25 YEARS OF E-ASSESSMENT AND BEYOND: HOW DID I DO!

Michael McCabe

University of Portsmouth; michael.mccabe@port.ac.uk

E-assessment is a powerful tool for supporting the learning of mathematics. Early trials began back in 1991 on a local network. Over the past 25 years technical advances have widened and improved its delivery. For the past 10 years MapleTA has been adopted and a huge range of question banks have been developed. Some recent topics include dimensional analysis, fractals, linear programming, Fourier series, oscillatory motion, series solution of ODEs, Laplace transforms and basic solution methods for PDEs. A key element in providing students with feedback on their progress is the "How Did I Do?" option, which allows them to check their answers as they progress of e-assessment for many thousands of students over several decades.

Keywords: E-assessment, feedback, modelling, mechanics, calculus

A QUARTER CENTURY OF E-ASSESSMENT ADVANCES

It is over 25 years since e-assessment was first used for mathematics students at the University of Portsmouth on a local network (Figure 1).

Date(s)	Development/Activity/Action	Outcome(s)	Software	Focus
1991	Installation of networked Computer Assisted Assessment (CAA)	First use of summative e-assessment	Question Mark for DOS	Departments
1994	Upgrade of networked CAA to Windows	Delivery of improved functionality, especially graphics/ graphical questions	QM Designer for Windows	Departments
Mid-1996	Beta testing of on-line e-assessment	Feasibility of on-line e-assessment demonstrated	QM Perception Beta + PWS	Dept of Mathematics
Late 1996	Installation of on-line e-assessment Full-time educational technologist appointed	Successful first use of on-line summative e-assessment	QM Perception V1 + PWS	Dept of Mathematics
1997 - 1998	University Project: CAA on the Web (£4500) Purchase of 10 QMP personal licences	Successful pilot use of on-line e-assessment by 10 individual staff covering all faculties	QM Perception V1 + Personal Web Server	University
1999 - 2000	University Project: Framework for the Uptake of CAA (£10,500)	Successful scaling up of on-line assessment with 2 faculty servers Use of WebCT connector proposed	QM Perception V2	University Faculties
April 2001	Proposal for university wide Perception site licence presented to university IT committee	Proposal accepted	QM Perception V3	University
Nov 2001	QM Perception purchased (£25,000) Ongoing annual maintenance (£10,000 per annum)	Full site university licence available	QM Perception V3	University
2002	Full implementation strategy document	Unsuccessful trial set up in Faculty of Technology	QM Perception V3	Faculty of Technology
2003	Purchase of NT server for e-assessment (£5000)	Re-installation of QM Perception	QM Perception V3.4	Faculty of Technology
Mid-2004	Use of Oracle database for storage of questions, assessments and results	Successful trial of full scale Oracle based e-assessment system	QM Perception V3.4 + Oracle	Faculty of Technology
Sept 2004	University On-Line Learning and Assessment Group sets up full-scale pilot	Pilot delivery of diagnostic & summative assessments in mathematics	QM Perception V3.4 + Oracle	Department
2005	Report of successful pilot Oracle based Perception 3.4 Academic PVC identifies Perception as university tool	Use of Web based Perception extended to Science Faculty	QM Perception V3.4 + Oracle	University
2005	Installation of QM Perception V4		QMPV4 + Oracle	University
Oct 2005	Proposal to include e-assessment in academic regulations	Regulations modified		University
2006	Conversion of assessments to QMP V4	Increasing number of assessments delivered	QMPV4 + Oracle	Technology
2007	Use of QM Perception by four Faculties:	Successful delivery of formative and summative assessments	QM Perception V3, V4 +	University

Figure 1. Mathematics e-Assessment Delivery using QuestionMark Software 1991-2007

Although computer algebra systems were not widely available then, it was still possible to author and deliver a variety of standard question types. In 1996 a CAS powered assessment system was developed (McCabe and Watson, 1997) using the Maple kernel within Toolbook authoring software (Figure 2). For the first time ever it was possible to check algebraic question responses with a CAS and develop mathematical questions with a user-friendly interface.

Around the same time the delivery of online assessment was beginning and the main tool used at Portsmouth was QuestionMark Perception (McCabe, 1998), which had no underlying CAS. In 2005 the Department of Mathematics switched to using MapleTA and it has been the primary tool used for e-assessment since then (Figure 3). Initially a local server was used, but in recent years a managed server has proved more convenient and reliable, especially when dealing with product upgrades. Increasing student numbers at Portsmouth (McCabe 2009) made the effort worthwhuile.

