

Exam Readiness Index (ERI): A Theoretical Framework for a Composite, Explainable Index

Ananda Prakash Verma
anandaprakashverma@gmail.com

September 3, 2025

Abstract

We present a theoretical framework for an *Exam Readiness Index* (ERI): a composite, blueprint-aware score $R \in [0, 100]$ that summarizes a learner’s readiness for a high-stakes exam while remaining interpretable and actionable. The ERI aggregates six signals—Mastery (M), Coverage (C), Retention (R), Pace (P), Volatility (V), and Endurance (E)—each derived from a stream of practice and mock-test interactions. We formalize axioms for component maps and the composite, prove monotonicity, Lipschitz stability, and bounded drift under blueprint re-weighting, and show existence and uniqueness of the optimal linear composite under convex design constraints. We further characterize confidence bands via blueprint-weighted concentration and prove compatibility with prerequisite-admissible curricula (Knowledge Space / learning-space constraints). The paper focuses on theory; empirical study is left to future work.

1 Introduction

High-stakes exam preparation hinges on answering four questions: *Am I ready now? Ready for what? What’s limiting me? What should I do next?* We propose a principled, explainable readiness index that is *blueprint-aware*: it respects an official syllabus with section/topic weights and pacing rules, and it decomposes into human-interpretable components that align with cognitive and operational constructs (ability, coverage, forgetting, timing, stability, endurance).

This paper makes four contributions:

1. **Axiomatic components.** We specify component maps from interaction streams to $[0, 1]$ with regularity properties (boundedness, Lipschitz continuity, monotonicity).
2. **Blueprint-aware composite.** We define a linear ERI $R = \sum_i \alpha_i X_i$ with design constraints and show stability and interpretability guarantees.
3. **Confidence and drift.** We derive blueprint-weighted concentration bounds for component estimates and a bound on ERI drift under blueprint version change.
4. **Prerequisite compatibility.** We provide a sufficient condition ensuring ERI-driven recommendations respect admissibility in a learning space (outer-fringe).

Scope. Our goal is a deployable theoretical scaffold. We do not perform parameter estimation or empirical validation; those are orthogonal and deferred to future work.

2 Related Work

Knowledge Space Theory (KST). KST models feasible *knowledge states* as union-closed families of item sets with natural learning properties (accessibility, well-gradedness) [1, 2]. ERI is complementary: it provides a continuous readiness summary while remaining compatible with KST’s admissible-next (outer fringe) principle (Section 6).

Item Response Theory (IRT). IRT [3, 4] models a latent ability parameter and item characteristics to predict responses. ERI does not require a single latent trait; instead, it aggregates multiple blueprint-weighted signals. When available, IRT-calibrated difficulties can instantiate the Mastery component M .

Spaced Repetition and Retention. A large body of work—tracing to Ebbinghaus’ forgetting curve—shows that spaced retrieval improves long-term retention [5, 6, 7]. ERI’s Retention component \mathcal{R} formalizes a blueprint-weighted exponential decay that is compatible with trainable schedulers (e.g., Leitner/FSRS-style models).

3 Blueprints, Signals, and Notation

Let \mathcal{S} denote sections and \mathcal{T} topics. A *blueprint* B provides nonnegative weights $\{w_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ with $\sum_t w_t = 1$, a duration T_{exam} , marking rules, and section-level pace targets $\{\tau_s\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ (seconds per item). Interaction logs induce per-topic sequences \mathcal{D}_t (attempt outcomes, timestamps, times), and per-section sequences \mathcal{D}_s .

We define six normalized component maps (all into $[0, 1]$):

$$M := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} w_t m_t(\mathcal{D}_t), \quad C := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} w_t c_t(\mathcal{D}_t), \quad \mathcal{R} := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} w_t r_t(\mathcal{D}_t),$$

$$P := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} p_s(\mathcal{D}_s), \quad V := v(\mathcal{D}), \quad E := e(\mathcal{D}).$$

Assumption 1 (Component axioms). *For each topic t and section s , the maps satisfy:*

(A1) **Normalization:** $m_t, c_t, r_t, p_s, v, e \in [0, 1]$ for any admissible data stream.

