Functional Programming and Theorem Proving for Undergraduates A Progress Report

Carl Eastlund and Matthias Felleisen Northeastern University

Rex Page University of Oklahoma

History

Before 2003

Traditional SE at OU (2-course sequence, 4th yr)

20%

Testing/Validation

- Process
 Design
 Option
- **60% 20%**
- **2003-2005**
 - SE course using ACL2 (FDPE 2005 report)
 - Process Design Testing/Validation
 30% 35% 35%
 - Successful despite crude programming env
- 2006 present
 - SE course with Dracula/ACL2 environment
 - 1st year course at NU using Dracula/ACL2

Mantra



- Successful despite crude programming env
- 2006 present
 - SE course with Dracula/ACL2 environment
 - 1st year course at NU using Dracula/ACL2

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    (* x x))
```











00	worm.lisp	- DrScheme			C
worm.lisp▼ (defun)▼	Debug 🍯	Check Syntax Q	Run 📌	Stop 🦲	Start ACL2
;; short-worm : Int	eger Integ	ger Directi	on ->	Worm	1
;; Produces a worm	without a	tail.			
(defun short-worm	x y d)				
(make-worm d (mak	e-point x	y) nil))			
;; worm-turn : Worm	Direction	n -> Worm			
;; Changes the dire	ction a wo	orm faces.			
(defun worm-turn (w	r d)				
(make-worm d (wor	m-head w)	(worm-tail	w)))		
;; worm-move : Worm	n -> Worm				
;; Moves the worm i	n the dire	ection it f	aces.		
(defun worm-move (w	7)				
(make-worm					
(worm-dir w)					
(point+ (worm-he	ad w)				
(dir-del	ta				
(worm-c	lir w)))				
(drop-last-point					
(cons (worm-hea	dw)				
(worm-tai	1 w)))))				
Dracula vd. 2 💌				314-0	Å

00	worm.lisp	- DrScheme		0
worm.lisp▼ (defun)▼	Debug 🍯	Check Syntax ${f Q}$ Run ,	🔏 Stop 🦲	Start ACL2
:: short-worm : Int	eger Inter	per Direction	-> Worr	m
·· Produces a worm	without a	tail	- 11021	
(defun short-worm (x y d)			
(make-worm d (mak	e-point v	w) nil))		
(maxe worm a (max	e point x	<i>y</i> / 111//		
;; worm-turn : Worm	Direction	n -> Worm		
;; Changes the dire	ction a wo	orm faces.		
(defun worm-turn (w	d)			
(make-worm d (wor	m-head w)	(worm-tail w)))	
;; worm-move : Worm	-> Worm			(
;; Moves the worm i	n the dire	ection it face	S.	
(defun worm-move (w)			
(make-worm				
(worm-dir w)				
(point+ (worm-he	ad w)			
(dir-del	ta			
(worm-d	ir w)))			
(drop-last-point				
(cor lump to Definitio	n			
View documenta	tion for cons			
binding cons imported from (planet	"language/dracula	.scm" ("cce" "dracula.plt" ·	4))	- •
Dracula v4.2 🔻			435:0	Ŕ





$\Theta \bigcirc \bigcirc$	worm.lisp -	- DrScheme				0
vorm.lisp▼ (defun)▼ Save 🗖	Debug 🍯	Check Syntax Q	Run 📌	Stop 🦲	Start A	CL2
;; short-worm : Inter	ger Inter	er Directi	on ->	Worm	ı	
;; Produces a worm with	thout a	tail.				- 1
(defun short-worm (x	y d)					- 1
(make-worm d (make-	-point x	y) nil))				
;; worm-turn : Worm I	Direction	n -> Worm				
;; Changes the direct	tion a wo	orm faces.				
(defun worm-turn (w c	1)					- 1
(make-worm d (worm-	-head w)	(worm-tail	w)))			
						0
;; worm-move : Worm -	-> Worm					- 1
;; Moves the worm in	the dire	action it f	aces.			- 1
(defun worm-move (the	e-worm)					- 1
(make-worm						- 1
(worm-dir the-worm	n)					- 1
(point+ (worm-head	d the-wor	cm)				- 1
(dir-delta	1					- 1
(worm-di	the-wor	rm)))				- 1
(drop-last-point						
(cons (worm-head	the-worn	n)				
(worm-tail	the-worn	n)))))				
Dracula v4.2 🔻				314:0		\$

00	worm.lisp – DrScheme	
worm.lisp▼ (defun)▼	Debug 🜒 Check Syntax Q Run 📌 Stop 🖲 🛛 Star	tACL2 Point
	Integer Integer Direction -> We	Source and the second s
;; Short-worm :	integer integer Direction -> wo	L'III
/defun short-wo	em (v u d)	Book and a second
(make-worm d	(make-point x y) nil))	
(make worm d	(make-point x y) mil)/	a fill and the second s
:: worm-turn :)	Worm Direction -> Worm	Charles and the second
;; Changes the	direction a worm faces.	Grid
(defun worm-tur	n (w d)	
(make-worm d	(worm-head w) (worm-tail w)))	Food
;; worm-move : 1	Worm -> Worm	Worm
;; Moves the wo:	rm in the direction it faces.	The second secon
(defun worm-move	e (w)	
(make-worm		
(worm-dir w)		Differences and the second
(point+ (worn	m-head w)	Martin and Contraction
(dir	-delta	
(wo:	rm-dir w)))	
(drop-last-p	oint	
(cons (worm	-head w)	Game
(worm	-tail w)))))	Jane
Dracula v4.2 🔻		435:0





