~PASS~~), <http://www.ous.edu/pass/standards/admission.html> (Oregon Proficiency-based Admissions Standards System)
- (~~RFC 2396~~), <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2396.txt> (Uniform Resource Identifiers)
- (~~SCANS~~), <http://www.tier.net/tcenters/scans.htm> (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills: Competencies)
- (~~SCORM~~), <http://www.adlnet.org> (ADL SCORM)
- (~~TATS~~), <http://www.adtdl.army.mil/atdls.htm> (Total Army Training System)
- (~~XPOINTER~~), <http://www.w3.org/TR/xptr-framework/> (XPointer Framework, Working Draft 10 July 2002)

3. Definitions and Acronyms

For the purposes of this standard, the following terms and definitions apply. [IEEE 100, The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, Seventh Edition](#) should be referenced for terms not defined in this clause.

- 1) ~~Identifier: A globally unique label that identifies this Definition of Competency or Educational Objective. This identifier uses the same data elements as the Identifier element defined in the IEEE LOM standard, and consists of two sub-elements: Catalogue and Entry. The Identifier is sufficient to reference the competency in any other system.~~
- 2) ~~Title: A single mandatory text label for the competency or objective. This is a short human-readable name for the competency. While the Identifier provides the definitive reference to the definition, it is typically unintelligible. The Title provides a convenient alternative readable form, but one which is not the definitive label. The Title may be repeated in multiple languages.~~
- 3) ~~Description: A human readable description of the competency. This is an optional unstructured (opaque) "text blob" meant to be interpretable only by humans. The Description may be repeated in multiple languages.~~

3.1.4) Definition: An optional structured description that provides a more complete definition of the competency or educational objective, usually using attributes taken from a specific model of how a competency or educational objective should be structured or defined.

~~Typically, such models define a competency or educational objective in terms of a “statement, conditions, criteria”, “proficiency, criteria, indicators”, “standards, performance indicators, outcomes”, “abilities, basic skills, content, process”, and similar sets of statements.~~

3.2: Definition Element: ~~The Definition element provides a structure for including an arbitrary collection of statements that determine a competency or educational objective. The author of a RDCEO is free to use the Definition element in the way that best describes the competency or objective. The accompanying best practices guide and examples will illustrate potential ways to express different types of competencies, objectives, and competency or objective models using the Definition element.~~

The Definition element contains the following sub-elements:

(A) Model Source: An identifier of the model or structure upon which the definition is based. The model defines which statements are used to define the competency; it defines the namespace and value-set of content for “Statement Name_i” ~~below.~~

~~NOTE: The value of Model Source should be specific enough to avoid conflict with other source names; therefore it is recommended that this value be a URI. If the value of Model Source is a URI, it may point to an actual document that defines the source formally. However, this is not required.~~

(B) Statement: A Statement is a description of a single characteristic of a definition. A definition must contain at least one and generally contains multiple statements. A statement has the following parts:

(C) Statement Id: An optional string that is a local identifier for the statement within the model._i

(i) Statement Name: An optional name that is a token used to label the statement.

~~The token is taken from a source vocabulary defined in the model identified by the Source element.~~

(ii) Statement Text: An optional unstructured textual description of those aspects of the competency referred to by the StatementName. ~~The StatementText may be repeated in multiple languages.~~

(iii) Statement Token: An optional vocabulary token, along with an identifier of the source of the vocabulary.
~~Note: Although all elements are optional, in practice a statement should contain at least one or more of these elements in order to be useful. For example, a particular learning objective model requires a list of specific statement strings, each of which has a specific name, such as “Condition”, “Performance” and “Standard”; a Definition matching this model would use the elements Statement Name and Statement Text.~~

3.3 Description: A human readable description of the competency. This is an optional unstructured (opaque) “text blob” meant to be interpretable only by humans.

3.4 LangString: as defined in IEEE 1484-12.1-2002: Standard for Learning Object Metadata (IEEE LOM), a composite datatype that includes a character string and information that identifies the language of the string.

