Unison Live: Automated Feedback, Grading, and Analytics LTI Application

Ashish Aggarwal

ashishjuit@ufl.edu Department of Engineering Education University of Florida Gainesville, Florida, USA

ABSTRACT

As the enrollments in CS courses continue to increase, the need to grade students' submissions and provide effective feedback promptly at scale is a growing challenge for CS educators. Many autograding solutions have been introduced to address this issue. However, there are multiple barriers to adopting these solutions, including requiring significant changes in a course's workflow, setup processes requiring extensive IT support, and, more importantly, the learning curve for instructors. These inhibit instructors' ability to use autograding solutions effectively. In this demo, we present Unison Live, an automated feedback and grading web application that integrates with LTI (learning-tools-interoperability) compliant learning management systems (LMSs) like Canvas. With its use, instructors can enable autograding instructions on their existing assignments in their CS1/2 courses through an intuitive user interface without changing course specifications. Students submit their program files on the LMS and receive instant feedback and grade reports. Unison Live currently supports programming languages like Python, C++, and MATLAB. After the submission deadline, instructors receive auto-generated code similarity reports and aggregate behavioral analytics on student submissions. We believe that an app like this will not only address the logistical issues related to grading but also pedagogically support the integration of formative & optional programming assignments that students can practice at their own pace and receive feedback. More details on Unison Live are available on https://www.unisonlive.io/

KEYWORDS

automated feedback, assessment, autograder, CS1/2, LTI, plagiarism, analytics

ACM Reference Format:

Ashish Aggarwal and Aeyzechiah Vasquez. 2022. Unison Live: Automated Feedback, Grading, and Analytics LTI Application. In *Koli Calling '22: 22nd Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research (Koli 2022), November 17–20, 2022, Koli, Finland*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1 page. https://doi.org/10.1145/3564721.3565960

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

Koli Calling '22, November 17–20, 2022, Koli, Finland

© 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9616-5/22/11.

https://doi.org/10.1145/3564721.3565960

Aeyzechiah Vasquez

avasquez1@ufl.edu Department of Engineering Education University of Florida Gainesville, Florida, USA

	M2 HW: Geometry		
Enabled	Programming Language*	Grading Scheme* () Activity Level -	
structor's Note 🕐		Allocated Points ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ /100	
Question 1 × Question 2	x +		
Title*		Points*	
Question 1		50	
Submission Files Ends with + HW2_1.m + A00 submission File HW2_1.m HW2_1.m +			
Submission Files Ends with	C Lenient Casing Types Mile cange It be educt.	Ignore Alphabetical Words,	
Submission Files End with	Lenient Casing Igrow Mile carry in the adjust Igrow Milespace denotes in the output	Ignore Alphabetical Words Browsinghalosida characters to the service of the ser	

Figure 1: The UI to enable the autograding settings

Live						
Deck. 1	unana rege	M2 Activities	: Input/Out	tput		
Stu	Student Code Similarity \circ \Leftrightarrow \oplus $=$ $=$					
	Student 1	Student 2	Lines Matched	Similarity +		
	Bob Herm (54%)	Timmy Turner (52%)	54	High View Code		
	James Houston (30%)	Patrick Star (30%)	33	Heckum View Code		
	Joe James (10%)	Homer Simpson (9%)	10	Low View Code		
	John Walsh (11%)	Peter Griffon (10%)	14	Low Viaw Code		
				Понкратрара: 12 ч. — 1-Cal 4. — С. — Э.		

Figure 2: Code similarity checker



Figure 3: Analytics on number of submissions over time