```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    (* x x))
```

```
;; All squares are nonnegative.
(defthm sqr>=0
  (implies (integerp x)
                           (>= (sqr x) 0)))
```

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    x)
```



Program Design

How to Design Programs code:

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(define (sqr x)
        (* x x))
```

```
;; Unit tests:
```

(check-expect (sqr 0) 0)

(check-expect (sqr 2) 4)

Program Design

Dracula code:

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    (* x x))
```

- ;; Unit tests:
- (check-expect (sqr 0) 0)
- (check-expect (sqr 2) 4)

Unit Tests

Dracula code:

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    (* x x))
```

;; Unit tests: (==> assert-event)
(check-expect (sqr 0) 0)
(check-expect (sqr 2) 4)

Unit Tests



Unit Tests



Beyond Unit Tests

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    (+ x x))
```

```
;; Unit tests:
```

```
(check-expect (sqr 0) 0)
```

```
(check-expect (sqr 2) 4)
```

Beyond Unit Tests



- ;; DoubleCheck property: (defproperty name (x [:where precondition] [:value distribution] ...) postcondition)

```
;; ACL2 theorem:
(defthm sqr>=0
  (implies (integerp x)
                          (>= (sqr x) 0)))
```

```
;; DoubleCheck property:
(defproperty sqr>=0
 (x)
 (implies (integerp x)
  (>= (sqr x) 0)))
```

;; DoubleCheck property: (defproperty sqr>=0 (x :where (integerp x)) (>= (sqr x) 0))

```
;; ACL2 theorem:
(defthm sqr>=0
  (implies (integerp x)
                     (>= (sqr x) 0)))
```

;; DoubleCheck property: (defproperty sqr>=0 (x :where (integerp x) :value (random-integer)) (>= (sqr x) 0))

;; Simple distributions: (random-string) (random-integer)

;; Parameterized distributions: (random-between low high) (random-list-of dist [:size size])

;; Write new distributions: (defrandom name (arg ...) expr)

```
;; ACL2 theorem:
(defthm sqr>=0
  (implies (integerp x)
                          (>= (sqr x) 0)))
```

;; DoubleCheck property:(==> defthm)
(defproperty sqr>=0
 (x :where (integerp x)
 :value (random-integer))
 (>= (sqr x) 0))

```
;; ACL2 theorem:
(defthm sqr>=0
  (implies (integerp x)
        (>= (sqr x) 0)))
```

```
;; Ideal syntax (future work):
(defproperty sqr>=0
  (implies (integerp x)
                    (>= (sqr x) 0)))
```





000	sqr.lisp - DrScheme		0
sqr.lisp ▼ (defun) ▼	Debug 🌒 Check Syntax 🤇	२ Run 🔏 Stop 🖲	Start ACL2
;; sqr : Int -	> Int		
(defun sqr (x)			0
(+ x x))			
;; Unit tests:			
(check-expect	(sqr 0) 0)		
(check-expect	(sqr 2) 4)		
(check-expect	(sqr -30) 900)		¥
			
Welcome to Dr 🖲 🤇	0	Test Results	
Language: Dra Ran	3 checks.		
> 1 c	of the 3 checks faile	ed.	
Dracula v4.2 🔻			
A	ctual value -60 dif	fers from 9	00, the expected value.
Tr	/IIsers/cce/Deskton	sor lisp at	line 12 column 0
	/ USELS/ CCE/ DESKCOP/	byr.rrsp ac	THE TE COLUMN O
			Close Dock

