Evaluating FOSS Course Evaluation Options
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# Introduction

This document records the evaluation of several course evaluation software projects and associated resources. It covers techniques, definitions, timeframes, and commentary. See the [**Conclusion**](#_Conclusion) for an executive summary of findings. Any relevant contextual information should be found in [**Information**](#_Information).

# Guiding Questions

1. What FOSS Products Exist that do Course Evaluation?  
   Is there a Project You Can Just Join?
2. What FOSS Products Exist that Can Provide Big Portions of Functionality we Want?
3. What Proprietary Products Provide Course Evaluations?

# Conclusion

Either [**Option 1**](EvaP#_Option_1_) or [**Option 2**](Sakai#_Option_2_) should be pursued for further development. All other options are either inadequate or inapplicable. Despite hundreds of results on GitHub, GitLab, and other public code-sharing platforms, most projects are of terrible quality. [**Options 4**](OpenSubmit#_Option_4_) through [**Options 7**](CourseEvaluation#_Option_7_) reflect some of the quality of projects found. [**Rejected Options**](#_Rejected_Options) include projects so small that no analysis was performed for them. A single [**proprietary project**](Anthology#_Option_3_) was included for reference.

Depending on whether integration into a larger institution content management system is sought will determine whether [**Option 1**](EvaP#_Option_1_) or [**Option 2**](Sakai#_Option_2_) is selected.

# Steps

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**Plan**](#_Plan) | Comparison Spreadsheet, Document Timeline, Project Timeline |
| [**Discovery**](#_Discovery_and_Steps) | GitHub, News Articles, Google, Comparison Reports |
| [**Testing**](#_Evaluation_Criteria) | Common Features, Safety/Security, Compatibility |
| [**Noting**](#_Options) | Record Results in Spreadsheet |

# 

# Plan

## Discovery and Steps

1. Layout Initial Document Design
2. Choose comparison format and item template
3. Search “Course Evaluation” on GitHub
4. Search “Quiz-Maker” on GitHub
5. Flesh out analysis of candidate projects
6. Outline final choice/eliminate candidates
7. Discuss with team which choice to pursue
8. Conclude and finalize report

## Document Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2021-01-31** | * Layout basic document for comparison * Decide on plan/timeline * Find initial candidate projects |
| **2022-02-04** | * Review status of document given new criteria |
| **2022-02-06** | * Submit final document |

Note, it would be preferable if all this discussion were not necessary. This feel extremely disconnected from reality and how this might be approached

## Project Timeline (Blue Team)

Assumes the much shorter and probable timeline of the course.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2022-01-31** | * (Today) |
| **2022-02-06** | * Confirm decisions concerning project direction |
| **2022-02-20** | * Basic forking/contributing experimented with * Some prototypes created * More detailed plans created |
| **2022-02-27** | * Most substantial contributions made |
| **2022-03-06** | * Finalize documents and prepare for closing activities |
| **2022-03-14** | * (Final Exams Start) * Cannot expect effective contributions during and past this period |

## Project Timeline (Drexel)

Assumes a much longer-term perspective past the cessation of the course.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2022-01** | * (Today) |
| **2022-03** | * Student investigations complete * Discuss with Drexel IT staff as they will be primary maintainers/users of any adopted course evaluation systems |
| **2023** | * Over course of 2022, complete investigations * If and only if a FOSS project is accepted by Drexel administration determine financial responsibility of project and sustainment |
| **2024** | * If and only if project is selected, work on developing to meet current AEFIS capabilities * Work with Drexel IT to determine necessities of migrating data |
| **2025** | * Slowly introduce new system and close AEFIS |

