

ECM2427 Outside the Box: Computer Science Research and Applications 2023-24

Continuous Assessment 2

Dr Yunxiao Zhang

Handed Out	Handed In
Thu, 29 Feb 2024	Thu 28 Mar 2024, 12:00 (noon)

This Continuous Assessment is an individual assessment worth 60% of the module mark. Your attention is drawn to the College and University guidelines on plagiarism and the use of generative AI in academic work.

<https://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tga-manual/aph/managingacademicmisconduct/>
<https://libguides.exeter.ac.uk/referencing/generativeai>

1 Assessment

This continuous assessment is a **literature review (no less than 2 pages and no more than 3 pages, excluding the reference section and statement of acknowledgement)** using the **IEEE conference** template provided. The subject of the literature review **must be** one topic covered by the guest lecturers. Note: if a guest lecturer covers multiple topics, you can select one topic from the talk.

It must have a structure described below. Each section and the references will be marked out of 10 or 20, plus an additional 10 marks for the formatting, grammar, and presentation, for a total of 60 marks.

Please note that an abstract is **not** required.

Introduction

The Introduction should succinctly explain your chosen topic and focus, giving readers a clear understanding of what to expect. It should outline the main topics or texts reviewed and, where applicable, describe your methodology for selecting and analysing sources. Moreover, you should explain the scope of this literature, including the delimitations for the focus and depth. This approach aims to prepare the reader, even those new to the subject, for the detailed exploration to follow, ensuring they grasp the central arguments and the rationale behind selecting sources for the review.

Recommends allocating half a page.

Section Marks: **10**

Running Total: **10/60**

Review (main body section)

At the beginning of the literature review section, you should state which of the three following options for organising your literature review you use. If using a mixed structure, explain how

they are mixed. For example, you use a thematic structure but organise literature chronologically within each theme.

- Option 1: Chronological
- Option 2: Thematic
- Option 3: Methodological

When writing the main body of the literature review, you need to focus on summarising the key points from each article. In addition, try to weave these ideas together cohesively, highlighting the significant themes. You should also analyse these findings to offer your own insights on their relevance and impact on the topic. It is important to evaluate each source critically, noting its strengths and weaknesses, and considering the methodologies and evidence used. Use clear paragraphs linked with transitional phrases to ensure your writing is organised. You may use subsections in this review section.

Recommends allocating two pages

Section Marks: **20**

Running Total: **30/60**

Conclusion

The Conclusion should summarise the significant insights from the literature, highlighting their relevance and importance. It should tie these findings back to the initial topic and the focus, providing a comprehensive answer and concluding the review.

Recommends allocating half a page.

Section Marks: **10**

Running Total: **40/60**

References

There should be between 10 and 20 supporting references (ideally from the computer science literature) formatted using **IEEE bibliography** styles. **Failing to use IEEE bibliography styles will result in a zero mark in the reference.**

Section Marks: **10**

Running Total: **50/60**

Statement of acknowledgement

You should include (a) a statement of acknowledgement in your work and (b) a description of how the AI tool was used and the information generated. Please check the university's guidelines on the use of generative AI in academic work [here](#).

1.1 Formatting and Presentation

You cannot modify the document class file **IEEEtran.cls**.

In addition, in file **main.tex** you cannot modify the preamble:

```
\documentclass[conference]{IEEEtran}
```

Any modification to the document class file or the preamble “\documentclass[]{}” will lead to a zero mark for this CA (i.e., 0 out of 60).

However, you can add external packages using:

`\usepackage{}`.

Also, if applicable, you can add a new theorem by using:

`\newtheorem{}{}`,

e.g., `\newtheorem{theorem}{Theorem}`. Please refer to the IEEEtran_HOWTO (Section XII), included in the template file.

The review must not exceed 3 pages and no less than 2 pages of body text, with unlimited additional pages for references and statement of acknowledgement.

Failing to satisfy the page limit will result in a zero mark for formatting and presentation.

The review should ensure proper grammar and spelling, proper length of each section, avoid LaTeX formatting errors, and maintain the report's overall appearance and readability.

Tables, figures and algorithms can be included. It is important to format them correctly according to the IEEE conference style. Please refer to the IEEEtran_HOWTO (Section X) for the IEEE style, which is included in the template file.

To ensure high-quality images, it is recommended to use EPS format or very high-resolution images that can be enlarged multiple times without compromising quality. **Screenshots or cropped images from reference papers are not acceptable.**

Section Marks: **10**

Running Total: **60/60**

1.2 SpLD marking guideline:

This CA will be marked only for its content (i.e., grammar and spelling will not be considered) if students have an ILP requiring SpLD marking guidance.