3.5 Identifier: A globally unique label that identifies this Definition of Competency or Educational Objective.

~~5) — **Metadata:** Optional meta-data record that further describe the RDCEO.~~

~~If a meta-data record is included, it is recommended that this record conform to IEEE 1484-12.1-2002: Standard for Learning Object Metadata (IEEE LOM). In such conforming records, the version of the Metadata Specification standard is given in the meta-metadata element of the meta-data record.~~

~~NOTE: Useful meta-data defined in the IEEE LOM include additional identification as an entry in one or more catalogues, information about the author, the creation date, and the coverage (in the sense of the Dublin Core as adopted by the IEEE LOM.) The Relation element may be used to relate a definition to a prior version of the definition, and one or more Classification elements may be used to indicate where this particular definition fits in a taxonomy of competencies or educational objectives.~~

~~More than one meta-data record is allowed, but if there is more than one record each record should conform to a different meta-data specification. An implementation must accept any meta-data record that it cannot interpret, but it is not required to interpret such meta-data records.~~

~~NOTE: A particular binding specification or application profile may impose additional restrictions or requirements.~~ **3.6 Title:** A single mandatory text label for the competency or objective. This is a short human-readable name for the competency. The Title provides a convenient alternative readable form, but one which is not the definitive label.

3.7 Vocabulary: as defined in IEEE LOM, a vocabulary data element type is a composite datatype that includes an identifier of the source vocabulary and a token value.

3.8 Abbreviations Acronyms

ADL	Advanced Distributed Learning
DTD	Document Type Definition
IEEE	Institute of Electronic & Electrical Engineering
ISO	International Standards Organization
JTC	Joint Technical Committee
LTSC	Learning Technology Standards Committee
RDCEO	IMS Reusable Definition of Competency or Educational Objective (this specification)
SCORM	Shareable Courseware Object Reference Model
W3C	World Wide Web Consortium
XML	Extensible Mark-up Language

4 2.2 Ordering of Data Elements

The RDCEO data model is minimalist and extensible. It is purposely neutral with regard to models of competencies and the use of competencies. Competencies are defined and structured in many ways in different communities of practice (ACRL, CASAS, CPA, Mager, NOICC, O*Net, PASS, SCANS, TATS). This standard allows communities of practice to exchange information according to the model they use.

Extensibility can be achieved by defining the structure of the Definition of Competency or Educational Objective or by including Learning Object Metadata (LOM) elements in the Metadata portion.

The information model contains the following elements:

- a) Identifier: A globally unique label that identifies this Definition of Competency or Educational Objective. This identifier uses the same data elements as the Identifier element defined in the IEEE LOM standard, and consists of two sub-elements: Catalogue and Entry. The Identifier is sufficient to reference the competency in any other system.
- b) Title: A single mandatory text label for the competency or objective. This is a short human-readable name for the competency. While the Identifier provides the definitive reference to the definition, it is typically unintelligible. The Title provides a convenient alternative readable form, but one which is not the definitive label. The Title may be repeated in multiple languages.
- c) Description: A human readable description of the competency. This is an optional unstructured (opaque) “text blob” meant to be interpretable only by humans. The Description may be repeated in multiple languages.
- d) Definition: An optional structured description that provides a more complete definition of the competency or educational objective, usually using attributes taken from a specific model of how a competency or educational objective should be structured or defined. Typically, such models define a competency or educational objective in terms of a “statement, conditions, criteria,” “proficiency, criteria, indicators,” “standards, performance indicators, outcomes,” “abilities, basic skills, content, process,” and similar sets of statements.

