InCITE 2021

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INFORMATICS, TECHNOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING

3rd Bi-Annual

PROGRAM BOOK

25-26 AUGUST 2021

Leveraging Smart Engineering

Faculty of Engineering
Universitas Surabaya

UBAYA
UNIVERSITAS SURABAYA

CONFERENCE ORGANIZER

The InCITE 2021 Organizing Comittee would like to thank the following names who has served as the:

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

- Prof. Benny Tjahjono, Ph.D. (Coventry University, Coventry, England)
- Prof. Dr. Anton Satria Prabuwono (King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia)
- Prof. Dr. Ing. Ir. I Made Londen Batan M.Eng. (Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS), Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Prof. Dr. Ir. Joko Lianto Buliali (Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS), Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Prof. Dr. Ir. Judy Retti B. Witono, M.App.Sc. (Universitas Katolik Parahyangan, Bandung, Indonesia)
- Prof. Dr. Ir. Wahyudi Sutopo, S.T., M.Si., IPM (Universitas Sebelas Maret, Solo, Indonesia)
- Prof. Ir. Arif Djunaidy, M.Sc., Ph.D. (Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS), Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Prof. Ir. Djoko Budiyanto, M.Eng., Ph.D. (Universitas Atma Jaya, Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Prof. Ir. Joniarto Parung, M.M.B.A.T., Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Prof. Ir. Lieke Riadi, Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Prof. Itthisek Nilkhamhang, Ph.D. (Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology, Pathum Thani, Thailand)
- Prof. Dr. Pavel Albores (MIET, FHEA) (Aston University, Birmingham, England)
- Assoc. Prof. Bertha Maya Sopha, S.T., M.Sc., Ph.D. (Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dina Natalia Prayogo, S.T., M.Sc. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr-Ing. Amalia Suzianti, S.T., M.Sc. (Universitas Indonesia (UI), Jakarta, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. F. M. Saifuddin Saif (American International University, Bangladesh)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Andi Cakravastia Arisaputra Raja, S.T., M.T. (Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), Bandung, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Benjawan Srisura (Assumption University of Thailand, Bangkok, Thailand)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Diana Purwitasari, S.Kom., M.Sc. (Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS), Surabaya)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dra. Amelia Santoso, M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dra. Ir. Evy Herowati, M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emma Savitri, S.T., M.Sc. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ir. Anas Ma'ruf, M.T. (Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), Bandung, Indonesia)

- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ir. Puguh Setyopratomo, M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ir. Susila Candra, M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Joko Siswantoro, S.Si., M.Si. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ludovic F. Dumee (Khalifa University, Uni Arab Emirates (UAE))
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mohd Sanusi Azmi (Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Melaka)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ridi Ferdiana, S.T., M.T. (Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rosita Meitha Surjani, S.T., M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Dr.Eng. Wahyudiono (Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan)
- Assoc. Prof. Elieser Tarigan, S.Si., M.Eng., Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Ir. Eric Wibisono, Ph.D., IPU. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Ir. Hanung Adi Nugroho, Ph.D. (MIEEE, MACM) (Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Restu Kartiko Widi, S.Si., M.Si., Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Satvasheel Powar, Ph.D. (Dalarna University, Sweden)
- Assoc. Prof. Tan Kay Chuan, Ph.D. (National University of Singapore (NUS), Singapore)
- Assoc. Prof. Teguh Bharata Adji, S.T., M.T., M.Eng., Ph.D. (Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. The, Jaya Suteja, S.T., M.Sc., Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Assoc. Prof. Timotius Pasang, Ph.D. (Oregon Institute of Technology, USA)
- Alexander Yohan, S.Kom., M.I.M., Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Djuwari, S.T., Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Dr. Awang Hendrianto Pratomo (UPN "Veteran" Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Dr. Delta Ardy Prima, S.ST., M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Dr. Drs. Muhammad Rosiawan, M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Dr. Fredy Purnomo, S.Kom, M.Kom. (Universitas Bina Nusantara, Jakarta, Indonesia)
- Dr. Hazrul Iswadi, S.Si., M.Si. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Dr. Hendri Himawan Triharminto (Akademi Angkatan Udara, Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Dr. Indri Hapsari, S.T., M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Dr. Jimmy, S.T., M.I.S. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Dr. Khoiruddin, S.T., M.T. (Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB), Bandung, Indonesia)
- Dr. Mohamad Rezi bin Abdul Hamid (University Putra Malaysia, Seri Kembangan, Malaysia)
- Dr. Naniek Utami Handayani, S.Si., M.T. (Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia)

