

NLQTI Overview

IMS QTI APMG – October 10th 2013

A little history

- 2012: Dutch standardization group consisting of:
 - Software vendors
 - Schools
 - Government organizations
- Need: Standard for the *exchange* of tests in between systems of different vendors
- Group formulated functional requirements
 - Subset of full QTI
- Focus on:
 - Exchangeability
 - Ease of implementation
 - Tests (in contrast to exercises)
 - Full compatibility (NLQTI is still QTI)

What is in NLQTI (1)

Making the implementation easier:

- Limited functionality of assessmentItem (e.g. only one interaction/item)
- Limited number of interaction types (15 of 20)
- Limited options within interactions
- Limited options and nesting levels within tests
- Standardization of scoring (always 0.0 - 1.0)
- Standardization of identifier names
- Limited feedback capabilities

Increased chance of correct usage and consistent display:

- Explained QTI content packaging in more detail
- Added guidelines for layout, assets, etc.

What is in NLQTI (2)

Experience showed: Implementation of the QTI “programming language” takes a disproportionate amount of time and effort!

Making the implementation even more easy:

- Removed the need for interpretation of the QTI “programming language”
- Prescribed fixed behavior of items and tests.
- For compatibility: Fixed set of results processing templates

→ NLQTI is now *declarative* (where full QTI is *procedural*)

What is not in NLQTI

- No adaptable items
- No templating
- No XInclude
- No specific provisions for accessibility
 - No APIP
 - Several options for this removed

What constitutes NLQTI

- Schema derived from the full (final V2.1) QTI schema
- Schematron rules for further checking
- Extensive narrative texts explaining NLQTI and all its options/limitations
- Example files (items, tests, content package)
- Tooling on <http://www.nlqti.nl>
 - Validation of individual items and tests
 - Checking of QTI content packages

So why NLQTI as QTI profile?

Does it have any merits outside the Dutch educational scope?

- Can serve as “entry level” QTI
 - Much more easy to create and interpret
 - In its own right or as a first step towards full QTI
- Although limited still very useful
 - Most digital tests we encountered do not need more than NLQTI provides
- Easier to combine with declarative, form-based, test systems