Online TA

Master Project

Datalogisk institut, Copenhagen University (DIKU)

Oleksandr Shturmov
mail@oleks.info

March 1, 2014.

Chapter 1

Introduction

> *In any teaching of the application of computers it is essential to have the students do practical programming problems and to grade their results. Such grading should consider both the formal correctness and the performance of the programs and tends to become difficult and time consuming as soon as the teaching is beyond the most elementary level. The possibility of using the computer to help in this task therefore soon suggests itself.*
>
> — PETER NAUR, *BIT 4* (1964)

1.1 Reader Expectations

The reader is assumed to be familiar with the concept of a university, i.e. an institution of higher education and research, aimed at educating scholars and professionals, granting them degrees, signifying their accomplishments.

The reader is assumed to be familiar with Computer Science, i.e. the study of computable processes and structures, with the aid of of computers. Preferably, the reader should hold a Computer Science degree, be, or have been enrolled in a Computer Science university programme.

1.2 Dictionary and Grammar

Unless otherwise stated, the reader

1.3 Legal Disclaimer

This report references certain legal documents, including Danish laws and university curricula. As the author is not trained in law, there is no claim as to the legal soundness of the claims and references made in this report.

A solid attempt has been made at retaining the formulation of the referenced material, and referencing the most current legal documents, unless this was hindered by other legal references.

For instance, the shared section of the BSc and MSc curricula for study programmes at the Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen [Curricula

(2013)] is based on Ministerial Order no. 819 as of June 29, 2010 [BEK 814]. This document is outdated and has been updated twice, most recently by Ministerial Order no. 1520 as of December 16, 2013 [BEK 1520]. In this particular case, it is the faculty curricula that was been deemed to mandate the relevant law to reference.

1.4 References

When looking for referenced material, material published in relevant scientific journals, yet accessible to the general public, was preferred. To ensure long-lasting access to publicly available, web-based resources, they were archived using WebCite®.

Chapter 2

Analysis

2.1 Assessment in Education

Assessment, or evaluation, in education is the practice of obtaining information about students' knowledge, attitudes, and skills [Pishghadam et al. (2014)]. The purpose of assessment may be manifold: provide feedback or certification, perform selection or comparison, improve learning processes, combinations of the aforementioned, and so on [Bradfoot & Black (2004)].

Assessment in education is primarily of students and their learning, or of teachers and their teaching. The primary intent of the former is to improve learning — the latter — to improve teaching. In this work we will primarily concern ourselves with the former, so assessment for us will be getting to know our students and the quality of their learning [Ramsden (1992)].

2.1.1 Categorising Assessment

There are two principal of kinds of assessment: formative and summative. The definition of each kind varies somewhat in educational research [Bloom et al. (1971), Sadler (1989), Harlen & James (1997)], and their mutual compatibility is questionable [Butler (1988)]. The intent of this work is not to advise on the matter, but to aid in performing assessment, regardless of the flavour.

Let us therefore adopt a primitive distinction, which still supports the purposes of our further analysis:

Formative A student's strengths and weaknesses are documented in free-text form. Formative assessments are qualitative and non-standardised: they are aimed at measuring the quality of a student's learning, rather than whether they live up to some standard criteria.

Summative A student is ranked on some well-defined scale, at some well-defined intervals, based on some well-defined criteria. Summative assessments are often compoundable and comparable. They may allow to deduce holistic summative assessments of students, or student groups, quantitatively measure student progress, etc.

Formative assessment necessitates the ability to perform personalised assessments, whereas summative assessment demands the ability to specify standards and perform standardised assessments.

There are other forms of assessment: diagnostic assessment, self-assessment, peer-assessment, etc [Bull & McKenna (2004), Topping (1998)]. These forms of assessment vary in terms of the formative/summative dimensions, but primarily differ in terms of when, by whom, and of whom the assessment is made.

2.1.2 Feedback

Feedback is information about the difference between the reference level and the actual level of some parameter which is used to remedy the difference in some way [Ramaprasad (1989)].

Feedback is an important bi-product of assessment in education [Black & William (1998)]. Ideally, feedback informs the student of the quality of their work, outlines key errors, provides corrective guidance, and encourages further student learning. To be so, it is important that feedback is understandable, timely, and acted upon by students [Gibbs & Simpson (2004)].

These requirements are an active area of educational research, and one aiding approach is to use computer-assisted assessment.

