

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 14, 2023

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose	1
1.1.1	Goals	1
1.2	Scope	3
1.2.1	Phenomena	4
1.3	Definitions, Acronyms, Abbreviations	6
1.3.1	Definitions	6
1.3.2	Acronyms	7
1.3.3	Abbreviations	7
1.4	Revision History	8
1.5	Reference Documents	8
1.6	Document Structure	8
2	Overall Description	10
2.1	Product perspective	10
2.1.1	Scenarios	10
2.1.2	Domain Class diagram	13
2.1.3	State diagrams	14
3	Specific Requirements	15
4	Formal Analysis Using Alloy	16
5	Effort Spent	17
	References	18

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 who created the battle, 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

1.3 Definitions, Acronyms, Abbreviations

1.3.1 Definitions

- **User:** anyone that has registered to the platform
- **Student:** the first kind of users and, basically, the people this product is designed for. Their objective is to submit solutions to battles
- **Team:** students can decide to group up and form a team to participate to a battle. The score assigned to the submission of a team will be assigned also to each one of its members
- **Team leader:** whoever creates a team for a battle
- **Educator:** the second kind of users. They create tournaments, set-up battles, and eventually, evaluate the solutions that teams of students have submitted during the challenge
- **Tournament:** collection of coding exercises (battles) about specific topics of a subject. Interested students can subscribe to it and participate to its battles as soon as they are published
- **Code Kata Battle (or battle):** the atomic unit of a tournament. Usually students are asked to implement an algorithm or to develop a simple project that solves the task. Each battle belongs to a specific tournament: students submitting solutions for a battle will obtain a score that will be used to compute both the team's rank for the battle and the members' tournament rank
- **Tournament collaborator:** other educator that is added by the tournament creator to help him in the management of the tournament. He can create battles and evaluate their submissions
- **GitHub collaborator:** person who is granted the access to a GitHub repository with write permission
- **Test cases:** each battle is associated with a set of test cases, which are input-output value pairs that describe the correct behavior of the ideal solution

- **Static analysis:** is the analysis of programs performed without executing them, usually achieved by applying formal methods directly to the source code. In the context of the platform this kind of analysis is used to extract additional information about the level of security, reliability and maintainability of a battle submission
- **Functional analysis:** measures the correctness of a solution in terms of passed test cases
- **Timeliness:** measures the time passed between the start of the battle and the last commit of the submission
- **Score:** to each solution is assigned a score which is computed taking into account timeliness, functional and static analysis and, eventually, manual score assigned by the educator that created the challenge. The score is a natural number between 0 and 100 (the higher the better)
- **Rank:** at the end of each battle, the platform updates the personal tournament score of each student. Specifically, the score is computed as the sum of all the battles scores received in that tournament. This overall score is used to fill out a ranking of all the students participating to the tournament which is accessible by any time and by any user subscribed to the platform
- **Notification:** it's an email alert that is sent to users to inform them that a certain event occurred such as the creation of a new tournament and battle or the publication of the final rank of a battle

1.3.2 Acronyms

- **CKB:** Code Kata Battles
- **API:** Application Programming Interface
- **UML:** Unified Modeling Language

1.3.3 Abbreviations

- **Gn:** Goal number “n”
- **Dn:** Domain Assumption number “n”

- **Rn:** Requirement number “n”

1.4 Revision History

- December 22, 2023: version 1.0 (first release)

1.5 Reference Documents

- Specification document: "Assignment RDD AY 2023-2024"
- RASD reference template: “02g.CreatingRASD”
- Paper: "Jackson and Zave: the world and the machine"
- UML official specification <https://www.omg.org/spec/UML/>
- Alloy official documentation: <https://alloytools.org/documentation.html>
- GitHub API official documentation <https://docs.github.com/en/rest/guides/getting-started-with-the-rest-api?apiVersion=2022-11-28>

1.6 Document Structure

- **Section 1: Introduction**

This section offers a brief overview of the product and its purpose. It also contains the list of definitions, acronyms and abbreviations that could be found in this document.

- **Section 2: Overall Description**

The second chapter contains some scenarios to better understand the expected functionalities and offers a more detailed description of the product domain through state machine diagrams and UML class diagram. It contains also the hardware and the software constraints of the system. Finally, there is an overview of all the product features and the actors they are built for.

- **Section 3: Specific Requirements**

This section contains a description of functional requirement through some use cases and activity diagrams.

- **Section 4: Formal Analysis through Alloy**

The fourth chapter is a formal analysis of the model, made through the Alloy, including a graphic representation of it obtained from Alloy Tool.

- **Section 5: Effort spent**

The fifth and last chapter contains the time spent by each contributor of this document.

2 Overall Description

2.1 Product perspective

2.1.1 Scenarios

1. Educator creates a tournament

Alan is a university professor. He has just finished explaining a very hard topic that occupied multiple lectures. He would like to test its class about it but exams dates are far away ahead and he thinks that trying to evaluate their understanding with a quick quiz performed in class before or after his next lecture would not be a good idea given the depth of the topic. Anyway he knows of a site that allows educators to easily organize challenges to which students can take part and decides to give it a try.