The Definition element provides a structure for including an arbitrary collection of statements that determine a competency or educational objective. The author of a RDCEO is free to use the Definition element in the way that best describes the competency or objective. The accompanying best practices guide and examples will illustrate potential ways to express different types of competencies, objectives, and competency or objective models using the Definition element. The Definition element contains the following sub-elements:

- 1) Model Source: An identifier of the model or structure upon which the definition is based. The model defines which statements are used to define the competency; it defines the namespace and value-set of content for “Statement Name” below.
NOTE: The value of Model Source should be specific enough to avoid conflict with other source names; therefore it is recommended that this value be a URI. If the value of Model Source is a URI, it may point to an actual document that defines the source formally. However, this is not required.
- 2) Statement: A Statement is a description of a single characteristic of a definition. A definition must contain at least one and generally contains multiple statements. A statement has the following parts:
 - i) Statement Id: An optional string that is a local identifier for the statement within the model.
 - ii) Statement Name: An optional name that is a token used to label the statement. The token is taken from a sourced vocabulary defined in the model identified by the Source element.
 - iii) Statement Text: An optional unstructured textual description of those aspects of the competency referred to by the StatementName. The StatementText may be repeated in multiple languages.
 - iv) Statement Token: An optional vocabulary token, along with an identifier of the source of the vocabulary.

NOTE: Although all elements are optional, in practice a statement should contain at least one or more of these elements in order to be useful. For example, a particular learning objective model requires a list of specific statement strings, each of which has a specific name, such as “Condition,” “Performance,” and “Standard”; a Definition matching this model would use the elements Statement Name and Statement Text.

- E) Metadata: Optional meta-data record that further describe the RDCEO. If a meta-data record is included, it is recommended that this record conform to IEEE 1484-12.1-2002: Standard for Learning Object Metadata (IEEE LOM). In such conforming records, the version of the Metadata Specification standard is given in the meta-metadata element of the meta-data record.

NOTE: Useful meta-data defined in the IEEE LOM include additional identification as an entry in one or more catalogues, information about the author, the creation date, and the coverage (in the sense of the Dublin Core as adopted by the IEEE LOM.) The Relation element may be used to relate a definition to a prior version of the definition, and one or more Classification elements may be used to indicate where this particular definition fits in a taxonomy of competencies or educational objectives.

More than one meta-data record is allowed, but if there is more than one record each record should conform to a different meta-data specification. An implementation must accept any meta-data record that it cannot interpret, but it is not required to interpret such meta-data records.

NOTE: A particular binding specification or application profile may impose additional restrictions or requirements.

4.1 Ordering of Data Elements

All elements in this data model are intrinsically unordered. The order of the elements in the data model summary and the order of the values in a list of values bear no meaning. For example, if the model includes three statements, then the order of these statements is not significant. They may appear in any order without loss of information.

NOTE: A binding may impose a particular ordering on RDCEO data instances that conform to that binding. Other than conformance to the binding, no significance is associated or should be inferred from that ordering requirement. In particular, the ordering of Statement elements in a Definition is undefined.

4.2 ~~2.3~~ Taxonomies of Competency or Objective Definitions

There are various ways to classify competencies or educational objectives. This ~~specification~~ standard is intended to meet the simple need of referencing and cataloguing a competency or objective, not classifying it. Nonetheless, an implementation might want to include relation and classification information, which can be done through the embedding of optional meta-data as specified in the information model.

~~3.~~ RDCEO Elements

~~3.1~~ Summary

Table 1 – Summary of RDCEO Elements

Name	Explanation	Reqd	Mult	Value Space	Datatype	Notes
Identifier	A globally unique label that identifies this Definition of Competency or Objective	M	Single			
Catalog	The name or designator of the identification or cataloguing scheme for this entry. A cataloguing scheme.	M	Single	Repertoire of ISO/IEC 10646-1:2000, as allowed by RFC 2396	Character String (smallest permitted maximum: 1000 characters)	Examples: "ISBN", "ARIADNE", "URI", "http://acme.org/compmodcat"