(A2) **Monotonicity:** m_t is nondecreasing in difficulty-adjusted success; c_t is nondecreasing in (evidence-weighted) coverage; r_t is nonincreasing in recency gaps; p_s is nonincreasing in pace deviation; v is nonincreasing in score variance; e is nonincreasing in late-session degradation.

(A3) **Lipschitz regularity:** For appropriate metrics d_t, d_s on streams, there exist $L_m, L_c, L_r, L_p, L_v, L_e$ with

$$|m_t(\mathcal{D}_t) - m_t(\mathcal{D}'_t)| \leq L_m d_t(\mathcal{D}_t, \mathcal{D}'_t), \quad \text{etc.}$$

(A4) **Blueprint separability:** Topic-level components aggregate linearly with weights $\{w_t\}$.

Instantiation examples (non-essential). One may take $r_t(\mathcal{D}_t) = \exp(-\lambda_t \Delta_t)$ with Δ_t the time since last successful retrieval and $\lambda_t > 0$; map section pace to $p_s = \phi(z_s)$ for a clipped linear ϕ of a pace z -score; and define coverage gates by evidence indicators. Our results require only Assumption 1.

4 The ERI Composite and Design Constraints

We define the readiness index as a convex combination of components:

$$R(\mathcal{D}; B, \alpha) = \alpha_M M + \alpha_C C + \alpha_R \mathcal{R} + \alpha_P P + \alpha_V V + \alpha_E E, \quad (1)$$

with weights $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^6$ and $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$.

4.1 Axioms for the composite

Definition 1 (ERI axioms). *A composite R is valid if it satisfies: (i) **Boundedness** $R \in [0, 1]$; (ii) **Monotonicity** in each argument; (iii) **Blueprint coherence** $\partial R / \partial w_t \geq 0$ whenever m_t, c_t, r_t weakly increase; (iv) **Scale-invariance** to monotone reparameterizations of individual components (achieved by pre-normalization).*

Proposition 1 (Validity of the linear ERI). *Under Assumption 1, the linear R in (1) is valid per Definition 1.*

Proof. Boundedness and monotonicity follow from nonnegativity and normalization. Blueprint coherence follows by linearity and separability. Scale-invariance holds as each component is normalized to $[0, 1]$. \square

4.2 Weight selection as convex design

Let \mathcal{C} denote design constraints (e.g., minimum emphasis on mastery and coverage, fairness caps per section), and $J(\alpha)$ a strictly convex penalty (e.g., quadratic deviation from a prior α^0 and entropy regularization for spread). Consider

$$\min_{\alpha \in \Delta_5} J(\alpha) \quad \text{s.t. } \alpha \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (2)$$

where Δ_5 is the 5-simplex.

Theorem 1 (Existence and uniqueness). *If J is strictly convex and \mathcal{C} is convex and nonempty, the solution α^* to (2) exists and is unique.*

Proof. Standard convex-optimization result. \square

Lemma 1 (Lagrangian KKT form). *Let $J(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \|\alpha - \alpha^0\|_2^2 - \eta \sum_i \alpha_i \log \alpha_i$. Then the KKT conditions yield*

$$\alpha_i^* \propto \exp(\alpha_i^0 / \eta - \lambda_i),$$

with multipliers λ_i enforcing the linear constraints in \mathcal{C} and the simplex.

5 Stability and Confidence

5.1 Lipschitz stability

Theorem 2 (ERI Lipschitz constant). *Let $d(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}')$ be a metric that dominates per-topic/section metrics. Under Assumption 1,*

$$|R(\mathcal{D}) - R(\mathcal{D}')| \leq \left(\alpha_M L_M + \alpha_C L_C + \alpha_R L_R + \alpha_P L_P + \alpha_V L_V + \alpha_E L_E \right) d(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}').$$

Proof. Triangle inequality and linearity. \square

5.2 Blueprint drift

Suppose a blueprint update changes weights from w to w' with total-variation $\delta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_t |w_t - w'_t|$.