# 

# Evaluation Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of System** | **Options:** Quiz, Course Evaluation, General, Tool, Other  Determines the direction an item can go in/what strategies are applicable.  **Weight:** None (Informational) |
| **License Quality** | **Options:** 0 = None/Proprietary/Overly Restrictive/Obscure  1 = Limited/Restrictive  2 = Unrestricted  It must be easy to contribute to. If the license makes that difficult, getting future contributors will be difficult.  **Weight:** 3 (Important) |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | **Options:** 0 = Nonexistent  1 = Basic  2 = Fully Featured  Ability to write useful Course Evaluations, Templates, Feedback, Analysis, Realtime Editing, Version Control.  **Weight:** 3 (Important) |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | **Options:** 0 = Hard  1 = Poor  2 = Easy  Use of a recent web framework with emphasis on extending to new formats over time. Can university IT staff manage the system?  **Weight:** 3 (Important) |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | **Options:** 0 = Obscure/Obsolete  1 = Acceptable/Minor Issues  2 = Excellent  Should also include User Management, Security, Ease of New Installation.  **Weight:** 3 (Important) |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | **Options:** 0 = No Security/Poor Migration  1 = Adaptable to current needs with effort  2 = Fits current needs/minor modification only  A focus on persistent storage for many years should be included. Database Migration, and Privacy of Data.  **Weight:** 1 (Less Important) |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness / Issue Tracking** | **Options:** 0 = Nonexistent  1 = Partial/Incomplete  2 = Complete Coverage  Determines what current/previous status of project is, informs ability for new contributors to contribute to system.  **Weight:** 2 (Important) |
| **Documentation Quality** | **Options:** 0 = Inaccurate  1 = Poor/Outdated/Unstructured  2 = Excellent  Is a good habit of updating documentation present?  **Weight:** 2 (Important) |
| **New Contributor Experience** | **Options:** 0 = Nonexistent  1 = Some Effort  2 = Optimized Experience  Is the README complete? Can an inexperienced and marginally involved person contribute meaningful code?  **Weight:** 2 (Important) |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | **Options:** 0 = None  1 = Basic/Minimum  2 = Robust Community Management  How do maintainers interact with one another? Is this a safe environment for new users? Have any formal rules been written?  **Weight:** 2 (Important) |
| **Community Size** | **Options:** 0 = No Users  1 = One User  2 = Two or More Users  Here a “user” refers to an institution, hence the small numbers. Still a niche and new area, so fewer users is expected.  **Weight:** 2 (Important) |
| **Maintenance Activity** | **Options:** 0 = No Activity in Past Year  1 = Any Activity in Past Year  2 = Consistent Activity each Month in Past Year  Prefer projects with active contributors.  **Weight:** 2 (Important) |
| **Maintainer Size** | **Options:** 0 = Three or Fewer Contributors  1 = Ten to Four Contributors  2 = More than Ten Contributors  Standard contributor sizes cannot be expected for most items, given the niche area. If a project with maintainers fitting this pattern, bias towards it strongly.  **Weight:** 2 (Important) |
| **Product Size** | **Options:** 0 = Project is too small or too large to fit needs  1 = Project can fit requirements with adjustment  2 = Project fits current requirements  **Small “student” projects** are especially common. **Comprehensive but hard to edit school-management-systems** that happen to include a course evaluation module are also common. Neither size is especially desirable.  **Weight:** 3 (Important) |
| **Comments** | **Options:** (Free)  Any other comments regarding this option.  **Weight:** None (Informational) |
| **Location** | **Options:** (URL)  Location of project on web.  **Weight:** None (Informational) |
| **Final Confidence** | **Options:** (Percent)  How confident an option the item is (would we feel confident pursuing this as an option).  **Weight:** None (Informational) |
| **Total Score** | **Options:** (Points and Percent)  Total Weight \* Value Summed across all Attributes for this given item. The highest possible score is 60 points. The percentage is calculated from this score. |
| **Evaluator** | **Options:** (Name)  The person who reviewed this item. |

# Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Options** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| **License Quality** | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness / Issue Tracking** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Documentation Quality** | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Community Size** | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| **Maintainer Size** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Product Size** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Final Confidence** | 90% | 90% | 90% | 10% | 20% | 10% | 10% |
| **Total Score** | 85% | 73% | 30% | 27% | 35% | 19 | 22% |