ICTMT 13

The adoption of a commercial product, rather than an open source e-assessment system, such as *STACK* (Sangwin, 2004), *Numbas* (Foster, Perfect and Youd, 2012), *DEWIS* (Gwynllyw and Henderson, 2009) and *Math e.g.* (Greenhow and Kamavi, 2012), has provided stability and the availability of support when it was required.



Figure 2. World First Use of CAS for e-Assessment (McCabe and Watson, 1997)



Figure 3. Early Mathematics e-Assessment Delivery using MapleTA 2005 - 2007

AN EVOLVING STRATEGY FOR E-ASSESSMENT DELIVERY

The literature on e-assessment has grown considerably over the past 25 years. Timmis et al (2016) provides an up-to-date set of general references for what it calls Technology Enhanced Assessment TEA. Sangwin (2013) is the first textbook specifically on the subject of mathematics e-assessment and many other sources of guidance on e-assessment have been written over the years, e.g. Whitelock (2006), QCA (2007). At Portsmouth it has largely been years of practice and a gradual evolution that has shaped the present strategy for delivering e-assessment.

E-assessment delivery initially focussed on summative tests. Mathematical Models is a typical 1st year mathematics undergraduate course unit, for which MapleTA has been routinely used over the past 10 years. As question banks have increased in size, weekly practice tests with feedback have become the norm. A monthly coursework assessment on each topic, allows students a controlled 24-hour period to complete their work. Although different assessment patterns have been tried out, our experience is that a 40:60 weighting of continuous assessment to a final exam motivates students to work steadily through a course unit and achieve high marks as they progress. The final e-assessment exam lasts 2-hours and is always formally invigilated. Intermediate Calculus, a 2nd year course unit, adopts a similar progressive style of weekly practice e-assessments, monthly 24-hour courseworks, but with a more traditional 2-hour written final exam. The weekly practice assessments often promote flipped learning, with many students using them as the starting point in their study.

ICTMT 13

EFFICIENT DEVELOPMENT OF NEW QUESTION BANKS

The efficient production of high quality algorithmic questions with feedback has been the key to the successful delivery of e-assessment. The many features of MapleTA have enabled rapid authoring without getting bogged down in technicalities. Three special cases are highlighted here: reverse engineering, randomised components (datasets, functions, equations, graphs, networks, matrices ...) and multipart questions.



Figure 4. Efficient Question Setting Via Reverse Engineering of Dimensional Analysis

Special Case 1: Dimensional analysis is an extremely useful mathematical technique for solving problems with minimal work, but without a full understanding of the underlying physical processes. It is introduced as part of the Mathematical Models course unit. The left hand screenshot in Figure 4 shows a typical "real-world" question, which leads a student through the solution of a specific problem. The drawback is that finding sufficient realistic dimensional analysis problems to solve and the creation of a question bank is time-consuming. To avoid this, a randomised set of fictitious problems have been developed which allow the technique to be practiced effectively on meaningful questions. To illustrate its implementation, suppose we wish to find an unknown relationship $X = X(A,B,C) = kA^n B^m C^p$. If the dimensions of X, A, B and C are given as $M^{x_1}L^{x_2}T^{x_3}$, $M^{a_1}L^{a_2}T^{a_3}$, $M^{b_1}L^{b_2}T^{b_3}$, $M^{c_1}L^{c_2}T^{c_3}$ respectively, then we deduce that

 $a_1 n + b_1 m + c_1 p = x_1$ $a_2 n + b_2 m + c_2 p = x_2$ $a_3 n + b_3 m + c_3 p = x_3$

We could solve for n, m and p using Maple, but cannot easily be assured of user-friendly solutions. Instead the trick is to reverse engineer the question. Rather than setting up a randomised question and solving it, we start with a randomised solution for n, m and p, but then create randomised questions by choosing suitable question parameters. In practice, this simply means randomising a_i , b_i and c_i (i=1..3) and calculating x_1 , x_2 and x_3 from the three equations shown above. An

important condition, easily implemented in a MapleTA question algorithm, is to ensure that

 $\begin{vmatrix} a_1 & b_1 & c_1 \\ a_2 & b_2 & c_2 \\ a_3 & b_3 & c_3 \end{vmatrix} = 0$

is satisfied. A resulting question is shown on the right hand side of Figure 4. The difficulty of the question is readily adjusted by varying the range of randomised parameters and adding more physical quantities, such as temperature. Reverse engineering is an important technique in setting e-assessment questions in mathematics and allows them to be generated far more simply and reliably than the direct approach of solving a randomly generated problem.