Proposition 2 (Bounded ERI drift under re-weighting). *With components fixed,*

$$|R(\mathcal{D}; w) - R(\mathcal{D}; w')| \leq \delta \cdot \max\{\|m\|_\infty + \|c\|_\infty + \|r\|_\infty, 1\}.$$

If all topic components lie in $[0, 1]$, the drift is at most 3δ for the topic-aggregated terms.

Proof. By linearity, the difference is a weighted sum of bounded topic terms, bounded by the ℓ_1 -distance of weights. \square

5.3 Confidence band via blueprint-weighted concentration

Let \hat{m}_t estimate m_t from n_t independent item outcomes in topic t with bounded range. By Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\Pr\left(|\hat{m}_t - m_t| \geq \epsilon_t\right) \leq 2 \exp(-2n_t \epsilon_t^2).$$

Aggregating with blueprint weights gives, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\Pr\left(|\widehat{M} - M| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon^2}{\sum_t w_t^2/n_t}\right). \quad (3)$$

Analogous bounds hold for $\widehat{C}, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ when estimated from bounded per-topic statistics. A union bound yields an overall ERI confidence band whose half-width shrinks with blueprint-weighted effective sample size $(\sum_t w_t^2/n_t)^{-1}$.

6 Prerequisite-Admissible Recommendations

Let (Q, \mathcal{K}) be a learning space (union-closed, accessible) over items/skills with *outer fringe* $F^+(X) = \{q \notin X : X \cup \{q\} \in \mathcal{K}\}$. A recommendation policy is *admissible* if it selects only items whose concepts lie in $F^+(X)$ or their immediate prerequisites.

Assumption 2 (ERI-compatible gating). *Action maps use only concepts with nonzero coverage evidence and admissible with respect to the current state estimate X .*

Proposition 3 (ERI actions respect admissibility). *Under Assumption 2, any action chosen by minimizing a separable surrogate loss of the form $\sum_t \psi_t(1 - M_t, C_t, \mathcal{R}_t)$ over admissible concepts respects the outer fringe and cannot introduce prerequisite violations.*

Proof. By construction, the feasible set is $F^+(X)$; separability preserves feasibility. \square

7 EDGE Integration (Future Work)

The ERI is readily composable with a broader adaptive framework such as *EDGE* (Evaluate \rightarrow Diagnose \rightarrow Generate \rightarrow Exercise) [10]. Concretely:

- **Inputs to EDGE.** The vector $(M, C, \mathcal{R}, P, V, E)$ and blueprint weights act as state features for schedulers and item selection. Low- \mathcal{R} concepts are prioritized for spaced retrieval; low- M/C concepts trigger targeted drills.

- **Outputs back to ERI.** EDGE’s counterfactual drills and retrieval sessions update topic-level statistics, which in turn update M , C , and \mathcal{R} ; pace-aware exercises update P ; session composition affects E and V stability.
- **Governance.** ERI provides an interpretable, bounded readiness signal and a confidence band; EDGE supplies the *actions* that move the signal. The two systems remain compatible with learning-space admissibility by gating recommendations to the outer fringe.

A separate manuscript will detail EDGE’s learning-theoretic underpinnings; here we note only the interfaces and invariants required for safe composition.

8 Limitations and Future Work

Our framework assumes component regularity and separability; while natural, they may be restrictive for highly entangled domains. Confidence bands rely on independence and boundedness assumptions; relaxing them to account for item overlap and adaptive sampling is future work. Empirical validation, parameter learning, and outcome calibration are deliberately out-of-scope.

