

# Assignment 1

## Deliverables and Submission Details

**Submission deadline: 17 August 2025, 23:00 (Week 2, Sunday)**

The deliverables for this assignment are as follows:

- One docx or PDF file containing your responses to the three tasks as described below; and
- The completed "Generative AI and Automated Writing Tools Usage Report" (also a docx file).

Templates for the tasks response file and "Generative AI and Automated Writing Tools Usage Report" are available on the INFO4990 / INFO5993 Canvas Assignment 1 description page. You must use these templates to complete this assignment.

Submit your completed files to the appropriate Assignment 1 submission boxes in the Canvas unit site and email it to your supervisor for marking by the published deadline (17<sup>th</sup> August 2025).

## Introduction

The objectives of this assignment are as follows:

- Familiarize yourself with leading researchers in quality research groups, conferences, and journals that are relevant to your research area.
- Learn how to find good research papers that are relevant to your research area; and
- Develop skills in evaluating published research.

You need to complete the tasks as described below. You are also required to complete a "Generative AI and Automated Writing Tools Usage Report". Details follow:

## Tasks

### Task 1 (5 marks)

Develop a list of the **leading researchers** who are working in the main research groups in your research topic. Briefly justify your selection.

**Identify your research topic** at the beginning of your response.

## Task 2 (10 marks)

Develop a **list of top conferences and journals** in your research area. While the ideal length of this list can vary greatly depending on your research area, for the purposes of this assignment, you may assume that you need to provide **between eight and twelve** conferences or journals. Your list must include a range of both conferences and journals. **Justify your selection** using a range of ranking systems and metrics such as **CORE, ERA, SCOPUS, Web of Science, Scimago, or other relevant evidence.**

## Task 3 (10 marks)

**Identify two exemplary papers** in your research area. For each of these papers, explain in detail **why you think each one is exemplary** (methodology evaluation, writing style, structure, etc.). Think about papers you could use as a model for your proposed research project.

## Citing and Referencing Sources

You must use an internationally recognized referencing style such as APA or IEEE referencing to cite and reference your sources. It is a requirement of this assignment that you cite and reference sources correctly.

## Policy on Using Automated Writing and Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools

You may use automated writing and/or generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools in this assignment for any reason as long as you comply with the following conditions:

- You will submit a correctly completed "Generative AI and Writing Assistance Tools Usage Report" for each assignment submission (a template is provided in this unit's Canvas site);
- You will use these tools in an ethical manner as required under relevant University policies;
- You will ensure that the work you submit is primarily your own work (you must not submit work that is primarily produced by automated writing tools and/or generative AI);
- You will not use automated writing or generative AI tools to enable, facilitate, or hide collusion with another student or anyone else;

- You will not use these tools to enable, facilitate, or hide any other form of Academic Dishonesty; and
- You must comply with all relevant laws that apply to you (for example, in Australia, it may be illegal for you to transmit copyrighted material to an AI chatbot if you do not own the copyright unless the copyright owner has expressly given you permission to do so).

# Rubric

## Task 1

Mark	Criteria
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies a range of leading researchers/representatives, relevant research groups that significantly contribute to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>Does not include research groups of questionable relevance</li> <li>Provides well-reasoned justification</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfies the criteria for full marks but with one of the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes one research group of questionable relevance.</li> <li>The list of relevant research groups is marginally shorter than what would constitute a representative list; or</li> <li>The justification is credible but not well-reasoned.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfies the criteria for full marks but with two or more of the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes one research group of questionable relevance.</li> <li>The list of relevant research groups is marginally shorter than what would constitute a representative list; or</li> <li>The justification is credible but not well-reasoned</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfies the criteria for full marks but with one (but not more) of the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes two or more research groups of questionable relevance.</li> <li>The list of relevant research groups is considerably shorter than what would constitute a representative list; or</li> <li>The justification is missing or not credible</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies two or more relevant research groups</li> <li>Identified research groups might only be tangentially relevant to the stated research area of interest</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> <li>Does not fulfil criteria for higher marks</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies one relevant research group</li> <li>Identified research group might only be tangentially relevant to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> <li>Does not fulfil criteria for higher marks</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to identify any relevant research group</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response is mostly or entirely a series of generative AI prompts</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response is primarily produced by an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> </ul>