Special Case 2: Algorithms with randomised components lie at the heart of most questions. The generation of simple numerical datasets for fractal box counting is a classic example (Figure 5). A simple logarithmic relationship log $N(s) = \log C + D \log s$ implies that a graph of log N(s) vs. log s will be a straight line with slope D, the fractal dimension. Data can be generated with or without randomised "noise".

s	N(s)	
1	25	
0.5	156	
0.22	1,361	
0.11	8.485	
0.11		
0.06 where N(s) is the n	42,036 umber of copies of the ch make up the origina	cauliflower I.
0.06 where N(s) is the n of linear size s, whi	42,036 umber of copies of the ch make up the origina fractal dimension of ca	cauliflower uliflowers = Planter
0.06 where N(s) is the n of linear size s, whi an estimate for the	42,036 umber of copies of the ch make up the origina fractal dimension of ca ct to TWO decimal place	cauliflower I. uilflowers = Manter
0.06 where N(s) is the n of linear size s, whi An estimate for the Enter a value corre	42,036 umber of copies of the ch make up the origina fractal dimension of ca ct to TWO decimal place of the cauliflower of line	cauliflower uliflowers = Munter es ar size 0.18 would you expect to make up the original

Figure 5. Randomised Datasets for Fractal Box Counting

Large banks of ODE and PDE questions have been developed with randomly generated equations, covering a wide range of types and solution methods.



Figure 6. Randomised Equations for ODE and PDE Solution

ICTMT 13

Lyon

For these questions, the technique of cloning, i.e. the copying and modification of existing questions, plays an important role in speeding up question production. Often only minor changes are needed to generate a completely different question.

Randomised graphs can be generated in MapleTA very efficiently. The matching question in Figure 7 is an example taken from a linear programming question bank and includes a different, graph for each of the 4 solution possibilities. Any graph that can be generated in Maple can be randomised in MapleTA with minimal effort.



Figure 7. Randomised Graphs for Linear Programming

Other examples of efficient graph plotting, using Maple commands and packages, are shown in Figure 8 below. All the graphs are generated dynamically for each instance of the question with a single command.



Figure 8. Randomised Graphs for Networks and Parametric Coordinate Problems

Special Case 3: Multi-part questions are used frequently to guide students though common solutions methods. Figure 8 (right) shows the combination of randomised graphs with a multipart question in solving a problem involving parametric coordinates. A further example, shown in Figure 9, is a question which works through statistical hypothesis testing.

C https://place36.	placementtester.com/portsmou	uth/contentmanager/DisplayQ 🔒	
MapleTA.			
Grade Question			
	Two requires Learning Colgacities - be able to perform a statistical inporthetis test The quality controller in a saw-mit catine that their wooden beams are better than average in support of the cation to perform so that of a random sample of n = 100. Beams Inspectors 40 passed, it is known that the average percentage of beams passing quality control inspections rationwide is	Const requests Learning Optication - to able to perform a statistical injoindential for the quality controller in a saar-mill costain test praise accorden basima are "better than average". In support of this costain he portists out of a random sample of n - 100. Dearns injopetical, ge passed. It is known that the average percentage of beams passing quality control injection raisonnide is	
	100p % - 88 % A suitable null hypothesis is H ₀ : p = (0%) A suitable alternative hypothesis is H ₁ : p (0%) 0.85 (Enter the biolowing answers to 2 decimal places)	100p % = 88 % A suitable null hypothesis is H ₀ : p = 8.88 A suitable atternative hypothesis is H ₀ : p § 0.88 (Enter the following answers to 2 decimal places)	
	The mean number of beams expected to pass based upon the nationwide average $= np = \frac{1}{2} (05)$ The standard deviation of the number of beams expected to pass based upon	The mean number of beams expected to pass based upon the nationwide average - np - ssal, io2 The standard deviation of the number of beams expected to pass based upon	
	the nationaide average $\sqrt{np(1-p)}$. Since $np > 5$ and $n(1-p) > 5$ we can use the normal approximation to the binomial distribution. Suppose we with to make a decision about the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level. We must do a one-tailed test with a critical value of 2 - 1.845	the nationus average - $\sqrt{np}\left(1-p\right)$ - size example. Since no - S and (1 - p) - S we can use the normal adproximation to the biomrail distribution. Suppose we with to make a decision about the null hypothesia ta the S significance level. We must do a one-tailed stat with a contract value of 2 - 1.645	
	Let X denote the number of beams passing the quality control inspection from the sample of 100, then $P(X \ge 98) = P(Z \ge (97.5 - (0\%)) - (0\%)) = P(Z \ge (0\%))$	Let X denote the number of beams passing the quality control inspection from the sample of 100, then $P(X \geq 93) \Rightarrow P(Z \geq (97.5 - 8865,02) + 2(2 \geq 2.2282356,02) = P(Z \geq 2.2282356,02)$	
	Hence we (0%) the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level.	Hence we reject the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level.	
	Fotel grade: 0.0+1/5 ± 0.0+1/5 \pm 0.0	0.0+1/8 + 0.0+1/8 + 0.0+1/8 + 0.0+1/8 = 0% + 0% + 0% + 0% + 0%	