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    (+ x x))
```

```
;; Unit tests:
```

```
(check-expect (sqr 0) 0)
```

```
(check-expect (sqr 2) 4)
```

```
(check-expect (sqr -30) 900)
```

```
;; sqr : Int -> Int
(defun sqr (x)
    (* x x))
```

```
;; Unit tests:
```

```
(check-expect (sqr 0) 0)
```

```
(check-expect (sqr 2) 4)
```

```
(check-expect (sqr -30) 900)
```

000 sqr.li	sp – DrScheme	\Box			
sqr.lisp ▼ (defun)▼	Debug 🍯 Check Syntax 🔍 R	un 📌 Stop 🦲 🛛 Start ACL2			
Admit Next Admit All Undo Last Undo	All Save / 000	SchemeUnit			
;; sqr : Int -> Int (defun sqr (x)	✓DoubleCheck ▶ sqr>=0	DoubleCheck			
(* x x)) ;; Unit tests:		Successes (1/1) sgr>=0			
(check-expect (sqr 0) 0)	\varTheta 🔿 🔿 acl2.122174	⊖ ○ ○ acl2.1221749229.txt - DrScheme			
(check-expect (sqr 2) 4)	<pre></pre>				
<pre>(check-expect (sqr -30) 900) ;; All squares are nonnegative.</pre>	(DEFTHM SQR>=0) Q.E.D.	(DEFTHM SQR>=0) Q.E.D.			
<pre>(defproperty sqr>=0 (x :where (integerp x) :value (random-integer)) (>= (sqr x) 0))</pre>	Q.E.D. Summary	Q.E.D. Summary Form: (DEFTHM SQR>=0) Rules: ((:DEFINITION NOT) (:DEFINITION SQR)			
Language: Dracula v4.2. All tests passed!	Form: (DEF Rules: ((:DE (:DE)				
Dracula v4.2 🔻					

Software Engineering Courses at OU SE-i

- Process (30%) Humphrey PSP
- Design (35%) FP in ACL2
- Testing/Validation (35%)
 - Predicate-based, automated testing (DblChk)
 - Mechanized logic for full verification (ACL2)
- Software development projects
 - 6 individual projects: Design/Code/PSP rpt
 - Early projects: small components
 - Later projects: applications using components
 - 2 team projects
 - Building on components and applications
 - Seven deliverables in all

Software Engineering Courses at OU SE-i

- Process (30%) Humphrey PSP
- Design (35%) FP in ACL2
- Testing/Validation (35%)
 - Predicate-based, automated testing (DblChk)
 - Mechanized logic for full verification (ACL2)
- Software development projects
 - 6 individual projects: Design/Code/PSP rpt
 - Early projects: small components
 - Later projects: applications using components
 - 2 team projects

60°/0

30%

10% other

- Building on components and applications
- Seven deliverables in all



Software Engineering Courses at OU SE-ii

- Organized around one sfw devp project
- Team project (4 6 students per team)
- Project size
 - 3,000 5,000 lines of code, before ACL2
 - 2,000 3,000 lines of code, since intro of ACL2
- 12 separate (team) deliverables
 - Engineering std, design/schedule, code, installation/usage doc, defect history, tests/theorems, meeting log, ...
 - 3 presentations last to Advisory Board

Individual journals — expanded PSP rpt

Background of SE Students

- Standard CS curriculum
 - ABET, math heavy
- No significant FP experience
 - Minor exposure in PL course
- Serious logic course (70% of students)
 - Reasoning about hdw/sfw properties
- So, SE is first serious exposure to FP
 - Almost all succeed in
 - Learning FP
 - Predicate-based testing
 - Success with ACL2 mechanized logic
 - Most acquire a reasonable level of comfort
 - 10% to 20% gain proficiency with ACL2 logic

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n-2} x_{n-1}$, $0 \le x_k \le m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1
- Define encode, decode, and predicates
 - encode, decode, code-list?
- Define correctness properties
 - kth element of encoded list is (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m
 - decode inverts encode

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 x_1 \dots x_{n\text{-}2} x_{n\text{-}1}$, $0 \leq x_k < m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1
- Define correctness properties
 - decode inverts encode
- Inversion property

(defproperty decode-inverts-encode

(m :value (random-between 2 100)

(random-between 0 (-m 1)))

(equal (decode m (encode m xs)) xs)))

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 \; x_1 \; \ldots \; x_{n\text{-}2} \; x_{n\text{-}1}$, $0 \leq x_k < m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1
- Define correctness properties
 - decode inverts encode
- Inversion property as (untrue) theorem (defthm decode-inverts-encode-thm (equal (decode m (encode m xs)) xs)))