## Task 2

Mark	Criteria
5 – 10	<p style="text-align: center; color: blue; font-size: 2em;">10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least <b>six venues/journals</b> must be identified; AND</li> <li>At least <b>two-thirds</b> of these identified conference venues/journals <b>substantially contribute to the research area of interest.</b></li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> </ul> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A full mark response will meet the following requirements:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies a range of representative flagship and other high-quality conference venues and journals that substantially contribute to the stated research area of interest.</li> <li>Includes all highly relevant flagship conferences and journals.</li> <li><b>Does not include</b> conferences or journals that are of <b>modest quality or only tangentially relevant;</b> AND</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides a well-reasoned justification.</li> <li>• Calculate the initial penalty mark as follows:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Apply three penalty marks if the justification is missing or not credible.</li> <li>○ Apply two penalty marks if the justification is credible but not well-reasoned.</li> <li>○ Apply two penalty marks if the list of conference venues and journals is marginally shorter than expected for a representative list.</li> <li>○ Apply one penalty mark if there are minor flaws in an otherwise well-reasoned justification.</li> <li>○ Apply one penalty mark for each highly relevant flagship conference venue or journal that is omitted.</li> <li>○ Apply one penalty mark every time a conference or journal of modest quality is mentioned; and</li> <li>○ Apply one penalty mark every time a conference or journal that is only tangentially relevant is mentioned.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The adjusted penalty mark is min(5 mark penalty, initial penalty mark); and</li> <li>• The final mark (out of 10) for this task is (10 marks – adjusted penalty mark).</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies four or more relevant and credible conference venues/journals that contribute to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>• At least two of these identified conference venues/journals <b>substantially</b> contribute to the research area of interest</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> <li>• Does not fulfil the criteria for higher marks</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies three or more relevant and credible conference venues/journals that contribute to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>• Identified conference venues or journals might only be tangentially relevant to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> <li>• Does not fulfil the criteria for higher marks</li> </ul>

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies two relevant and credible conference venues/journals that contribute to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>Identified conference venues or journals might only be tangentially relevant to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> <li>Does not fulfil the criteria for higher marks</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies one relevant and credible conference venue/journal that contributes to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>Identified conference venue or journal might only be tangentially relevant to the stated research area of interest</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> <li>Does not fulfil the criteria for higher marks</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to identify any relevant and credible conference venue or journal</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response is mostly or entirely a series of generative AI prompts</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response is primarily produced by an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>

## Task 3

For each paper, apply the rubric below:

Mark	Criteria
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a detailed, clear, and convincing explanation on why the selected paper is exemplary</li> <li>Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a detailed explanation on why the selected paper is exemplary.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The explanation has minor flaws in one of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unbalanced treatment of the various features of the paper being considered.</li> <li>○ Written expression.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a detailed explanation on why the selected paper is exemplary.</li> <li>• The explanation has minor flaws in both of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unbalanced treatment of the various features of the paper being considered; and</li> <li>○ Written expression.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a detailed explanation on why the selected paper is exemplary.</li> <li>• The explanation has more serious flaws in one of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Structure of the arguments being presented; or</li> <li>○ Written expression.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a detailed explanation on why the selected paper is exemplary</li> <li>• The explanation has more serious flaws in one of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Structure of the arguments being presented; or</li> <li>○ Written expression</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefly describes some features of the selected paper in Academic English</li> <li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes general comments about the selected paper.</li> <li>• Might fail to follow Academic English conventions, but the response is entirely in English.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not primarily rely on an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li></ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fails to select a good paper</li></ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Selects a good paper but fails to provide any comments.</li></ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Response is mostly or entirely a series of generative AI prompts.</li></ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Response is primarily produced by an automated writing tool and/or generative AI tool.</li></ul>