# Options

## Option 1 “EvaP”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **Course Evaluation** |
| **License Quality** | 2 | 3 | **(MIT)** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 2 | 3 | **(Many Types Supported)** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 2 | 3 | **(Follows Conventions)** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 2 | 3 | **(Django Framework)** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 1 | 1 | **(Must Configure for Own Database)** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** | 2 | 2 | **(Extensive; Tagged; Up to date)** |
| **Documentation Quality** | 2 | 2 | **(Hyperlinked, Structured, Modern)** |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 2 | 2 |  |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 2 | **(None Specified)** |
| **Community Size** | 2 | 2 | **(Cannot be determined)** |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 2 | 2 | **This project is frequently being updated with information and contributions. Last commit/update was 2022-01-31.** |
| **Maintainer Size** | 2 | 2 | **There are only 55 open issues, most are major with bugs and improvements to be made on data testing, and some are minor involving improvement to the user interface.** |
| **Product Size** | 2 | 3 |  |
| **Comments** |  |  | The best option found so far, comprehensive system, documentation, effort. See also [Option 2](Sakai#_Option_2_). |
| **Location** |  |  | <https://github.com/e-valuation/EvaP> |
| **Final Confidence** | 90% |  | We would be willing to use this system. |
| **Total Score** | 51 | 85% | 6 + 6 + 6 + 6 + 1 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 0 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 6 = 51 |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | *Peter Mangelsdorf* |

## Option 2 “Sakai Evaluation System (EVALSYS)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **Course Evaluation** |
| **License Quality** | 1 | 3 | **(Obscure)** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 2 | 3 | **(Multiple Types)** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 2 | 3 |  |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 2 | 3 | **(Java 8 and** [**Sakai**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sakai_(software))**)** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 1 | 1 | **(Must Configure for Own Database)** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** | 2 | 2 | **(Uses JIRA)** |
| **Documentation Quality** | 1 | 2 | **(Code Comments Only)** |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 1 | 2 | **(Minimal Documentation)** |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 2 | **(None Specified)** |
| **Community Size** | 0 | 2 | **(Cannot Determine)** |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 2 | 2 |  |
| **Maintainer Size** | 2 | 2 |  |
| **Product Size** | 2 | 3 |  |
| **Comments** |  |  | The second-best project to move forward with. Note the unusual license. Part of a larger integrated platform. See also [Option 1](EvaP#_Option_1_). |
| **Location** |  |  | <https://github.com/sakaicontrib/evaluation> |
| **Final Confidence** | 90% |  | We would be willing to use this system. |
| **Total Score** | 44 | 73% | 3 + 6 + 6 + 6 + 1 + 4 + 2 + 2 + 0 + 0 + 4 + 4 + 6 = 44 |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | *Hoang Nguyen* |

## Option 3 “Anthology Course Evaluations”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **Course Evaluation** |
| **License Quality** | 0 | 3 | **(Proprietary)** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 2 | 3 |  |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 0 | 3 | **(Unknown)** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 0 | 3 | **(Unknown)** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 0 | 1 | **(Unknown)** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** | 0 | 2 | **(Unknown)** |
| **Documentation Quality** | 2 | 2 |  |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 0 | 2 | **(Unknown)** |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 2 | **(Unknown)** |
| **Community Size** | 2 | 2 |  |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 0 | 2 | **(Unknown)** |
| **Maintainer Size** | 2 | 2 |  |
| **Product Size** | 2 | 3 |  |
| **Comments** |  |  | Proprietary, featureful platform. Note recognized as an option given the license. Useful for feature comparison. Most likeliest to be maintainable by Drexel IT staff. |
| **Location** |  |  | <https://www.anthology.com/> |
| **Final Confidence** | 90% |  | We would be willing to use this system. |
| **Total Score** | 18 | 30% | 0 + 6 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 4 + 0 + 0 + 4 + 0 + 4 + 6 = 18 |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | *Charles Porter* |