- Dr. Yenny Sari, S.T., M.Sc. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Firman Kurniawansyah, S.T., M.Eng.Sc., Ph.D. (Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember (ITS), Surabaya)
- Nemuel Daniel Pah, S.T., M.Eng., Ph.D. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Ratna Surya Alwi, S.T., M.Si. Ph.D. (Universitas Fajar, Makassar, Indonesia)
- Drs. Heru Arwoko, M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Hendi Wicaksono Agung Darminto, S.T., M.T. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Liliana, S.T., M.MSI. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Maya Hilda Lestari Louk, S.T., M.Sc. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Mohammad Farid Naufal, S.Kom., M.Kom. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Monica Widiasri, S.Kom., M.Kom. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Vincentius Riandaru Prasetyo, S.Kom., M.Cs. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Yuana Elly Agustin, S.T., M.Sc. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)
- Yunus Fransiscus, S.T., M.Sc. (Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia)

STEERING COMMITTEE

Chair:	Asst. Prof. Putu Doddy Sutrisna, S.T., M.Sc., Ph.D.
Honorary Members:	Prof. Ir. Joniarto Parung, M.M.B.A.T., Ph.D. Prof. Ir. Lieke Riadi, Ph.D.
Members:	Assoc. Prof. Ir. Eric Wibisono, Ph.D., IPU Assoc. Prof. Ir. Markus Hartono, S.T., M.Sc., Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Djuwari, S.T., Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dra. Amelia Santoso, M.T. Asst. Prof. Nemuel Daniel Pah, S.T., M.Eng., Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emma Savitri, S.T., M.Sc. Assoc. Prof. Elieser Tarigan, S.Si., M.Eng., Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Jaya Suteja, S.T., M.Sc., Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Ir. Hudiyo Firmanto, M.Sc., Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Restu Kartiko Widi, S.Si., M.Si., Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Joko Siswantoro, S.Si., M.Si. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Indri Hapsari, S.T., M.T. Asst. Prof. Susilo Wibowo, S.T., M.Eng. Asst. Prof. Arum Soesanti, S.T., M.T.

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Chair:	Asst. Prof. Dr. Jimmy, S.T., M.I.S.
Vice Chair:	Asst. Prof. Yuwono Budi Pratiknyo, S.T., M.T.
Secretariat:	Ms. Liliana, S.T., M.MSI. Mr. Marcellinus Ferdinand Suciadi, S.T., M.Comp.
Treasurers:	Ms. Rafina Destiarti Ainul, S.ST., MT.
Program:	Ms. Maya Hilda Lestari Louk, S.T., M.Sc. Mr. Herman Susanto, S.T.,M.Sc.
Website:	Mr. Daniel Soesanto, S.T., M.M. Mr. Felix Handani, S.Kom., M.Kom.
Design:	Ms. Tryza Adelia, S.Sn., M.Inf.Tech.

InCITE 2021 ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS SURABAYA
DEAN BUILDING TB 2, RAYA KALIRUNGKUT
SURABAYA, 60293, INDONESIA

PHONE: +62-31-2981150, FAX: +62-31-2981151

EMAIL: incite@unit.ubaya.ac.id

WEBSITE:
https://incite.ubaya.ac.id
http://teknik.ubaya.ac.id

PREFACE

WELCOME FROM InCITE 2021 ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Welcome to InCITE 2021! The third bi-annual international conference on engineering domain conducted by the Faculty of Engineering, The University of Surabaya (UBAYA). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, InCITE 2021 is held as an online conference. Online conference opens the opportunity for many researchers around the globe to share their findings and learn from other global researchers with less restrictions.

