

AY 2023/2024



POLITECNICO
MILANO 1863

POLITECNICO DI MILANO

RASD: Requirement Analysis and Specification Document

Tommaso Capacci Gabriele Ginestroni

Professor
Elisabetta DI NITTO

Version 1.2
November 13, 2023

Contents

| | | |
|----------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Purpose | 1 |
| 1.1.1 | Goals | 1 |
| 1.2 | Scope | 3 |
| 1.2.1 | Phenomena | 4 |
| 1.2.2 | Definitions | 6 |
| 1.2.3 | Acronyms | 6 |
| 1.2.4 | Abbreviations | 6 |
| 1.3 | Revision History | 6 |
| 1.4 | Reference Documents | 6 |
| 1.5 | Document Structure | 6 |
| 2 | Overall Description | 7 |
| 3 | Specific Requirements | 8 |
| 4 | Formal Analysis Using Alloy | 9 |
| 5 | Effort Spent | 10 |
| | References | 11 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

Traditional classroom teaching focuses heavily on theory and concepts, without providing sufficient opportunities for students to gain hands-on coding experience. Additionally, the student-instructor relationship is usually limited to formal lectures and exams, missing some kind of continuous evaluation, which is essential to stimulate learning.

CodeKataBattle aims to fill these gaps by facilitating competitive programming challenges that motivate students to put concepts into practice. The aim of the product is to provide an alternative to evaluate students with respect to their coding skills in a more enjoyable way: this is achieved by allowing educators to create tournaments in which students can participate and compete. Through integration with static analysis tools, the automated scoring system provides reliable evaluation so students can measure their improvements. By collaborating in teams, they also learn key skills like communication and source control. Indeed, participating to battles, students will gain experience in using GitHub as source control system.

These kind of evaluation also teaches how the test-first approach can be useful when it comes to developing a new piece of software.

For instructors, CodeKataBattle enables closer mentorship driven by qualitative code reviews, by including optional manual evaluation. In this way, educators will have the opportunity to enhance their code review skills while increasing the engagement with their students. Overall, the platform creates a virtuous cycle of learning powered by practice, feedback and community.

1.1.1 Goals

The main objectives of our system are the following:

- **G1: Allow students to participate to programming challenges in teams**

This is the main goal of the system. Students will be able to form teams to participate to Code Kata Battles and collaborate through GitHub.

- **G2: Allow educators to create tournaments**

Only educators are allowed to create tournaments, which are composed by a non predefined number of battles. Whenever a new tournament

is created, all the students of the platform are notified and can participate to it. After the creation of a tournament, the educator can add collaborators that will help him in the management of the tournament.

- **G3: Allow educators to create programming challenges**

The creator of the tournament (or invited collaborators) can create programming challenges (Code Kata Battles) within the context of a tournament.

- **G4: Let the system to automatically analyze and rank submissions of students**

Students submissions are automatically analyzed and ranked by the system, combining functional aspects, timeliness and quality level of sources. Functional aspects are measured in terms of number of unit test cases passed out of all test cases. Timeliness instead is measured in terms of elapsed time passed since the start of the battle. Finally, quality level of sources is measured in terms of code quality, whose aspects can be selected by the educator at battle creation time, and is computed by integrating with static analysis tools.

- **G5: Allow educators to manually inspect and review submissions of students**

Educators will have the possibility to enable manual evaluation of students' submissions for a battle. If the option is enabled, the educator, at the end of the submission phase of a battle, can review the code of all the teams and assign a score. In this case, the system will combine the automatically computed score with the manual one to produce the final battle rank.

- **G6: Allow students to track their performance**

Teams will be able to see their current rank evolving during the battle, updated for each new submission. Additionally, at the end of each battle, the platform updates a personal tournament score of each student, that is the sum of all battle scores received in that tournament. In this way, the student can track his performance during the tournament as well.

1.2 Scope

The Code Kata Battle (CKB) platform aims at providing a collaborative environment for students to enhance their software development skills through structured practice sessions called "code kata battles". CKB facilitates an engaging learning experience by enabling students to participate in friendly competition while refining their programming skills.