2.1.3 Computer-Assisted Assessment

Computer-assisted assessment is the form of assessment performed with the assistance of computers [Conole & Warburton (2005)]. The benefit of using computers is ideally, fast, highly-available, consistent, and unbiased assessment [Ala-Mutka (2005)]. The requirement is that the perceived student performance can be encoded in some useful digital format.

This requirement however, has proven evasive. Free form performances, such as essays or oral presentations, are still hard to assess automatically [Valenti et al. (2003)]. On the other hand, it is questionable in how far easily assessable performances, such as, multiple-choice questionnaires, are appropriate for assessment in higher education [Conole & Warburton (2005)].

We hypothesise, without further proof, that in how far computers can assist in assessment, depends on how rigorous the student performance can be expected to be. We formalise this notion in the following sections.

2.1.4 Assignment

An assignment is a request for someone to perform a particular job. An assignment in education is a request for a student to make a particular performance, and often, to provide a record thereof. One purpose of an assignment is to provide basis for an assessment. The request therefore, often includes a specification of what the assessment will be based on, and in what time frame the assignment should be completed in order to be assessed.

2.1.5 Submission

A submission is a record of student performance, submitted for the purposes of assessment. A digital submission is a digital encoding of such a record. Digital submissions are amenable to assessment with the assistance of computers, and thus of most interest to us.

We say that a structure is *rigorous* if we can devise effective procedures to extract the individual elements of the structure, preferably within a finite number of steps. In how far computers can assist in assessment depends on how rigorously a submission can be expected to be structured.

With the advent of modern computer technology, submissions can also be expected to be structured with the assistance of computers. Such use of computers can give some rigor to the structure of submissions.

For instance, in a multiple-choice test, a computer may present the student with the questions and options. The student may then respond to the computer using toggles, and have the computer encode the options thereby chosen in a tableau of integers. An assessment then constitutes merely comparing against a reference tableau — something computers are notoriously good at.

If instead a student is asked to write an essay, modern computers can assist with little more than dictionaries, thesauri, and mark up. From the point of view of a computer, an essay is often little more than a stream of words and punctuation. Much of the structuring is conducted directly by the student.

An essay can of course be assumed to be written in a natural language. Natural languages however, often lack in rigor. Vagueness and ambiguity flourishes in natural languages. They are at best, somewhat rigorous. The extent of this "somewhat" is the subject matter of much research in natural language processing and automated essay assessment [Valenti et al. (2003)].

Beyond where computers can help, it is the question of how rigorous one can expect the students to be. In some disciplines, such as Computer Science, high rigor can often be expected in certain types of assignments, such as programming assignments. We explore this in the following sections.

2.2 Assessment in Computer Science

Computer Science is the study of computable structures and processes. Computer Science graduates are (among other things) expected to be eloquent in the theory and practice of computer programming [CS Curricula 2013].

To this end, practical work is a popular basis for assessment in Computer Science [Carter et al. (2003)]. Practical work is concerned with the composition of programs to be executed by a computer. To be executable by computers, computer programs are written in highly rigorous languages, and so are amenable to assessment with the assistance of computers.

The assessment of computer programs is a wide area of research and industry, known as e.g. software verification or quality assurance.

2.3 Roles in Assessment

There are two principal roles in assessment: the assessing and the assessed. It is the assessing that define the form of assessment and perform the assessment itself. It is a matter of ethical concern that the assessed are sufficiently informed of their assessment and concede to it.

In education, the assessing are often also involved in the role of teaching, and the assessed are often also involved in the role of learning.

Those involved in the role of assessing, but not in teaching, are involved in either censure of the assessment, or are interested merely in the summative purposes of an assessment. Those involved in the role of assessed, but not in the role of learning, are of little interest to us.

2.3.1 Teaching

Teaching is the expediting of learning. Students learn on their own, but teachers provide the conditions for effective learning [Skinner (1965)].

Teachers exert authority over students.

Teaching assistants

Teaching assistants assist in teaching responsibilities. They are teaching subordinates of teachers. They exert some authority over students, but are often limited in their authority when it comes to important summative assessments. The result is that teaching assistants perform much of the formative assessment, and provide guiding remarks either for the purposes of feedback or to ease important summative assessments for the teachers.

Teaching assistants come about as a scaling mechanism. Once class size exceeds

2.3.2 Learning

Learning is the gaining of knowledge or skills. It is a qualitative change of a person's view of the world. Individuals engage in learning in hope of being somehow enlightened or trained for solving particular kinds of problems.