InCITE 2021 invites three keynote speakers, well reputable global researchers in their research domain from Australia and Taiwan. Following each keynote session are two presentation sessions run in parallel.
This year, we received 66 papers submitted by researchers from four distinct countries (i.e., first author's country of origin): Indonesia, Australia, Taiwan, and Kazakhstan.

We employed a double-blind review to ensure a high standard and a minimum level of bias in the reviewing processes. This resulted in 56% of the submissions were accepted and will be published to the AIP Conference Proceedings.

Authors of all accepted papers are to disseminate their findings during InCITE 2021 conference between 25 to 26 of August 2021. This presents a great opportunity for everyone, including the researchers, to discuss and further improve current achievements.

We thank all keynote speakers, presenters, and reviewers/scientific committees for the generous supports. We thank the University of Surabaya, the Faculty of Engineering UBAYA, and all InCITE 2021 committees that enable InCITE 2021.

We wish you a very pleasant and rich conference experience in InCITE 2021 and looking forward to seeing you again on InCITE 2023! Thank you.

Yours sincerely,
Asst. Prof. Dr. Jimmy
InCITE 2021 Organizing Committee

INVITED SPEAKERS



Dr. Ahmed Mourad
Postdoctoral Research Fellow
Information Engineering Lab (IELAB)
University of Queensland
AUSTRALIA

Prof. Chuan-Kai Yang, Ph.D
Professor
Information Management
National Taiwan University of Science and Technology
TAIWAN

Dr. Anton van der Vegt
Postdoctoral Research Fellow
EMPOWER, a Joint Venture between Queensland Health & the University of Queensland
University of Queensland
AUSTRALIA

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

International Conference on Informatics, Technology and Engineering 2021 (InCITE 2021) Organizing Committee wishes to express its gratitude and appreciation to:

Dr. Ir. Benny Lianto, MMBAT., Rector of Universitas Surabaya for consenting to be the guest of honour

All invited speakers session, moderators and conference speakers, for their participation

All conference sponsors, supporters, exhibitors and advertiser for their generous support

All participants and other who have in one way or another contributed towards the success of this conference

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Dr. Ahmed Mourad



Dr. Ahmed Mourad is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Information Engineering Lab (ielab), University of Queensland. His current research focuses on Conversational Systems in the context of Agricultural domain. AgAsk is a conversational agent that will provide access to agricultural R&D output (which is currently locked away into project reports, communications and scientific publications) leading directly to better, data-driven growing decisions. Through machine learning driven question-answering systems, AgAsk will elicit and understand growers information needs and preferences, providing contextualised access to insights in agricultural R&D.

He completed his PhD in Computer Science at RMIT University in 2019 under the supervision of Professor Mark Sanderson, Professor Falk Scholer and Associate Professor Walid Magdy. His research focused on the Influence of geographic biases on geolocation prediction in Twitter. Before the PhD, He worked as a Research Assistant at Qatar Computing Research Institute (QCRI) focusing on Information Retrieval and Sentiment Analysis on Arabic datasets. He also worked as a Software Engineer at large corporates including Microsoft and Mentor Siemens.

Prof. Chuan-Kai Yang, Ph.D

Prof. Chuan-Kai Yang, Ph.D received his Ph.D. degree in computer science from Stony Brook University, USA, in 2002, and his M.S. and B.S. degree in computer science and in mathematics from National Taiwan University in 1993 and 1991, respectively. He served as the chairman for the department of information management, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan, from 2017 to 2019, and is currently a Professor in the department. His research interests include computer graphics, scientific visualization, multimedia systems, and computational geometry. He has published over hundreds of research papers, including more than 30 SCI journal papers and more than 40 international conference papers.

