

XMarks draft information model – assessment data object

No.	Name	Explanation	Req	n	Type	Note
1.1	comment	A comment for the overall Assessmentnt structure	O		comments	See common objects
1.2	sourcedid	The ID of the assessment as defined by the source system	M		sourcedid	See common objects
1.3	courseid	The course code of the course to which these marks belong	M		string32	aka module
1.4	groupid	Where the assessment belongs to a teaching group rather than a whole course	O		string32	
1.5	assessment mode	contributory/non-contributory	M		string32	
1.6	conflation rule	how is this assessment combined with others to give an overall mark	O		string32	probably only relevant for contributory assessments. for display only.
1.7	weighting	what percentage of overall mark does this assessment carry	O		number	probably only relevant for contributory assessments. for display only.
1.8	assessment type	a description of the sort of assessment	M		String, enumerated	e.g. presentation, essay, composition, lab report Enumerated list. Each institution will wish to define its own?
1.9	handin	details about handin requirements	O			
1.9.1	datetime		O		datetime	see common objects
1.9.2	location or method	this could be a physical room location, or it could be the learning system that will be used for implement a given assessment	O		string1024	
1.10	mark scheme	integer, scale etc	M		string	including a value for non-marked assessments
1.11	maxmark	the maximum mark possible in the given mark scheme	O			

Assumptions/limitations/questions

1. Only one mark scheme is specified here although the marks format allows for the possibility of marks within a course having different mark schemes, e.g. for a course that is taken by students from a range of programmes in an institution where students from an MSc programme get alphabetic grades whereas students from an MA programme get numeric grades. So any implementation would need to specify behaviour where the mark scheme from the marks record differed from that defined in the assessment record.
2. We've assumed all assessments belong to a course aka module, or a teaching group within a course/module. But presumably it also possible for assessments to belong to an overall programme of study, so the object to which the marks are attached may need to be more flexible.

XMarks draft information model – marks data object

This format enables the representation of a number of marks that are all passed together for a single assessment. The structure mark-listing (2.3) is therefore a multivalued structure within the main marks data object.

It would also be possible to use the format to represent a single mark from one student.

No	Name	Explanation	Req	n	Type	Note
2.1	comment	A comment on the overall Marks structure	0		comments	See common objects
2.2	assessment-sourcedid	The ID of the assessment as defined by the source system	M			This will be the source system with respect to the marks, which isn't necessarily where the assessment originated?
2.3	mark-listing	A set of marks	M	M		
2.3.1	student-id		M		person-id	See common objects
2.3.1	mark		M			
2.3.2	mark-scheme		O			where more than one scheme is possible, e.g. numeric, alphabetic
2.3.3	submit status		O		Likely to be a list: "non-submit" "late", "very late" etc	
2.3.4	submit date	Where submission is managed electronically, the full date-time of the submission could be passed	O		date	See common objects
2.3.5	marker-comments-individual	Comments intended for the student on their individual work				
2.3.6	marked-by				person-id	See common objects
2.3.7	marked-date				date	See common objects
2.4	marker-comments-group	General comments intended for the whole cohort			comments	See common objects

Assumptions/limitations/questions

1. This format assumes that mitigation for late or non-submitted assessments or the calculation of penalty points do not form part of this light-weight spec. These are likely to be functions carried out by the student records system.

2. Our view is that if a learning management system or other tool is being used to manage methods of assessment such as peer marked assessments, where each student may end up receiving several marks from their peers, then it is the function of that tool to normalise all these marks and provide a single mark to be represented in this data model. But we'd appreciate comments on this scoping issue.

3. Our view is that if a learning management system or other tool is being used to manage methods of assessment such as group marked assessments, then it is the function of that tool to normalise all these marks and provide a single mark to be represented in this data model. Comments on this scoping issue?

4. Both the assessment and the marks data model contain a mark scheme. This represents the fact that different students on the same course may be marked according to different schemes. It is therefore an implementation issue to decide how to manage situations where the mark schemes differ.

XMarks draft data format – common data objects

No	Name	Explanation	Req	n	Type	Note
3.1	comments	comments about the containing data structure	-		string2048	
3.1.1	lang	the writiten language of the comment	0			as for 3.2
3.2	lang	the written language of the string	-	-	string128	
3.3	datasource	identifier for original source of information	-	-	string256	
3.4	person-id					
3.5	datetime	Date and time the objects were generated or when an event is expected to take place (e.g. handin)			datetime	as for ISO8601
3.6	sourcedid	The id of the data bject defined by the source				

Assumptions/limitations/questions

1. more to add here