



University
of Exeter

COURSEWORK SPECIFICATION

ECMM428 – Individual Research
Project

Module Leader: **Dr Mohammed
Abdelsamea**

Academic Year: 2024/25

Title: **Literature Review and Project Plan**

Title: **Literature Review and Project Plan**

Submission deadline: **12pm, 27th November 2024**

This assessment contributes **20%** of the total module mark and assesses the following **intended learning outcomes**:

- Master writing styles appropriate to both a theoretical discursive document and technical report, including use of tables and figures and good referencing practice.
- Undertake independent research in a chosen topic, summarise findings and provide critical analysis.

This is an individual assessment and you are reminded of the University's regulations on collaboration and plagiarism. You must avoid plagiarism, collusion, and any academic misconduct behaviours. Further details about academic honesty and plagiarism can be found at <https://ele.exeter.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=1957>.

Use of GenAI tools in *Literature Review and Project Plan*

The University of Exeter is committed to the ethical and responsible use of Generative AI (GenAI) tools in teaching and learning, in line with our academic integrity policies where the direct copying of AI-generated content is included under plagiarism, misrepresentation and contract cheating under definitions and offences in [TQA Manual Chapter 12.3](#). To support students in their use of GenAI tools as part of their assessments, we have developed a category tool that enables staff to identify where use of Gen AI is integrated, supported or prohibited in each assessment. This assessment falls under the category of **AI-prohibited**. This is because the use of GenAI tools in developing this assessment prevents achievement of the module learning outcomes.

[You can find further guidance on using GenAI critically, and how to use GenAI to enhance your learning, on Study Zone digital.](#)

When submitting your assessment, you must include the following declaration:

☐ *I have not used any GenAI tools in preparing this assessment.*

Please note that submitting your work without an accompanying declaration, or one with no ticked boxes, will be considered a declaration that you have not used GenAI tools in preparing your work.

If a declaration sheet cannot be uploaded as part of an assignment (i.e. at the start of an essay), students understand that by submitting their assessment that are confirming they have followed the assessment brief and guidelines about GenAI use.

Instructions

You must produce a 10-page report covering the preliminary research you have done to prepare yourself for undertaking the project, together with an initial specification for the project itself.

In your MSci project, research involves **deep exploration and critical analysis** of existing work in both your subject area and the computational methods you'll apply. Unlike undergraduate projects, you are expected to engage with **current research**, identify gaps, and **contribute new insights**. You'll need to **critically evaluate** sources like journal/conference papers and datasets to support your project's development. Ensure proper referencing and focus on how your work fits into and advances the existing research landscape. For example, an undergraduate project might apply an existing algorithm to detect lung cancer in X-rays, while an MSci project would use state-of-the-art frameworks to analyse X-ray data alongside clinical information, aiming to answer specific research questions, such as identifying early indicators of cancer.

The project aims, objectives and deliverables should be defined explicitly. You should provide clear criteria for evaluating the final product and results, i.e., what will count as a successful outcome to your project.

Your submission must comprise three parts, as follows:

1. A separate **title page** containing the title, your name, a 100-200 word abstract, and a signed declaration stating: *I certify that all material in this dissertation which is not my own work has been identified.*
2. The **body**, which must be no more than 10 sides of A4 and presented in font size 11 point with margins of 2cm (single column, and single space between lines).
3. The **bibliography**, also in a font not less than 11pt; it is expected that this section will take up at least half a side of A4 and is not likely to exceed three sides.

You must submit your work to ELE2 by the submission time stated on the first page of this document.

Please refer below to the marking criteria:

	Literature Review (60%)	Project Plan (30%)	Style (10%)
<u>Fail (0-39%)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very little work is reviewed and there is no depth or breadth.• No critical analysis has been attempted.• There are few or no references included, and they are not of appropriate quality.• No gaps in the literature have been identified.• The project lacks clear research questions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aims and objectives are minimal or missing.• There is little or no detail in the description of work. Major queries remain about the approach to be taken in the project.• No evaluation strategy or rationale for the work is presented, making it difficult to understand the purpose or direction of the project.• No time plan is provided for the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The basic style guidance has not been followed.• Writing style is extremely poor and material cannot be understood.• No bibliography has been provided.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no discussion of either risk or ethics. 	
<u>3rd (40-49%)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some relevant existing work is reviewed but there is little depth or breadth. • Very little critical analysis. The text is very descriptive. • There are some references but they are from unreliable sources and are not up-to-date. • Limited gaps in the literature are identified and there are no suggestions about how they might be addressed. • The project defines vague or incomplete research questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims and objectives are confused and unclear with little significant gaps relating to the project described. • There is little detail in the description of work and the approach to be taken is unclear. • The evaluation strategy is basic and has significant gaps. • A basic time plan is provided. More detail is needed. • Limited discussion of either risk or ethics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been an attempt to follow the style guidance but with major omissions. • Writing style is poor – major parts cannot be understood. • Basic bibliography – poorly formatted and with major omissions.
<u>2:2 (50-59%)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review has breadth of the area but one or two major omissions. There is little depth. • Critical analysis is attempted but is lacking. • A range of references are used but they may be either from unreliable sources or are not up-to-date. • Some gaps are identified in the state-of-the-art but are limited. Very few suggested approaches to address them. • The report outlines research questions that are somewhat clear but lack depth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims and objectives provide a reasonable overview of the project but lack detail. • One or more major omissions in the description of work leading to questions about what will be done in the project. • The evaluation strategy is reasonable, though it could benefit from more depth. • Reasonable time plan but does not highlight deliverables, milestones or account for stretch goals or slippage. • Reasonable discussion of either risk or ethics (lacking minor details). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the style guidance is followed but there are omissions. • Writing style hinders understanding in some parts. • Bibliography is incomplete and references are missing important details.
<u>2:1 (60-69%)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review of the area covers most important areas with some minor omissions. Most areas are covered in sufficient depth. • Reasonable critical analysis identifies weaknesses in current approaches. • Mostly reliable and up-to-date sources are used. • Some gaps are identified in the state-of-the-art but limited approaches suggested to address them. • The report provides clear research questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims and objectives mostly cover the project described. Clarity and presentation could be enhanced. Objectives are not measurable or prioritised. • The description has slight gaps in detail. • A clear evaluation strategy is provided. • Time plan missing one or two details. Deliverables and milestones highlighted but stretch goals and slippage time are not accounted for. • Risk and ethics are considered but lacking in some minor details. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Style guidance mostly followed. • Written material easy to follow but minor points could be clarified. • Bibliography is missing minor details for some references.

<p><u>1st (70-79%)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive review of the area is presented with ideas discussed in depth. • Excellent critical analysis of the existing work in the field. • An excellent range of reliable and up-to-date sources are used. • The review identifies appropriate gaps in the state-of-the-art and proposes approaches to addressing them. • The project has clear and focused research questions that are directly tied to the objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project aims and objectives are complete, clearly presented and precise. Objectives are measurable and prioritised. • The work to be undertaken is clear and comprehensively described. • The evaluation strategy is comprehensive and aligns perfectly with the research questions and objectives. • The project has been organised into a sensible time plan that includes stretch goals, slippage time, deliverables and milestones. • Detailed consideration of risk and ethics is made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Style guidance followed completely. • Writing style is clear and concise with few (if any) typos/errors. • Bibliography is complete and correct.
<p><u>1st (80-100%)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An exceptionally comprehensive review of the area is presented, showing not only depth but also the ability to synthesise complex ideas into a cohesive narrative. • Outstanding critical analysis that demonstrates original thought, with a deep and nuanced critique of the existing work and their limitations. • An exceptional range of authoritative sources are used, showcasing a deep engagement with the latest research. • The review not only identifies gaps in the literature but also proposes highly innovative and viable approaches for addressing these gaps, demonstrating intellectual independence and creativity. • The project presents exceptionally clear, focused, and innovative research questions that are tightly aligned with the objectives, addressing critical gaps in the field and demonstrating high potential for significant impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project aims and objectives are exceptionally comprehensive and articulately defined. Objectives are not only measurable and prioritised but also clearly aligned with project challenges. • The work to be undertaken is extensively detailed, demonstrating a deep understanding of the project scope and employing innovative methodologies. • The evaluation strategy is thorough, innovative, and demonstrates a deep understanding of the research questions and objectives. • The project plan is expertly structured, showcasing a detailed timeline that includes stretch goals, slippage time, along with deliverables and milestones. • Extensive consideration of risk and ethical implications is provided, reflecting a proactive and nuanced approach to potential challenges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Style guidance followed completely. • Writing style is clear and concise with no typos/errors. • Bibliography is complete and correct. • The style and presentation should meet a quality level suitable for publication in a reputable conference or journal.