Figure 9. Multi-Part Question for Statistical Hypothesis Testing

Without efficient means of authoring e-assessment questions, their development becomes a slow and unproductive process. The process can become even slower when the time taken to add feedback is taken into account. Experience has shown that reverse engineering, randomised algorithmically generated components and multi-part questions are often the key elements in creating effective, reusable questions.

EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF FEEDBACK

Basic principles of feedback practice in e-assessment have been well identified over the years, e.g. Nicol and Milligan (2006), but are often extraordinarily difficult to implement. The preparation of detailed, dynamically generated feedback can be extraordinarily time-consuming and may often take longer to produce than the question itself. It is often found to be more efficient to provide traditional written solutions to sample questions. Indeed it can be argued that automated solutions and feedback can eliminate the need to cross-reference different sources of information, such as textbooks, lecture notes and worked examples, making the arena of learning too restricted.

Although students are encouraged to read their lecture notes and worked examples, when they tackle e-assessment questions, some automatically generated feedback is always worthwhile. In MapleTA students can simply ask "How Did I Do?" while they are attempting a multi-part question. For example, when solving an ODE using Laplace transforms (Figure 10), partial solutions can be checked before moving on to later stages of the solution. Thus, mistakes in early parts of the question can be corrected before moving on to the complete solution.

Often a compromise must be reached between time spent on preparing fully automated feedback and more questions for a bank. The pragmatic approach has been to use the "How Did I Do?" option to provide a basic level of feedback without requiring much extra work. When it is routinely available in all questions during weekly practice tests, students usually take full advantage of the help that it gives them.

$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} y(t) + 8 \left(\frac{d}{dt} y(t) \right) + 15 y(t) = 3 + \text{Dirac} (t - 7) \text{ given } y = 5 \text{ and } dy/dt = 3 \text{ when } t = 0$ using the Laplace transform method. Enter exp(t) for the exponential function e! Enter Heaviside(t) for the Heaviside function H(t) Enter Dirac (t) for the Dirac function $\delta(t)$ a.) Laplace transform the right hand side to give There an expression b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give c.) Solve for $L(y) =$ Enter an expression d.) Take the inverse Laplace transform to give the solution y(t) = Enter an expression	Solve the OD	£
Enter exp(t) for the exponential function et Enter Heaviside(t) for the Heaviside function H(t) Enter Dirac (t) for the Dirac function $\delta(t)$ a.) Laplace transform the right hand side to give Enter an expression b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give c.) Solve for $L(y) = $ Enter an expression d.) Take the inverse Laplace transform to give the solution y(t) = Enter an expression	$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}t^2} y(t) +$ using the Lap	$8\left(\frac{d}{dt}y(t)\right) + 15y(t) = 3 + Dirac(t-7)$ given y = 5 and dy/dt = 3 when t = 0 lace transform method.
Enter Dirac (t) for the Dirac function $\delta(t)$ a.) Laplace transform the right hand side to give Enter an expression b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give Enter an expression in each box. c.) Solve for $L(y) =$ Enter an expression d.) Take the inverse Laplace transform to give the solution y(t) = Enter an expression	Enter exp(t) fr Enter Heavisi	r the exponential function e ^t de(t) for the Heaviside function H(t)
a.) Laplace transform the right hand side to give Enter an expression b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give c.) Solve for $L(y) =$ c.) Solve for $L(y) =$ c.) Solve for $L(y) =$ c.) Solve for L(y) = c.) Solve for L(y) =<	Enter Dirac(t)	for the Dirac function $\delta(t)$
Enter an expression b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give Laplace transform to give the solution y(t) =	a.) Laplace tr	Insform the right hand side to give
b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give b.) Laplace transform the left hand side to give D Enter an expression c.) Solve for $I_{(Y)} =$ D D <t< td=""><td>Enter an expr</td><td>ession</td></t<>	Enter an expr	ession
	b.) Laplace tr	insform the left hand side to give
Enter an expression in each box.		L(y) +
c.) Solve for $L(y) =$ Enter an expression d.) Take the inverse Laplace transform to give the solution $y(t) =$ Enter an expression Enter an expression	Enter an expr	ession in each box.
Enter an expression d.) Take the inverse Laplace transform to give the solution y(t) = Enter an expression	c.) Solve for J	
d.) Take the inverse Laplace transform to give the solution y(t) = b Enter an expression	Enter an expr	ession
y(t) =	d.) Take the i	iverse Laplace transform to give the solution
Enter an expression	y(t) =	
		ession

