Rubric HTML/JavaScript Tool

# Requirements / suggestions the Tool (extensions over current status)

The suggested strategy is as follows:

With respect to collecting data, we should add possibilities to collecting all data that is relevant to at least one of the institutions or the courses. In cases where a data item is simply not available or not meaningful, it can simply be left blank. Of course, this should be kept within limits, because too many input fields will clutter the view and impact the simplicity of using the tool.

With respect to functionality, we only aim for a common behavior which is relevant to all users. For example, the automatic feedback generation may be orthogonal for different institutions. The tool contains a sample implementation for the work flows that we envision. The implementation can be extended and changed by partners themselves.

In summary, suggestions regarding functional behavior should only be made, when they are relevant to QPED as a whole. Other extensions or changes of behavior may be implemented directly by the interested partner site. This will be possible as the source is available.

## Filling in the rubric (page: “Rubric.html”)

Additional data to collect:

* For each feature, for positive and negative examples, add a check box with a text field to allow entering a custom example
* In general: free text to store comments from corrector

Data format for output (to be used in QPED-O4 evaluation):

CSV file with the following columns:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Column short description** | **Explanation** |
| Assignment Identifier | (see Section 1.2) |
| Grader |  |
| Score for Modularity feature | 1 – 4 (or 0 for “not applicable”) |
| Score for Data Types feature | 1 – 4 (or 0 for “not applicable”) |
| … | And so on for all features in the rubric |
| Achieved Points | Actually awarded grade for the solution by the examiner. (maximum points stored for assignment, see Section 1.2) |
| Selected examples | A list of the selected examples, positive and negative. The examples have a unique “key” in the implementation, so that we can simply store a list of the keys |

Automatic score pre-selection:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategy** | **Type your name next to strategies that you agree with** |
| Score based on percentage of selected positive and negative examples: | (current implementation)  Christoph |
|  | Christoph (favorite, closer to our grading scheme) |

## Defining task (page: “new task.html”)

Additional data in the selection of the features:

* Allow to specify weight (used for automatic grading/feedback, not for the data collection for QPED)
* Add features from IO2 (Procedural guidance)

Functionality extension:

* Add buttons to collectively enable/disable groups of features at once, e.g., all PG-related features.

Additional meta-information to collect about the assignment:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Possible values** |
| Institution | One of:   * OUNL * TUE * UOC * UMR |
| Course | One of:   * OOP (UMR) * TODO |
| Max. points | Number |
| Identifier | Text  Either auto generated (UUID), or hand written (then lecturer must ensure uniqueness within the same course) |
| Relevant QPED deliverables | Selection of 0 or more of:   * IO1 – TILEd slides * IO1 – TILEd assignment * IO2 – PG API * IO2 – PG IPI * IO2 – PG Implementation * IO3 – syntax, semantics (solution approach) * IO3 – style * IO3 – testing * IO3 – class design |
| Reference to assignment from IO1 or IO2 inventory | Identifier (Text) |
| Topic(s) according to IO1 blueprint | Selection of 0 or more of:   * … |
| Level of the course | Selection of 1 of:   * First semester (1st/2nd quarter) * Second semester (3rd/4th quarter) * >= Third semester |
| Differentiation of background | Selection of 1 of:   * Extra support * Regular * Challenging |
| Week within course | Number |