Dr. Anton van der Vegt

Anton completed his PhD in Information Retrieval from The University of Queensland, co-sponsored by CSIRO. His reserach investigated the impact of time and knowledge constraints on the ability of clinicians to make high quality clinical decisions in the context of using a search engine to support this task. Anton proposed a minimal interaction framework, as an alternative to the traditional SERP (Search Engine Results Page) approach to clinical search. As a result of his research, numerous papers have been published in high ranking journals such as JASIST, JMLA and JDOC.

Prior to his PhD studies, Anton spent four years working in the UK, supporting the implementation of the National Programme for IT into the NHS; this included development and installation of clinical and administrative software systems to connect patient care across the UK. Through this work he developed a much better understanding of the unique challenges faced by clinicians and public healthcare organisations when implementing such systems. This experience, together with his thesis research informs his current role as PostDoctoral Research Fellow with EMPOWER, a Joint Venture between Queensland Health and the University of Queensland. The purpose of this JV is to create a scalable platform for clinicians to access intelligent information to improve clinical outcomes across Queensland.

PARALLEL SESSION 4

Venue: Virtual Meeting – Breakout Room Suro

Session Chair: Christabel Parung

No.	From	To	Paper ID	Author	Paper Title
1.	13.00	13.25	32	Jimmy Jimmy and Vincent Riandaru Prasetyo	Sentiment Analysis on Feedback of Higher Education Teaching Conduct: An Empirical Evaluation of Methods
2.	13.25	13.50	26	Md. Hazrat Ali	Recent advances and application of Selective Laser Melting (SLM) in the aerospace industry
3.	13.50	14.15	25	Rudy Agustriyanto, Puguh Setyopratomo and Endang Srihari Mochni	Dynamic Study of Batch Milk Cooling Process at KUD SAE Pujon
4.	14.15	14.40	31	Ellysa Tjandra, Sri Suning Kusumawardani and Ridi Ferdiana	Student Performance Prediction in Higher Education: A Comprehensive Review

Venue: Virtual Meeting – Breakout Room Boyo

Session Chair: Elieser Tarigan

No.	From	To	Paper ID	Author	Paper Title
1.	13.00	13.25	52	Delta Ardy Prima	Implementation of Behavior Tree for Creating an In-Game Cut-Scene
2.	13.25	13.50	45	Putu Padmareka Deandra, Herry Santoso and Judy Retti B. Witono	Carbon Based Sulfonated Catalyst as an Environment Friendly Material: A Review
3.	13.50	14.15	9	Yu-Chung Tsao, Felix Arril Simbara Barus and Chien-Wei Ho	How energy efficiency, smart factory, and mass personalization affect companies in Industry 4.0
4.	14.15	14.40	18	Yoni Kristiawan, Edi Purwanto, and Rustono Farady Marta	The Role of Supply Chain Performance to Determine the Firm Performance

PAPER ID: PAPER 31

Student Performance Prediction in Higher Education: A Comprehensive Review

Ellysa Tjandra[1, 2, a)], Sri Suning Kusumawardani [2, b)], Ridi Ferdiana [2, c)]

[1] *Department of Informatics Engineering, Universitas Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia*

[2] *Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

[a)]*Corresponding author: ellysa@staff.ubaya.ac.id*

[b)]*suning@ugm.ac.id*

[c)]*ridi@ugm.ac.id*

Student dropout still becomes a critical problem in education. Educational Data Mining (EDM) can bring potential impact to support academic institution's goals in making academic decisions, such as regulation renewal, rule enforcement, or academic process improvement. The sooner at-risk students can be identified, the earlier institution members can provide necessary treatments, thus prevent them from dropout and increase the student retention rate. This study performs a comprehensive literature review of student performance prediction using EDM techniques, including various research from 2002 to 2021. Our study is aimed to provide a comprehensive review of recent studies based on student performance prediction tasks, predictor variables, methods, accuracy, and tools used in previous works of student performance prediction. Performing student performance prediction in an academic institution can be helpful to provide the student performance mitigation mechanism because it can be managed earlier by the management to decrease the student dropout rate.