He connects to the website of the platform and signs up as an educator. After that, he navigates to the “Tournaments” section and selects the option to create a new one: inputs the name of the tournament and a deadline for the subscription. All students subscribed to the CKB platform are now notified and can join the tournament.

Since Alan’s schedule is often very busy, he then decides to grant the permission to create battles to his teaching assistant Thomas, which has already subscribed to the platform.

2. Educator creates a battle

Linus is a famous youtuber that publishes video courses on programming languages. He wants to increase the engagement with his subscribers, so for this reason he has already subscribed to the CKB platform and created a tournament. In his last video lecture, he has started a new playlist on Java language, explaining some basic concepts typical of object oriented programming.

To challenge his viewers, he decides to create a new coding battle. He now connects to the website of the platform and log-ins with his credential. He clicks on the tournament called “LinusTechChallenges” he previously created and selects the option to generate a new battle. The platform then asks him to specify some settings for this specific challenge: he selects “Java” as programming language, uploads the “code kata” which includes a textual description of the challenge and all the

files related to the software project like test cases and build automation scripts, selects set the minimum and maximum number of students per group, fixes the registration and final submission deadlines. Since he has many subscribers and cannot manually review every solution, he also specifies that a final manual evaluation is not needed. However, Linus decides to enable all the available aspects the static analysis should focus on (e.g. security, reliability, maintainability). At this point he confirms the creation of the battle and the system automatically notifies all the students subscribed to the tournament about the new coding battle.

3. Student subscribes to a tournament

Mark is struggling to keep the pace of its professor's lectures. Moreover, since his anxiety always penalizes him, he is afraid he will organize some activity in class to evaluate his knowledge about the last, complex topic. One day, while looking at the academic mail, he notices that the feared professor is contacting its students to inform them of an alternative evaluation method that would allow them to avoid part of the final exam and which involves to write code to solve problems related with the subject and compete with other students. Mark immediately decides to go for it and subscribes (as a student) to the platform indicated by the professor. Once logged in, he goes to the "Tournaments" section and selects the option to search for a specific tournament: at this point he searches the tournament by the name communicated by the professor, selects it and subscribes to it. Once a new battle will be available, he will be notified by the system. He is now ready to participate to the battles and prove what he has learned.

4. Students form a team

Liam is a software engineer that has subscribed to CKB because a famous IT company is offering some job positions to the most talented developers discovered through the platform. For this reason, he already joined the tournament created by the company. Since the company is interested in developers with the ability to work in teams, its human resources department has set "2" as minimum number of team members for their first battle. So, Liam decides to tackle the first challenge with a trusted former university colleague of his. He navigates to the "Tournaments" section, searches and selects the ongoing tournament of

the company and clicks on the first battle called “Challenge 1”. The system shows 2 options: “Create a team” and “Join a team”. Liam selects the first option and chooses a name for his team, checking the “private” flag option. The system generates an invite code that he can now share privately to his friend in order to join the team.

5. Student submits a solution

Jonas is subscribed to the CKB platform in order to participate in quizzes organized by his computer science professor. He is very happy with this kind of continual evaluation because it’s a great way to understand those difficult concepts taught during theory classes and skip some exercises at the final written exam.

When a new programming challenge is announced, Jonas gets excited to test his skills. He forms a team with two other classmates to collaborate on solving the exercise. After working hard to come up with a new solution, Jonas submits it to the CKB platform by committing the solution on their GitHub repository before the deadline. Jonas and his team mates have monitored their score during the whole battle, but are not satisfied with rank of their final submission computed with the automated evaluation.

The next day, after the consolidation stage, Jonas is thrilled to see his final team rank near the top of the leaderboard! Indeed the professor liked a lot their innovative solution and decided to reward them during the manual evaluation.

6. Educator manually evaluates solutions

Oliver is an instructor and he is using CKB to evaluate the students enrolled in his online programming course. He enjoys the platform especially because it organizes the students’ GitHub repository in a convenient and central way. Indeed, once the submission phase ends, during the consolidation stage Oliver can select the current battle and go through the whole list of teams. For each team, the system shows the GitHub repository link and the scores related to the automated evaluation. After inspecting the code in the repo, Oliver inputs in the same page a natural number between 0 and 100 as manual evaluation score (the higher the better). Once he has finished reviewing the code of all the teams, he clicks on the “Terminate battle” field next to the current battle tab and all students involved are notified about the final

mark.

2.1.2 Domain Class diagram




Figure 1: Domain-level UML diagram

Additional notes on the class diagram:

- the “created by” relation between "Student" and "Team" encapsulates the concept of "team leader".
- the "proofDocument" attribute of the "Educator" class contains a reference to the file through which the educator was verified.

2.1.3 State diagrams

In order to provide a complete description of the application domain, here we included the state diagrams relative to battles and tournaments.




Figure 2: Tournament state diagram




Figure 3: Battle state diagram

In particular, in the case of battles, which transition is taken after the submission stage only depends on whether the manual evaluation was enabled or not.

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