2.3.3 Censure and Summative Assessments

Censure is a process of quality assurance of assessment. A censor's participation in an assessment in an assessment varies from mere observation to avid participation.

2.3.4 General Public

The general public includes those who are ultimately interested in the outcomes of education and the quality of assessment therein. This includes both perspective students, future employers, the politically concious, etc.

The general public may be interested in open access to the elements of education and assessment for the purposes of assessing the quality of education. The intent may be to see if the education lives up to social expectations, demands of the labour market, political promises, etc.

Privacy and anonymity is a matter of grave public concern. If open access is given, it should only identify those who may reasonably be held responsible for an eventual lack of quality in education. Also, issues of copyright have to be taken into account.

As the general public would assess education, and not students, students should not be personally identifiable by the general public. In how far teachers and teaching assistants may reasonably be held responsible by the general public for the quality of education may be a matter of university policy (as their employer). It is important that the assessed are sufficiently informed of their assessment and have conceded to it.

As students typically own the content they produce, individual student work or commentary should not be made available to the general public. In how far teachers and teaching assistants own the content they produce may again be a matter of university policy (as their employer). It is important that the owners of content have command over its reproduction.

2.4 Course

A course is a unit of education imparted in a series of learning activities. The student performance in a course is always assessed, at least, on a pass/fail/not applicable basis. A student passes a course, if the student has shown to possess some predefined knowledge or skills by the end of the course.

A graduating education is composed of a series of courses that the student has to pass in order to obtain a degree. A degree is statement of performance in all the courses passed.

Chapter 3

Feature Specification

We are interested in a online system for assistance with teaching responsibilities. This involves the management of online assignments and submissions, as well as providing the means for introducing automated assessment steps.

We are interested in a system that does more than provide for the management of online assignments. It should suit the needs of the assessing and the assessed, and so of both teachers, teaching assistants, and students.

3.1 Overview

We are interested first and foremost in a system for the management of assignments in a course.

3.2 Assignments

A principal function of the online TA is to allow the management of assignments. This includes:

- Specifying assignment texts.
- Specifying

3.3 Users

The online TA is to be made available on the World Wide Web. The set of users therefore, includes a wide range of principals of which only a very small subset will ever access the system, and even fewer are likely to use it as intended.

The system should be safeguarded against malicious users, yet provide all the relevant capabilities to authentic users with sufficient permissions.

3.3.1 User Roles

For an online TA there are two principal user roles: *system administrators* and *stakeholders* (students, teachers, and the general public). (TODO: is the general public really a stakeholder?) (TODO: how limited is the general public?)

System administrators have complete control of the servers running the service, including the mechanisms that enforce the security policies of the service. (They can, in principle, change anything.) System administrators are also responsible for monitoring the service for abnormal or abusive behaviour.

Stakeholders access the system through a secure online interface. They set up, enroll participants, and participate in courses — where a course is a collection of programming assignments for the students to solve.

There are four principle course-specific stakeholder roles: *instructors*, *assistants*, *students*, and *non-participants*. That is, for each course, every stakeholder has exactly one of these four roles.

Instructors are the principle course administrators. They can enroll other participants as either instructors, assistants, or students. Their primary role is to define the elements of a course.

Assistants are second-level course administrators. They can enroll other participants as either assistants or students. Their primary role is to assist the instructors in defining the elements of a course, and to provide feedback to students.

Students are the basic users of a course. They cannot enroll other participants, or tamper with the elements of a course. Their primary role is to submit solutions to the programming assignments of a course. Student submissions are individual or group-based, and so not visible to other students in general. Student submissions are visible to instructors and assistants for the sake of evaluation.

Non-participants can see the elements of a course, but they cannot participate in the course in any way. The reasoning here is that there is no implicit trust relationship among the participants of a course, that does not exist among all the stakeholders of an institution. Providing access to non-participants allows them to get a feel for the course, which is useful for both encouraging participation and course evaluation.

NOTES:

- Only instructors and assistants can define the elements of a course.
- Only students can make submissions to programming assignments.
- Course contents is open for everyone in the system to see.

3.3.2 User Data

The system must retain sufficient information to securely authenticate and authorise all the users of the system.