## Option 4 “OpenSubmit”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **Quiz/Other** |
| **License Quality** | 1 | 3 | **(AGPL License, Some Restrictions)** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 0 | 3 | **(No Quiz Questions/System)** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 1 | 3 | **(Very Little Defined)** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 2 | 3 | **(Uses Django, Docker)** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 2 | 1 | **(All Defined)** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** | 1 | 2 | **(Some Issues but no extensive documentation)** |
| **Documentation Quality** | 0 | 2 | **(Very Minimal. Links to External Documentation Broken)** |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 0 | 2 | **(None Written and Not Apparent in Issues)** |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 2 | **(None)** |
| **Community Size** | 0 | 2 | **(Cannot Determine)** |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 0 | 2 | **(Last Commit 2020-02-19)** |
| **Maintainer Size** | 0 | 2 | **(Most Contributions Insignificant)** |
| **Product Size** | 0 | 3 | **(Tiny)** |
| **Comments** |  |  | **NOT** applicable to this project, included for example inadequacy seen in [Rejected Options](#_Rejected_Options). |
| **Location** |  |  | <https://github.com/troeger/opensubmit> |
| **Final Confidence** | 10% |  | We would NOT be willing to use this system. |
| **Total Score** | 16 | 27% | 3 + 0 + 3 + 6 + 2 + 2 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 16 |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | *Eric Savoy* |

## Option 5 “FUI-KK”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **Course Evaluation** |
| **License Quality** | 2 | 3 | **(MIT)** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 1 | 3 | **(Textual Only)** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 1 | 3 | **(No Frameworks Used)** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 1 | 3 | **(No Frameworks Used)** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 1 | 1 | **(Report Generation; Etcetera; No Privacy Apparent)** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** | 1 | 2 | **Some documents need updating and are missing.** |
| **Documentation Quality** | 1 | 2 | **Documents are hard to follow. Mostly unfinished documents. README only explains how to test the software, not contribute.** |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 0 | 2 | **Following through the documentation is hard. Interacting with other contributors will be hard since they have not worked on this project in two years.** |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 2 | **A README is present but does not specify the rules/guidelines.** |
| **Community Size** | 0 | 2 | **(Cannot be determined)** |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 0 | 2 | **The project has not been updated since 2020-04-22.** |
| **Maintainer Size** | 0 | 2 | **(Effectively only 1 contributor)** |
| **Product Size** | 1 | 3 | **(Does Not Include User Management)** |
| **Comments** |  |  | Not preferable given [Option 1](EvaP#_Option_1_) and [Option 2](Sakai#_Option_2_). Many necessary features not present. |
| **Location** |  |  | <https://github.com/fui/fui-kk> |
| **Final Confidence** | 20% |  | **We would NOT be willing to use this system.** |
| **Total Score** | 21 | 35% | 6 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 3 = 21 |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | *Jay Patel* |

## Option 6 “Quiz Master”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **Quiz** |
| **License Quality** | 2 | 3 | **(Apache)** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 0 | 3 | **(Wrong Format for Evaluations)** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 1 | 3 | **(Much Adaptation Required)** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 2 | 3 | **(Scala; Hydro Framework)** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 0 | 1 | **(None)** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** | 0 | 2 | **(Few Issues and No Documents)** |
| **Documentation Quality** | 0 | 2 | **(None)** |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 0 | 2 |  |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 2 | **(Not Specified)** |
| **Community Size** | 0 | 2 | **(Cannot Determine)** |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 2 | 2 |  |
| **Maintainer Size** | 0 | 2 | **(One Contributor)** |
| **Product Size** | 0 | 3 | **(Tiny)** |
| **Comments** |  |  | Not preferable given [Option 1](EvaP#_Option_1_) and [Option 2](Sakai#_Option_2_). Would need to use this as part of a larger system we would develop. The data serialization format (YAML) and presentation are noteworthy. |
| **Location** |  |  | <https://github.com/nymanjens/quizmaster> |
| **Final Confidence** | 10% |  | We would NOT be willing to use this system. |
| **Total Score** | 19 | 32% | 6 + 0 + 3 + 6 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 4 + 0 + 0 = 19 |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | *Eric Savoy* |