Name	Explanation	Reqd	Mult	Value Space	Datatype	Notes
Entry	The value of the identifier within the identification or cataloguing scheme that designates or identifies this Definition of Competency or Educational Objective. A namespace specific string	M	Single	Repertoire of ISO/IEC 10646-1:2000, as allowed by RFC 2396	Character String (smallest permitted maximum: 1000 characters)	Examples: "2-7342-0318", "LEAO875", "http://imglobal.org/dco/1234"
Title	Text label of this RCEOD	M	Single-*(a)		LangString(smallest permitted maximum: 1000 characters)	Examples: "English proficiency", "Schmiblick failure diagnostic level 4", "Demonstrates conflict resolution skills"
Description	Description of the Competency or Educational Objective	O	Single-(a)*		LangString(smallest permitted maximum: 2000 characters)	Examples: "Proficiency in written and spoken English and use of English for meaningful oral or written expression.", "Performance of level 4 diagnostic as specified in IETM #SCMBLK007"
Definition	A list of statements according to a particular definition model	O	Multiple			
Model Source	Source of the Model being used	O	Single	Repertoire of ISO/IEC 10646-1:2000, as allowed by RFC 2396	Character String (smallest permitted maximum: 1000 characters)	Examples: "3-part-learning-objective", "http://foo.edu/ref/lo s.xml"
Statement		O	Multiple			
Statement ID	A local identifying label for the Statement	O	Single		Character String (smallest permitted maximum: 4096 characters)	

Name	Explanation	Reqd	Mult	Value Space	Datatype	Notes
Statement Name	Name of the Statement	O	Single	String		Examples: "Condition", "Action", "Standard", "Outcome", "Criteria"
Statement Text	Text of the statement	O	Single (a)*	LangString		Example: "Given a set of integer numbers in the range 1 to 49"
Statement Token	Token value for the statement	O	Single	Vocabulary defined in definition model	Vocabulary (state)	
Metadata	Embedded Metadata about this RDCEO	O	Single			
RDCEO Schema	Describes the schema that defines and controls this RDCEO	O	Single	Repertoire of ISO/IEC 10646-1:2000, as allowed by RFC 2396	Character String (smallest permitted maximum: 100 characters)	If no schema element is present in a RDCEO instance, its value is assumed to be "IMS RDCEO"
RDCEO Schema Version	Describes the version of the above schema.	O	Single	Repertoire of ISO/IEC 10646-1:2000, as allowed by RFC 2396	Character String (smallest permitted maximum: 20 characters)	If no schema version element is present in a RDCEO instance, its value is assumed to be "1.0"
{Additional Metadata}	Additional embedded Metadata describing this RDCEO	O	Multiple	The information contained in this section is defined by the IMS Metadata specification	Smallest permitted maximum 10	See (see Annex A) Best Practice document guidance for Metadata records

* (a) Elements with type "LangString" and multiplicity "single" must appear at most once per language but may appear multiple times with different language attributes. The smallest permitted maximum of such expressions of a LangStrings is 10.

3.2 — Datatypes

~~LangString is as defined in IEEE 1484-12.1-2002: Standard for Learning Object Metadata (IEEE LOM). A LangString is a composite datatype that includes a character string and information that identifies the language of the string.~~

~~Vocabulary is as defined in IEEE LOM. A Vocabulary data element type is a composite datatype that includes an identifier of the source vocabulary and a token value.~~

4.3 ~~3.3~~ Smallest Permitted Maximum Values

In the Information Model, smallest permitted maximum values are defined for:

- ~~==~~• Items with multiple values: All applications that process RDCEO instances shall process at least that number of entries stated. In other words: an application may impose a maximum on the number of entries it processes for a data element with multiple values, but that maximum shall not be lower than the smallest permitted maximum value.
- ~~==~~• Data elements with type CharacterString or LangString: All applications that process RCD instances shall process at least that length for the CharacterString value (either directly or contained in the LangString) of that data element. In other words: an application may impose a maximum on the number of characters it processes for the CharacterString value of that data element, but that maximum shall not be lower than the smallest permitted maximum value for the data type of the data element.

NOTES

~~Note-1~~ ~~==~~:-The intent is for the smallest permitted maximum values to cover most cases.

~~Note-2~~ ~~==~~:-What “processing” means in the above depends on the nature of the application.

Annex A: Bibliography

(informative)

To be added.

Annex B: Best Practice and Implementation Guide

(informative)

To be added.

Annex C: XML Binding

(informative)

To be added.