The system should allow 2 types of accesses, one for **educators** and the other for normal **students**: educators will have the possibility to create **tournaments** and **battles**, while students will have the possibility to subscribe to tournaments and provide solutions for the battles that compose them.

Students can decide whether to participate to a battle by creating a new team or joining one, in respect with the constraints decided by the educator at battle creation time. Teams can be created by students in the context of a battle so that other students subscribed to the same tournament can freely decide to join and team up to produce a solution.

The system will facilitate the collaboration between team members by integrating with **GitHub** through its *GitHub Actions*. In this way, students will be able to collaborate on the same project and share their code.

Once the students start developing their solutions, the platform will also start evaluating them. Evaluation is performed in 2 ways:

- Mandatory **automated evaluation**; it includes:
 - functional aspects measured in terms of number of test cases that are correctly solved; unit test cases are provided by the educator when uploading the project files related to the battle
 - timeliness, measured in terms of time passed between the start of the battle and the last commit
 - quality level of the sources, extracted through **external static analysis tools** that consider multiple aspects selected by the educator at battle creation time (e.g. security, reliability, and maintainability)
- Optional **manual evaluation**: personal score assigned by the educator, who checks and evaluates the work done by students

Lastly, once the deadline for the submission of solutions expires (and after the manual evaluation has been performed in case it was expected), the system

assigns to every team that participated in the battle an integer score between 0 and 100. This will concur both to the team's battle rank and to the personal score of each user in the context of the tournament the battle belongs to. At any point in time every user subscribed to CKB can see the list of ongoing tournaments and the rank of enrolled users. For a smoother experience, students will receive email notifications about the most important events, such as the availability of a new tournament and battle, or the publication of the final rank of a battle.

1.2.1 Phenomena

According to the paper "The World and the Machine" by M.Jackson and P.Zave, we can identify the application domains. The following table describes the world, shared and the machine phenomena, including the reference to which part controls the phenomena.

| Phenomenon | Controlled | Shared |
|---|------------|--------|
| Teachers test their students | W | N |
| Evaluator decides to challenge his students | W | N |
| Student wants to improve his coding skills | W | N |
| Students may communicate with each other | W | N |
| Student invites other student to join his team | W | N |
| Student/educator subscribes to the platform | W | Y |
| Student/educator logs in | W | Y |
| Educator creates a tournament | W | Y |
| Educator adds other educator as tournament collaborator | W | Y |
| Educator creates a battle within a tournament | W | Y |
| Educator closes the battle's consolidation stage | W | Y |
| Educator terminates a tournament | W | Y |
| Educator submits manual optional evaluation | W | Y |
| Student creates a team | W | Y |
| Student joins a team | W | Y |
| Student checks list of ongoing tournaments and ranks | W | Y |
| Student forks the GitHub repository of the code kata | W | Y |
| Student commits a new submission on GitHub | W | Y |
| Student checks the updated score of a battle | W | Y |
| System closes tournament's subscription phase | M | Y |
| System closes battle's team formation phase | M | Y |
| System closes battle's submission phase | M | Y |
| Platform creates GitHub repository and sends the link to the students of the teams subscribed to the battle | M | Y |
| Platform sends notification to users | M | Y |
| System computes and updates battle score of a team | M | Y |
| System computes and updates student's tournament personal score | M | Y |
| System evaluates quality level of a submission through static analysis | M | Y |
| System checks login data | M | N |
| System pulls new submission from GitHub | M | N |
| System evaluates functional aspects of a submission | M | N |
| System evaluates timeliness of a submission | M | N |

Table 1: phenomena table

1.2.2 Definitions

1.2.3 Acronyms

1.2.4 Abbreviations

1.3 Revision History

1.4 Reference Documents

1.5 Document Structure

2 Overall Description

3 Specific Requirements

Organize this section according to the rules defined in the project description.

4 Formal Analysis Using Alloy

Organize this section according to the rules defined in the project description.

5 Effort Spent

Provide here information about how much effort each group member spent in working at this document. We would appreciate details here.

References