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Programming Education in the Past

- The year 2000: over 150 first-year students in CS
- Practical programming course: done on paper
- Five independent groups
- Process:
  1. collect programs
  2. evaluate programs
  3. administrate results

Programming Contests

- IOI: IOI’95 in Eindhoven, IOI’96–’07
- NIO
- Process:
  1. collect programs
  2. evaluate programs automatically
  3. administrate results automatically

Peach/vs

Programming Education And Contest Hosting verification system

Developed in the summer of 2001 by Erik Scheffers

First used in September 2001 for Programming 0

September 2007 (version 3): Peach
Feature Overview

- Web-based client-server system: peach.win.tue.nl
- Various user categories: student, grader, teacher, admin, observer
- Collect, store, evaluate, compare submitted work and results
- Supports multiple courses, with groups, over multiple years
- Evaluation configurable per assignment
- Supports multiple (programming) languages

Peach As Communication Aid

Who should do/did what when with what result?

- Register participants
- Provide assignments (configurable open/close period)
- Define and enforce deadlines and number of attempts
- Collect and store the work (web-viewable by submitter and staff)
- Provide feedback (automatic and/or manual)
- Administrate results

What Peach Is (Not)

Peach is not intended as a full-blown generic

- student administration system
- course management system (cf. Moodle.org)
- web content management system (WCMS)
- workflow management system
- program development environment (IDE)
- configuration/version management system (cf. Subversion)

Student View

- Register once (usercode/password; future: central login portal)
- Join course/group (once per course)
- Read assignment
- Submit work, check acceptance
- Read feedback/result

Repeat where necessary

Further support to interpret feedback (error messages) is desirable
Grader View

- View submission: files, checks
- Provide feedback
- Determine result

Grading scheme/criteria currently not stored in Peach

Teacher View

- Prepare assignments
  Can be developed stand-alone as a *Peach package*
- Make assignments (un)available
- Set deadlines and limits
- Inspect results
- View statistics

Further support for assignment preparation desirable

Manual Evaluation

Grading scheme covering

- Layout
- Comments, (formal) annotation
- Naming
- Definitions
- Modularization
- Coding patterns

Automated support imaginable

Automatic Evaluation

Typically, for submitted *programs*:

1. **Preprocess** (e.g. max. program length, language, TODOs)
2. **Compile** (possibly together with test framework)
3. **Execute** (with defined environment/input)
4. **Check** behavior/output
5. Determine **score**, repeat 2–5 as desired

Generally, can handle anything supported by analysis tools under *Linux*: *models, specifications, grammars, proofs, test cases*, . . .
Assignment Preparation

- Descriptive text: problem, input, output, constraints, hints, ...
- Allowed programming language(s)
- What needs to be submitted, other preprocessing checks
- Compiler options, libraries, ...
- Run-time limits, environment
- Test cases: input, expected output or output checker
- Scoring function; accept/reject criteria
- Good and bad programs, to test the assignment configuration

Example Assignment: Candy (2IP05)

*K* kids together receive *C* candies. Your program must determine whether it is possible to divide all candies fairly, and if so, how many candies each kid receives. This is a integer *Q* such that *C* = *K* *Q*.

**Input**: The first line contains two integers *K* and *C*, separated by one space, with 0 ≤ *K*, *C* < 10^9.

**Output**: The first line must be the string ‘Yes’ if it is possible to divide all candies fairly, and ‘No’ otherwise. If it is possible, then there is a second line, containing integer *Q* (number of candies each kid receives), with 0 ≤ *Q* < 10^9. *If there are multiple answers, then it does not matter which answer your program writes.*

Example:

```
input  output
3 15      Yes
5
```

Checker Issues

- Output format: whitespace, newlines, upper/lower case
- If input uniquely determines output: expected output
  - Can be generated by known-correct program
- If input does not uniquely determine output: checker program
  - Reads input, program’s output, optional additional data
  - Verifies specified I/O relationship
  - Must be robust: program’s output can be garbage
- Possibly no input/output, but provide a service or use a service
- GUI/web applications, distributed/parallel programs (not yet done)

Checker Example: Dice Game (2IP05)

- Players 1–4 each roll two regular dice (outcomes 1..6 + 1..6)
  Player 5 rolls a dodecahedron (outcomes 1..12)
  *Unique maximum* value wins, otherwise no winner
  Is Player 5 better off or worse off than the others? How much?
- Assignment: Randomly simulate multiple rounds
  Various programming errors possible
- Checker must test statistical hypothesis
Checker Example: **Energy Pills** (2IP05)

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>input</th>
<th>output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 30 0</td>
<td>0* 1 30 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 10 1 3</td>
<td>2* 10* 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 20 7 99</td>
<td>4 20* 7* 99*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Consider monotonic paths from *upper left* to *lower right* corner
- Maximize the path sum (total energy)
- Evaluation must “catch” greedy algorithms and other errors

Plagiarism

- *Correlate submissions* (same assignment, multiple years)
- No search on internet (only in its own database)
- False positives, false negatives, assignment dependence
- Subsequent investigation is time consuming
- Further tool support desirable
- Cannot detect that someone else did the work
- Alternative: give assignments *under exam constraints*

Checker Example: **Binary Search Test Driver** (2IP10)

- Assignment: Write a test driver for a binary search routine

  procedure Find ( const s: List; const x: Entry;
  var found: Boolean; var pos: Index);
  { pre:  s is ascending (duplicates allowed)
   post: found == (E i: 0 <= i < s.len : s.item[i] = x) \/
       found => 0 <= pos < s.len \/
       s.item[pos] = x }

  Evaluation based on *coverage*

- Compile with *instrumented* version of Find

  Log each call; check precondition

  Evaluate with various good and bad implementations of Find

  Check distribution of parameter values over all Find calls

Checker Example: **Bounded Queue** (2IP05)

- Assignment: Implement a bounded queue ADT, given its contract

  constructor Create(...);
  function Count;
  function IsEmpty;
  function IsFull;
  function First;
  procedure Put(...);
  procedure RemFirst;

  When precondition not satisfied, an *exception* must be raised

- Evaluation must verify *functionality and robustness*

  Done without using a known-correct bounded queue
Availability

- Production environment on our own SET server
- Installable on other platforms (requirements . . .)
- Open source license (except: authorization/comparison modules)
- Also used in Finland, India

Usage Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Until</th>
<th># Courses + Contests</th>
<th># Active Users</th>
<th># Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2003</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>5990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2004</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>10509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2005</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>14327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2006</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>18622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>24313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2007*</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>25747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2007†</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Peach 2
†Peach 3

Conclusions

- Peach is a success:
  1. Automated evaluation strictly enforces functional quality
  2. Support for manual evaluation of other qualities
  3. Uniform administration, easily accessible by all involved
  4. Enforced deadlines, individually extendible
  5. Plagiarism detection
- But automatic evaluation comes at a cost
- Future: interface to secure exam software, central login portal

Questions?