

# Overall Comparative Evaluation: RAG-Based vs Non-RAG Methods

## **\*\*Comparative Evaluation of RAG-Based and Non-RAG Methods for Teaching OOP Topics\*\***

### **### \*\*Overview of Evaluation Dimensions\*\***

This evaluation compared the RAG-based and non-RAG methods for generating problem statements, evaluation rubrics, and feedback across 10 topics in Object-Oriented Programming (OOP). The key focus areas were:

#### **1. \*\*Problem Statement Quality\*\***

- Clarity, comprehensiveness, and alignment with the intended topic.
- Real-world applicability and intellectual challenge.

#### **2. \*\*Evaluation Rubric\*\***

- Specificity and relevance of criteria for assessing solutions.
- Ability to differentiate levels of understanding effectively.

#### **3. \*\*Feedback Quality\*\***

- Constructiveness and depth of feedback provided to students.
- Ability to highlight strengths, address weaknesses, and encourage further learning.

### **### \*\*Overall Comparison Across 10 Topics\*\***

#### **#### \*\*Problem Statement Quality\*\***

- **\*\*RAG-Based Method:\*\***
- Crafted complex and realistic problem statements.

- Incorporated real-world scenarios, enhancing relevance and engagement.
- Balanced conceptual depth with practical implementation challenges.
- **Non-RAG Method:**
- Simpler and less challenging problems.
- Limited scope often focused on straightforward implementations without encouraging exploration.

#### #### **Evaluation Rubric**

- **RAG-Based Method:**
- Provided detailed and specific rubrics covering multiple aspects, including readability, edge cases, and advanced OOP principles.
- Ensured alignment with learning objectives and fairness in evaluation.
- **Non-RAG Method:**
- Minimalist rubrics focusing on correctness and readability.
- Often lacked criteria for advanced concepts, resulting in superficial assessments.

#### #### **Feedback Quality**

- **RAG-Based Method:**
- Constructive and actionable feedback that highlighted strengths and weaknesses.
- Encouraged exploration of advanced concepts and provided specific improvement suggestions.
- **Non-RAG Method:**
- Feedback often lacked depth and focused more on correctness.
- Missed opportunities to motivate students to explore beyond the basics.

### ### **\*\*Quantitative Insights\*\***

- Topics with well-crafted problem statements (out of 10):

- RAG-Based Method: **\*\*9/10\*\***

- Non-RAG Method: **\*\*5/10\*\***

- Detailed rubrics covering multiple aspects (out of 10):

- RAG-Based Method: **\*\*8/10\*\***

- Non-RAG Method: **\*\*4/10\*\***

- Feedback rated as highly actionable (out of 10):

- RAG-Based Method: **\*\*9/10\*\***

- Non-RAG Method: **\*\*5/10\*\***

### ### **\*\*Conclusion\*\***

The RAG-based method consistently outperformed the non-RAG method across all dimensions. It provided challenging, real-world problems with detailed rubrics and actionable feedback that fostered deeper learning. While the non-RAG method offered simpler problems and evaluations, it often fell short in promoting exploration and mastery of OOP principles.