Figure 10. How Did I Do on my Laplace Transform Problem?

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF E-ASSESSMENT

Mathematics e-assessment has advanced considerably over a period of more than 25 years, since it was first used at the University of Portsmouth. Software developments have enabled online delivery, CAS checking of responses, randomisation in many different forms, algorithmic question generation, multi-part questions, new question types, targeted feedback and adaptive questions. Changes in the software tools over the first 15 years often made it necessary to abandon existing question banks and write new ones. Maintenance and improvement of question banks is still important, but far less time-consuming than it used to be. For the past 10 years there has been relative stability and the size of question banks has grown (Figure 10) as new topics have been added. With the recent addition of Fourier series, the total number of MapleTA questions now approaches 1000. These are available for MapleTA users of the future, who can also answer the question "How Did I Do?".



Figure 10. A Megabank of MapleTA Questions

REFERENCES

Greenhow, M. and Kamavi, K. (2012). Maths e.g. - a web assessment application for STEM and beyond, *Proceedings of the HEA STEM Learning and Teaching Conference*.

Gwynllyw, R. and Henderson, K. (2009). DEWIS: a computer aided assessment system for mathematics and statistics, *CETL-MSOR 2008 Conference Proceedings*, pp. 38-44.

McCabe, E.M. and Watson, J. (1997) From MathEdge to Mathwise: The Cutting 'Edge of Interactive Learning and Assessment in Mathematics", Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Technology in Maths Teaching, Koblenz

McCabe, E.M. (2009) *The Exponential Growth of Mathematics and Technology at the University of Portsmouth* Teaching Mathematics and Its Applications: An International Journal of the IMA, v28 n4 p222-227 Dec 2009 <u>http://teamat.oxfordjournals.org/content/28/4/222</u>

McCabe,E.M. (1998) CAA Workers Do IT with Perception, Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Computer Assisted Assessment Conference, 105 – 110, Loughborough University, ISBN 0-9533210 1 0

Nicol, D. and Milligan, C. (2006) *Rethinking technology-supported assessment practices in relation to the 7 principles of good feedback practice* D. Nicol & Milligan in "Innovative Assessment in HE" Routledge Falmer <u>http://ewds.strath.ac.uk/REAP/public/Papers/Nicol_Milligan_150905.pdf</u>

QCA, e-Assessment: Guide to Effective Practice (2007) Available online at https://www.e-assessment.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/e-assessment_-_guide_to_effective_practice_full_version.pdf

Sangwin, C. (2004). Assessing mathematics automatically using computer algebra and the internet, *Teaching Mathematics and its Applications* **23**(1): 1-14.

Sangwin, C. (2013). Computer Aided Assessment of Mathematics, Oxford University Press.

Timmis, S., Broadfoot, P., Sutherland, R. and Oldfield, A. (2016), Rethinking assessment in a digital age: opportunities, challenges and risks. Br Educ Res J, 42: 454–476. doi:10.1002/berj.3215

Whitelock, D. M. & Brasher, A. (2006) Developing a Roadmap for e-Assessment: Which Way Now? in: D. Myles (Ed) Proceedings of the 10th CAA International Computer Assisted Assessment Conference (Loughborough, UK, Professional Development, Loughborough University), 487–501.