9 Conclusion

We presented a blueprint-aware, axiomatic readiness index with theoretical guarantees: monotonicity, Lipschitz stability, bounded drift under re-weighting, unique weight design under convex constraints, and compatibility with prerequisite-admissible recommendations. The framework is deployment-ready and can later accommodate richer component estimators, empirical calibration, and integration with EDGE-style adaptive schedulers.

A Appendix A: Additional Lemmas and Proofs

Lemma 2 (Component aggregation Lipschitzness). *If each topic map m_t is L_m -Lipschitz w.r.t. d_t and $\sum_t w_t = 1$, then M is L_m -Lipschitz w.r.t. $d = \sum_t w_t d_t$.*

Proof. Immediate by convexity and triangle inequality. □

Lemma 3 (Explicit Lipschitz constants for exponential retention). *If $r_t(\mathcal{D}_t) = \exp(-\lambda_t \Delta_t)$ with Δ_t the time since last success and $|\Delta_t - \Delta'_t| \leq \delta_t$, then $|r_t - r'_t| \leq \lambda_t \delta_t$ for δ_t small; hence $L_r \leq \max_t \lambda_t$.*

Proposition 4 (Identifiability under ordinal constraints). *Suppose we observe only pairwise orderings of readiness for a family of profiles. If the set of profiles has full-dimensional convex hull in \mathbb{R}^6 and we require R to be linear and monotone, then α is identifiable up to a positive scalar (fixed by the simplex constraint).*

Proof. Follows from uniqueness of separating hyperplanes consistent with strict orderings on a full-dimensional set. □

B Appendix B: Lagrangian Details

Consider $\min_{\alpha \in \Delta_5} \frac{1}{2} \|\alpha - \alpha^0\|_2^2 - \eta \sum_i \alpha_i \log \alpha_i$ with linear constraints $A\alpha \leq b$. The Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha, \lambda, \nu) = \frac{1}{2} \|\alpha - \alpha^0\|_2^2 - \eta \sum_i \alpha_i \log \alpha_i + \lambda^\top (A\alpha - b) + \nu(\mathbf{1}^\top \alpha - 1).$$

Stationarity gives $(\alpha_i - \alpha_i^0) - \eta(1 + \log \alpha_i) + (A^\top \lambda)_i + \nu = 0$, yielding the exponential-form solution stated in Lemma 1.

C Appendix C: Knowledge Spaces and Admissibility

Let (Q, \mathcal{K}) be a *learning space* (union-closed, accessible, well-graded). If the action generator restricts to $F^+(X)$ and surrogates are separable, ERI-driven policies are admissible. Extensions include *quasi-ordinal* relaxations for noisy prerequisites.

Acknowledgements

We thank colleagues for helpful discussions. This paper intentionally avoids empirical validation; any errors are our own.

References

- [1] J.-P. Doignon and J.-C. Falmagne. *Spaces for the assessment of knowledge*. International Journal of Man-Machine Studies, 23(2):175–196, 1985.
- [2] J.-C. Falmagne and S. Cosyn. *Learning Spaces*. Springer, 2011.
- [3] G. Rasch. *Probabilistic Models for Some Intelligence and Attainment Tests*. Danish Institute for Educational Research, 1960.
- [4] F. Lord. *Applications of Item Response Theory to Practical Testing Problems*. Routledge, 1980.
- [5] H. Ebbinghaus. *Memory: A Contribution to Experimental Psychology*. 1885 (English transl. 1913).
- [6] N. J. Cepeda et al. *Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis*. Psychological Bulletin, 132(3):354–380, 2006.
- [7] P. I. Pavlik Jr. and J. R. Anderson. *Using a model to compute the optimal schedule of practice*. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 14(2):101–117, 2008.
- [8] R. Barlow et al. *Statistical Inference under Order Restrictions*. Wiley, 1972.
- [9] B. Korte, L. Lovász, and R. Schrader. *Greedoids*. Springer, 1991. (Learning spaces relate to antimatroids/greedoids.)
- [10] Ananda Prakash Verma, *EDGE: A Theoretical Framework for Misconception-Aware Adaptive Learning*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.07224, 2025.