2 Submission

The literature review should be submitted in PDF using ELE2. You do not have to submit any source files of LaTeX. The submission date is **Thursday, 28 Mar 2024, 12:00 (noon)**.

3. Assessment Criteria

Introduction (10 Points)

- 1-2 Points: Introduction lacks clarity and fails to effectively explain the topic. It does not forecast key content or texts, nor does it describe source selection or analysis methodology.
- 3-4 Points: Introduction provides a basic explanation of the topic but is limited in forecasting key content or texts. Minimal description of source selection and analysis.
- 5-6 Points: The introduction adequately explains the topic, with a fair overview of the key content or texts to be discussed. It somewhat describes the source selection and analysis methodology.

- 7-8 Points: Introduction clearly explains the topic, effectively forecasts key content or texts, and provides a good description of source selection and analysis methodology.
- 9-10 Points: Exceptional introduction that succinctly explains the topic, comprehensively forecasts key content or texts, and thoroughly describes the source selection and analysis methodology, setting a solid foundation for the review.

Reviews (main body) (20 Points)

- 1-4 Points: Minimal summarisation with no synthesis. Analysis and interpretation are largely absent, with little to no critical evaluation. The writing lacks structure, making it difficult to follow.
- 4-8 Points: Basic summarisation of sources with limited synthesis. Some analysis is present but lacks depth—minimal critical evaluation of sources. Paragraphs are somewhat structured, but transitions are weak.
- 9-12 Points: Good summarisation and synthesis of sources. The analysis adds some interpretation of findings, with a moderate level of critical evaluation. The writing is structured into coherent paragraphs with appropriate transitions.
- 13-16 Points: Very good summarisation, synthesis, analysis, and interpretation. Demonstrates a strong ability to evaluate sources critically, identifying both strengths and weaknesses. The writing is well-structured, with clear connections and contrasts drawn between sources.
- 17-20 Points: Exceptional summarisation, synthesis, analysis, and interpretation of sources. Offers insightful critical evaluations with a deep understanding of the literature. The writing is excellently structured, with seamless transitions and a clear argumentative progression.

Conclusion (10 Points):

- 1-2 Points: Minimal summary of key findings, lacking clarity on their significance and connection to the research question.
- 3-4 Points: Basic summary of findings with limited emphasis on their significance or clear linkage to the research question.
- 5-6 Points: Adequate summary of key findings, highlighting their importance and connecting them to the research question.
- 7-8 Points: Clearly summarises key findings and emphasises their significance, effectively connecting back to the research question.
- 9-10 Points: Exceptionally summarises and emphasises the key findings' significance, seamlessly connecting everything back to the research question and demonstrating a deep understanding of the literature's contribution to the field.

References (10 Points)

- 1-2 Points: References are insufficient in number and lack relevance and academic rigour, significantly undermining the literature review's credibility.
- 3-4 Points: References are sufficient in number but vary in relevance and quality, showing some alignment with the research topic but lacking depth.
- 5-6 Points: A good number of references are used, mostly relevant and of acceptable quality, supporting the research adequately.
- 7-8 Points: References are highly relevant and of high quality, indicating thorough research and strong support for the review's arguments.

- 9-10 Points: The references are of exceptional quality and relevance, showcasing exemplary research depth and directly enhancing the review's academic integrity and argumentation.

Formatting & Presentation (10 Points)

- 1-2 Points: Significant use of low-resolution images and screenshots or cropped images from papers. Pervasive grammar errors, typos, poor section lengths, and numerous LaTeX formatting errors disrupt readability.
- 3-4 Points: Use lower-quality images and screenshots or non-compliant images. Frequent grammar errors, typos, poor section lengths, and multiple LaTeX formatting mistakes.
- 5-6 Points: Images are decent quality and can be enlarged with minimal quality loss, with no screenshots from papers. Occasional grammar errors, typos, well-proportioned sections, and some noticeable LaTeX formatting errors.
- 7-8 Points: Tables, figures, and algorithms are well formatted with only slight deviations from IEEE style, and high-resolution images are used to maintain quality when enlarged. Minor grammar errors, typos, well-proportioned sections, and minimal LaTeX formatting issues.
- 9-10 Points: Perfect formatting of tables and figures according to IEEE conference style, exclusive use of EPS format or high-resolution images that retain quality under magnification, demonstrating exemplary attention to detail and presentation standards. Flawless grammar and spelling, perfectly balanced section lengths, and error-free LaTeX formatting.

Penalty

1. **Failing to satisfy the page limit.**
2. **Failing to use IEEE bibliography styles**
3. **Modification in the document class file or the preamble \documentclass.**