# ECBD: Evidence-Centered Benchmark Design for NLP





Yu Lu Liu<sup>5, 1\*, 2\*</sup>, Su Lin Blodgett<sup>3</sup>, Jackie Chi Kit Cheung<sup>1,</sup> <sup>2, 4</sup>, Q. Vera Liao<sup>3</sup>, Alexandra Olteanu<sup>3</sup>, Ziang Xiao<sup>3\*, 5</sup>

Mila



<sup>1</sup>Mila – Quebec Artificial Intelligence Institute <sup>2</sup>McGill University

<sup>3</sup>Microsoft Research, Montréal, Canada <sup>4</sup>Canada CIFAR AI Chair <sup>5</sup>Johns Hopkins University \*previous affiliation, work done while affiliated Contact: yliu624@jh.edu



## How can we assess benchmark quality? How can we design better benchmarks?

We take inspiration from Evidence-Centered Design (ECD), a framework introduced in the field of education with the goal of guiding the design, evaluation, and interpretation of educational tests (Mislevy et al., 2003).

ECD: testing students as the process of gathering evidence from these **students** about their **abilities**.

#### In summary...

- We propose ECBD, a framework guiding practitioners in benchmark creation and analysis;
- We illustrate its usage for benchmark analysis, uncovering issues that threaten benchmark validity.

#### **Evidence-Centered** Benchmark Design Framework

We view benchmarking as the process of gathering evidence from *models* about their *capabilities*.

Intended Use

- What are the intended objects of evaluation?
- Who are the intended **users** of the benchmark?
- How should the users interpret and use the benchmark results?

#### Case Studies on Existing Benchmarks

**BoolQ** 

SuperGLUE

HELM

(Clark et al., 2019)

(Wang et al., 2019)

(Liang et al., 2022)

Little description of intended users and how they should interpret and use the benchmark results

#### Capability Module

Capabilities that the benchmark aims to measure;

Connection between the benchmark and its intended use.

## Content Module

Pool of available test items;

Each item elicits capability evidence about the capabilities it targets.

Adaptation Module

Adapting or instructing the obj. of eval. to respond;

Adaptation methods are well-suited for all intended objects of eval.

Assembly Module

Selecting test items to present to objects of eval.;

Selected set elicits sufficient evidence to measure the capabilities.

HELM

"Accuracy" (construct)

= "umbrella term for the standard accuracy-like metric"

Collapsing capabilities with the way they are measured

#### HELM

Using BoolQ dataset to measure "(social) bias", "toxicity", etc.

Repurposing data without appropriate justification

SuperGLUE

**BoolQ** 

No prescribed adaptation methods

SuperGLUE

BoolQ HELM

Assembly methods not described, nor justified

#### SuperGLUE **General-purpose** Language

**Understanding** Commonsense Everyday

Unclear decomposition into "intermediate" capabilities

#### HELM

"(Social) bias," "fairness," "toxicity" measurable without requiring "knowledge about the broader social context."

> Capabilities lacking appropriate grounding

#### SuperGLUE | HELM

"[ROUGE-2] is the default accuracy metric for CNN-DM and XSUM" (summarization datasets)

Decisions justified by the desire to follow prior work

#### **Evidence Module**

**Evidence** Extraction

For each test item, capture response from obj. of eval. and extract evidence about the targeted capabilities;

Extracted evidence captures the capabilities targeted by the item.

Accumulate extracted evidence across all presented items, to measure the **Evidence** capabilities of interest; Accumulation

Accumulated evidence captures the capabilities of interest.

### **Object** of Eval. (e.g., LM)

Benchmarks rarely gather validity evidence to support their design choices

#### **Examples of validity evidence:**

- Surveys: what capabilities to measure?
- Prior work conceptualizing capabilities
- Expert panels to examine test items
- Experiments (e.g., on correlation between metric scores and "gold" scores)

#### Describe

**What** design decisions are made?

#### Justify

Why are these decisions made?

Forming a hypothesis: These decisions enable the module to fulfill its role.

What **shows** that these decisions indeed enable the module to fulfill its role?

Support

Validity evidence supporting the hypothesis

#### **Future Directions**

#### Investigating:

- The use of ECBD to guide benchmark creation
- Practitioners use of ECBD through user studies
- How ECBD can be applied to areas beyond the evaluation of NLP models and systems