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 \; x_1 \; \ldots \; x_{n\text{-}2} \; x_{n\text{-}1}$, $0 \leq x_k < m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1
- Define correctness properties
 - decode inverts encode
- Inversion property with preconditions (defproperty decode-inverts-encode
 - (m :where (and (integerp m) (>= m 2))
 - :value (random-between 2 100)
 - xs :where (code-list? m xs)
 - :value (random-list-of
 - (random-between 0 (-m 1)))
 - (equal (decode m (encode m xs)) xs)))

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 \; x_1 \; \ldots \; x_{n\text{-}2} \; x_{n\text{-}1}$, $0 \leq x_k < m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1
- Define correctness properties
 - decode inverts encode
- Inversion property as theorem
 (defthm decode-inverts-encode-thm
 (implies (and (integerp m)
 (>= m 2)
 (code-list? m xs))
 (equal (decode m (encode m xs))
 xs))))

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 \; x_1 \; \ldots \; x_{n\text{-}2} \; x_{n\text{-}1}$, $0 \leq x_k < m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1

Define correctness properties

- kth element of encoded list is (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 \; x_1 \; \ldots \; x_{n\text{-}2} \; x_{n\text{-}1}$, $0 \leq x_k < m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1
- Define correctness properties
 - kth element of encoded list is (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m

- Linear encode/decode
 - Message: $x_0 \; x_1 \; \ldots \; x_{n\text{-}2} \; x_{n\text{-}1}$, $0 \leq x_k < m$
 - Encoding: ... (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m ..., where x_n=m-1

Define correctness properties

- kth element of encoded list is (x_k + x_{k+1}) mod m

Team Project Example from SE-ii

- Conway game of life (cellular automaton)
 - Multiple topologies sphere, cylinder, torus, Klein
 - Six solutions, 1200 7000 lines of code, avg: 3000
 - 7000-line implementation included
 - Three-dimensional rendering
 - Over 100 properties verified by ACL2 mechanized logic
 - Ten properties on 3D-rending (eg, no bit-plane errors)



Reactions to SE Courses

- Students
 - PSP unpopular (time & defect logs, plans...)
 - Functional programming
 - Almost all get it, eventually
 - 10% complain
 - 10% 20% really like it
 - The rest take it as an interesting challenge
 - Property-based testing
 - Just started this semester
 - Students seem to like it
 - Smoothes the way towards theorems
 - Theorems
 - Top quarter like it, bottom quarter gets lost

Advisory board (from computing industry)

Positive comments nearly universal

Outreach

- Three-day workshop, May 2008
 - Participants: 13 CS instructors from 6 states
 - Lectures (35%) plus hands-on projects (65%)
 - Two leaders, plus two aids with ACL2 expertise
- Lessons learned
 - Theorems are easier than automated testing
 - Appropriate random distributions add complication
 - Specifying properties requires careful thought
 - Incorrect or vacuous theorems— common first attempts
 - Payoff— better understanding of software
 - Projects must be carefully constructed
 - Ensure reasonable solutions (solve them in advance)
- MEPLS semiannual meeting

Outreach

- Three-day workshop, May 2008
 - Participants: 13 CS instructors from 6 states
 - Lectures (35%) plus hands-on projects (65%)
 - Two leaders, plus two aids with ACL2 expertise
- Lessons learned
 - Theorems are easier than automated testing
 - Appropriate random distributions add complication
 - Specifying properties requires careful thought
 - Incorrect or vacuous theorems— common first attempts
 - Payoff— better understanding of software
 - Projects must be carefully constructed
 - Ensure reasonable solutions (solve them in advance)
- MEPLS semiannual meeting

• **Google** Dracula DrScheme, Rex SEcollab, MEPLS

Plans for Future

- Integrated testing / verification
- Dracula module facility
- Coordinated projects (on website)
 - Building from components to applications
 - Four tracks, 4 6 projects in each track
- Outreach workshops
 - SIGCSE tutorial
 - Three-day workshops

The End