3.3.3 System Administrators

3.3.4 Stakeholders

Stakeholders have to be identifi

- Name
- E-mail
- KU username

3.4 Courses

3.4.1 Course Data

Programming Assignments

- Assignment text. Everyone may see. Probably requires some pretty printing.
- Static submission analyses. Only instructors and assistants.
- Input data generator. Only instructors and assistants may see the actual program, everyone may see the resulting generated data. Resources limited to instructors and assistants.

3.5 Source Code and Documentation

3.5.1 OSS/FS

Open Source Software / Free Software (OSS/FS) programs are programs whose licenses give users freedom to run the program for any purpose, to study and modify the program, and to redistribute copies of either the original or modified program [Wheeler, 2007].

To fully reap the benefits of OSS/FS, it is necessary to ensure that there is an active community around it, devoted to bug tracking and fixing, as well as developing new features (unless the product can be deemed feature-complete).

If such a community is absent, the worst fears of the sceptics of OSS/FS may well be true: vulnerabilities may be known to adversaries.

Developing software that later

Chapter 4

The Data Model

4.1 Assignment Groups

An assignment group is a set of assignments and a set of overarching properties for those assignments. A course may be composed of one or more assignment groups.

Principal to an assignment group is the listing of enrolled users and their roles as either teacher, teaching assistant, student, or observer.

4.2 Assignments

- Assignment group
- Assignment text
- Time limits
- Try limits
- Summative assessment kinds for every attempt.

Bibliography

[Wheeler, 2007] David A. Wheeler. *Why Open Source Software / Free Software (OSS/FS, FLOSS, or FOSS)? Look at the Numbers!*. Revised as of April 16, 2007. Retrieved from http://www.dwheeler.com/oss_fs_why.html on March 7, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6NtSnvALX.

[CS2013] ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Task Force on Computing Curricula. *Computer Science Curricula 2013*. December 2013. ACM Press and IEEE Computer Society Press. Retrieved from http://ai.stanford.edu/users/sahami/CS2013/final-draft/CS2013-final-report.pdf on March 7, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6NtTXPH2s.

[EHEA (1999)] Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education. *The Bologna Declaration*. June 19, 1999. The European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Declarations/BOLOGNA_DECLARATION1.pdf on March 9, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6Nwr8h8l7.

[CND (2004)] Sebastian Horst and Carl Winsløw. *Undervisning i blokstruktur - potentialer og risici*. April 1, 2004. DidakTips 5. Center for Natufagenes Didaktik. University of Copenhagen. Retrieved from http://www.ind.ku.dk/publikationer/didaktips/didaktips5/5.undervisningiblokstruktur-potentialerogrisicimedomslag.pdf on March 9, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6NwjYWlBi.

[BEK 814] Ministeriet for Forskning, Innovation og Videregående Uddannelser. *Bekendtgørelse om bachelor- og kandidatuddannelser ved universiteterne (uddannelsesbekendtgørelsen)*. Ministerial Order no. 814 of December 19, 2013. Retrieved from https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=160853 on March 9, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6NyGHXc4N.

[BEK 1520] Ministeriet for Forskning, Innovation og Videregående Uddannelser. *Bekendtgørelse om bachelor- og kandidatuddannelser ved universiteterne (uddannelsesbekendtgørelsen)*. Ministerial Order no. 1520 of December 19,

2013. Retrieved from https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=160853 on March 9, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6Nx4DxLGL.

[BEK 666] Ministeriet for Forskning, Innovation og Videregående Uddannelser. *Bekendtgørelse om eksamen og censur ved universitetsuddannelser (eksamensbekendtgørelsen)*. Ministerial Order no. 666 of June 24, 2012. Retrieved from https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=142560 on March 10, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6NyI0DlqJ.

[BEK 250] Ministeriet for Forskning, Innovation og Videregående Uddannelser. *Bekendtgørelse om karakterskala og anden bedømmelse ved universitetsuddannelser (karakterbekendtgørelsen)*. Ministerial Order no. 250 of March 15, 2007. Retrieved from https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=29307 on March 11, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6NzVOdWtv.

[Curricula (2013)] *The shared section of the BSc and MSc curricula for study programmes at the Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen*. September 2013. Retrieved from http://www.science.ku.dk/studerende/studieordninger/faelles_sto/Faelles-del-ENG-2013-web.pdf/ on March 10, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6NyEpPK67.