Keywords: student performance, prediction, student dropout, Educational Data Mining, EDM review

Student performance prediction in higher education: A comprehensive review

Cite as: AIP Conference Proceedings **2470**, 050005 (2022); https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0080187
Published Online: 25 April 2022

Ellysa Tjandra, Sri Suning Kusumawardani and Ridi Ferdiana

Student Performance Prediction in Higher Education: A Comprehensive Review

Ellysa Tjandra[1, 2, a)], Sri Suning Kusumawardani[2, b)], and Ridi Ferdiana[2, c)]

[1] *Department of Informatics Engineering, University of Surabaya, Surabaya 60293, Indonesia*
[2]*Department of Electrical and Information Engineering, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

[a)] *Corresponding author: ellysa@staff.ubaya.ac.id*
[b)] *suning@ugm.ac.id*
[c)] *ridi@ugm.ac.id*

Abstract. Student dropout still becomes a critical problem in education. Educational Data Mining (EDM) can bring potential impact to support academic institution's goals in making academic decisions, such as regulation renewal, rule enforcement, or academic process improvement. The sooner at-risk students can be identified, the earlier institution members can provide necessary treatments, thus prevent them from dropout and increase the student retention rate. This study performs a comprehensive literature review of student performance prediction using EDM techniques, including various research from 2002 to 2021. Our study is aimed to provide a comprehensive review of recent studies based on student performance prediction tasks, predictor variables, methods, accuracy, and tools used in previous works of student performance prediction. Performing student performance prediction in an academic institution can be helpful to provide the student performance mitigation mechanism because it can be managed earlier by the management to decrease the student dropout rate.

Keywords: student performance, prediction, student dropout, Educational Data Mining, EDM review

INTRODUCTION

Student dropout and retention is a prominent issue in education at present. When the dropout rate increases, it means the institution loses the number of students, or the student retention rate decreases. According to the Indonesian academic minister of higher education (Kemenristekdikti), in 2017, there were 195.176 of 6.924.511 (28.2%) students in higher education quitted from school [1]. Various procedures or processes can be conducted to prevent student dropout: student performance monitoring, academic rule enforcement, or academic improvement. To perform these activities, higher education institution needs supporting system, which can be established by Educational Data Mining (EDM).

Educational Data Mining (EDM) is still being considered as a popular solution in education. EDM techniques provide potential impact for supporting academic institution goals to improve the quality and efficiency of learning activities and monitoring processes. Aldowah et al. (2019) summarized the previous works in the EDM field, specifically in computer-based student performance prediction, into three main objectives: evaluating learning materials (course contents, syllabus, etc.), monitoring learning activities/results (delivery methods, assignments, scoring, etc.), and preventing student dropout (performance measurement, early warning, survival index, etc.). They also categorized EDM into four domains based on its objective: Learning Analytics (LA), Predictive Analytics (PA), Behavioral Analytics (BA), and Visualization Analytics (VA) [2]. In their review, it could be concluded that predictive analytics still has the highest demand, which implies that predictive analytics is still being the most challenging subject in the EDM field.

There were plenty of EDM techniques had been conducted by many researchers [3]–[8]. The previous literature reviews mainly concentrated on using EDM methods/techniques and student performance prediction, such as

International Conference on Informatics, Technology, and Engineering 2021 (InCITE 2021)
AIP Conf. Proc. 2470, 050005-1–050005-9; https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0080187
Published by AIP Publishing. 978-0-7354-4180-4/$30.00

classification, clustering, rule-based methods, statistics, and user interfacing or visualization, but no comprehensive review of student performance prediction had been conducted. This research is aimed to provide a comprehensive review of recent studies based on student performance prediction tasks, predictor variables, predictive variables, methods, accuracy, and tools used in previous works of student dropout prediction.