## Option 7 “CourseEvaluation”

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **Quiz** |
| **License Quality** | 1 | 3 | **(Restrictions)** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | 1 | 3 | **(Only Basics Covered)** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | 1 | 3 | **(No Web Framework Used)** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | 1 | 3 | **(No Web Framework Used)** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | 1 | 1 | **(Much Adaptation Required)** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** | 0 | 2 | **(None)** |
| **Documentation Quality** | 0 | 2 | **(No Documents)** |
| **New Contributor Experience** | 0 | 2 |  |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | 0 | 2 | **(None Specified)** |
| **Community Size** | 0 | 2 | **(Cannot Determine)** |
| **Maintenance Activity** | 0 | 2 | **(No History/Recent Commits Only)** |
| **Maintainer Size** | 0 | 2 | **(One Contributor)** |
| **Product Size** | 0 | 3 | **(Tiny)** |
| **Comments** |  |  | Not preferable given [Option 1](EvaP#_Option_1_) and [Option 2](Sakai#_Option_2_). Only useful if starting a new project from scratch, and if Java is insisted upon. Otherwise prefer [Option 2](Sakai#_Option_2_) (Java) or [Option 1](EvaP#_Option_1_) (Django). |
| **Location** |  |  | <https://github.com/aimerneige/CourseEvaluation> |
| **Final Confidence** | 10% |  | We would NOT be willing to use this system. |
| **Total Score** | 13 | 22% | 3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 1 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 13 |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | *Peter Mangelsdorf* |

# Misc

## Document License

CC0 1.0 Universal  
<https://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/legalcode>  


## Rejected Options

* [**Google Android Quiz**](https://github.com/googlearchive/android-Quiz/blob/master/Application/src/main/assets/Quiz.json) Outdated, Unmaintained, Insignificant
* [**QuizDen**](https://github.com/TanvirSojal/QuizDen) Outdated, Unmaintained, Insignificant
* [**SchemaOrg Quiz**](https://schema.org/Quiz) Just a schema, no tools, no platform
* [**RateMyCourse**](https://github.com/yutianw00/RateMyCourse) Outdated, Unmaintained, Insignificant
* [**Course-Evaluation**](https://github.com/Quatresa/Course-Evaluation) Outdated, Unmaintained, Insignificant

## [Blackboard’s List of Question Types](https://help.blackboard.com/Learn/Instructor/Original/Tests_Pools_Surveys/Question_Types)

## Evaluation Criteria Item Table Template 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of System** | **MISSING** |
| **License Quality** | **MISSING** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** | **MISSING** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** | **MISSING** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** | **MISSING** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** | **MISSING** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness / Issue Tracking** | **MISSING** |
| **Documentation Quality** | **MISSING** |
| **New Contributor Experience** | **MISSING** |
| **Contribution Guidelines** | **MISSING** |
| **Community Size** | **MISSING** |
| **Maintenance Activity** | **MISSING** |
| **Maintainer Size** | **MISSING** |
| **Product Size** | **MISSING** |
| **Comments** | MISSING |
| **Location** | MISSING |
| **Final Confidence** | MISSING |
| **Total Score** | MISSING |
| **Evaluator** | MISSING |

## Evaluation Criteria Item Table Template 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concern** | **Score** | **Weight** | **Comments** |
| **Type of System** |  |  | **MISSING** |
| **License Quality** |  | 3 | **MISSING** |
| **Quality of Quiz System / Technology I** |  | 3 | **MISSING** |
| **Ease of Extensibility / Technology II** |  | 3 | **MISSING** |
| **Platform Relevancy / Technology III** |  | 3 | **MISSING** |
| **Data Management / Technology IV** |  | 1 | **MISSING** |
| **Documentation Comprehensiveness /Issue Tracking** |  | 2 | **MISSING** |
| **Documentation Quality** |  | 2 | **MISSING** |
| **New Contributor Experience** |  | 2 | **MISSING** |
| **Contribution Guidelines** |  | 2 | **MISSING** |
| **Community Size** |  | 2 | **MISSING** |
| **Maintenance Activity** |  | 2 | **MISSING** |
| **Maintainer Size** |  | 2 | **MISSING** |
| **Product Size** |  | 3 | **MISSING** |
| **Comments** |  |  | MISSING |
| **Location** |  |  | MISSING |
| **Final Confidence** |  |  | MISSING |
| **Total Score** |  |  | MISSING |
| **Evaluator** |  |  | MISSING |