[Bradfoot & Black (2004)] Patricia Broadfoot and Paul Black. *Redefining assessment? The first ten years of assessment in education*. 2004. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 7–26. DOI: 10.1080/0969594042000208976. Retrieved from https://cmap.helsinki.fi/rid=1G5ND18R4-1QLJN7R-1SB on March 16, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6O7OhF8LW.

[Pishghadam et al. (2014)] Reza Pishghadam, Bob Adamson, Shaghayegh Shayesteh Sadafian, and Flora L. F. Kan. *Conceptions of assessment and teacher burnout*. 2014. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 34–51. DOI: 10.1080/0969594X.2013.817382.

[Harlen & James (1997)] Wynne Harlen and Mary James. *Assessment and Learning: differences and relationships between formative and summative assessment*. 1997. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 365–379. DOI: 10.1080/0969594970040304.

[Butler (1988)] Ruth Butler. *Enhancing and understanding intrinsic motivation: the effects of of task-involving and ego-involving evaluation on interest and performance*. February 1988. British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 1–14.

[Sadler (1989)] D.Royce Sadler. *Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems*. June 1989. Instructional Science, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 119–144. Kluwer Academic Publishers. DOI: 10.1007/BF00117714

[Bloom et al. (1971)] Benjamin S. Bloom, J. Thomas Hastings, and George F. Madaus. *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning*. 1971. McGraw-Hili, Inc. United States. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 75129488. ISBN 0070061149.

[Ramaprasad (1989)] Arkalgud Rapaprasad. *On the definition of feedback*. January 1989. Behavioural Science, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 8–13.

[Black & William (1998)] Paul Black and Dylan William. *Assessment and Classroom Learning*. 1998. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 7–74. DOI: 10.1080/0969595980050102.

[Gibbs & Simpson (2004)] Graham Gibbs and Claire Simpson. *Conditions Under Which Assessment Supports Students' Learning*. May 2004. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, Issue 1. Retrieved from http://www2.glos.ac.uk/offload/tli/lets/lathe/issue1/issue1.pdf on March 22, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6OGkhvGyE.

[Ramsden (1992)] Paul Ramsden. *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. 1992. Routledge. ISBN 0-415-06415-5.

[Conole & Warburton (2005)] Gráinne Conole and Bill Warburton. *A review of computer-assisted assessment*. March 2005. The Journal of the Association for Learning Technology (ALT-J), Research in Learning Technology, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 17–31. Retrieved from http://www.researchinlearningtechnology.net/index.php/rlt/article/download/10970/12674 on March 23, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6OIAQzo2d.

[Valenti et al. (2003)] Salvatore Valenti, Francesca Neri, and Alessandro Cucchiarelli. *An Overview of Current Research on Automated Essay Grading*. January 2003. Journal of Information Technology Education, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 319–330.

[Ala-Mutka (2005)] Kirsti M. Ala-Mutka. *A Survey of Automated Assessment Approaches for Programming Assignments*. June 2005. Computer Science Education, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 83–102.

[Bull & McKenna (2004)] Joanna Bull and Colleen McKenna. *Blueprint for Computer-Assisted Assessment*. 2004. Taylor & Francis e-Library. Master e-book ISBN: 0-203-46468-0.

[Topping (1998)] Keith Topping. *Peer Assessment between Students in Colleges and Universities*. Autumn 1998. Review of Educational Research, Vol. 68, No. 3, pp. 249–276.

[Carter et al. (2003)] Janet Carter, John English, Kirsti Ala-Mutka, Martin Dick, William Fone, Ursula Fuller, Judy Sheard. *How Shall We Assess This?* December 2003. Working group reports from ITiCSE on Innovation and technology in computer science education (ITiCSE-WGR '03), David Finkel (Ed.), pp. 107–123. DOI: 10.1145/960492.960539.

[CS Curricula 2013] The Joint Task Force on Computing Curricula. Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). IEEE Computer Society. *Computer Science Curricula 2013: Curriculum Guidelines for Undergraduate Degree Programs in Computer Science*. December 20, 2013. Retrieved from http://www.acm.org/education/CS2013-final-report.pdf on March 29, 2014.

Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/6ORGeUYy5.

[Skinner (1965)] Burrhus Frederic Skinner. Harvard University. *Reflections on a Decade of Teaching Machines*. 1965. In Teaching Machines and Programmed Learning, Vol. 2, Robert Glaser (Ed.), pp. 5–20. National Education Association of the United States. LCCN: 60-15721.