PREVIOUS WORKS

Many literature reviews of EDM had been conducted and provided further insight into EDM fields. Each review captured the different points of view of EDM works. In 2015, [6] performed SLR to find the most frequent attributes and methods used in predicting student performance. Afterward, a review of student performance factors, clustering algorithm, and EDM tools had been conducted by [3], [4], [9], [10], followed by a literature review of student retention factors [11], EDM using big data framework [5], and domains and student success factors in the first year of higher education [12]. After that, [2] provided a broad analysis of EDM domains and applications, while [13] portrayed a comprehensive review of predictors, predictive values, and EDM techniques used to predict academic performance. [14] conducted an SLR of Student Achievement Influencing Factors. In 2021, student performance SLR is still being conducted. [15] performed an SLR of Student Performance Prediction based on Outcome-Based Education using Student Outcomes and Learning Outcomes, while [16] conducted an SLR of Student Performance Prediction Model used by each educational level. Overall, about 250 studies of student performance prediction had been established from 2002 to 2021. However, no comprehensive review of student performance prediction, especially for student dropout prevention, had been established.

These works of literature are categorized into three main objectives as shown in Table 1: categorizes student performance prediction objectives into three main categories: evaluating learning materials, such as course contents, syllabus, etc. (59 or 23.60%), monitoring learning activities/results, such as delivery methods, assignments, scoring, etc. (168 or 67.2%), and preventing student dropout, such as performance measurement, early warning, survival index, etc. (23 or 9.20%). It can be concluded that dropout and retention is still the least researched sub-field in student performance prediction, while the dropout and retention problem is still the crucial problem of education that needs to be resolved immediately.

TABLE 1. Studies of Student Performance Prediction

Objectives	Number of Studies	%
Evaluating learning materials	59	23.60%
Monitoring learning activities/results	168	67.20%
Preventing student dropout	23	9.20%
Total	**250**	**100%**

METHODS

Therefore, this study proposes five research questions:

Q1: What are the student performance prediction tasks performed by the previous studies?
Q2: What are the predictor variables (attributes) used in student performance prediction?
Q3: What are the prediction methods used for students dropout prevention?
Q4: How about the results (accuracy) in each prediction method?
Q5: What are the frequently used tools to perform prediction tasks?

To narrow the result search, this review was conducted using specific search keywords and criteria(s):

Search Keywords

This review was conducted using these keywords and combination terms:

- Educational Data Mining OR Learning Analytics
- Student Performance Prediction
- Early Warning OR Early Prediction OR Early Detection OR Early Estimation
- Higher Education OR College OR Undergraduate OR University OR Degree Program
- Student Performance Index OR Student Performance Model

- Student Retention OR Persistence OR Survival
- Student Dropout OR Student Failure OR At-Risk Student OR Student Difficulties

We limit our search for any studies performed in 2002 until December 2020. Hence, any paper published after that time is not included in our review.

Search Criteria

After a strict screening of previous studies, only strong-related papers were selected in this review, as well as duplicate papers were excluded from this review, resulting in 34 papers (each paper can contain more than one research). All articles were chosen from reputable journals and conferences published by trusted publishers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

At first, this review summarizes the number of previous works in the EDM field, specifically in computer-based student performance prediction.

Student Performance Tasks

Student performance prediction is categorized into five main tasks: Student Identification & Classification, Student Modeling and Enhancement, Recommendation System, Early Warning, and Survival Indexing. Table 2 obviously describes the top three frequent tasks performed by recent studies are Student Identification & Classification (44.12%), Student Retention Modeling & Enhancement (23.53%), Early Warning (14.71%), Recommendation System (11.76%), and Survival Indexing (5.88%), while Table 3 explores details of the studies.

TABLE 2. Number of Student Performance Prediction Studies

Task	Number of Studies	%
Student Identification & Classification	15	44.12%
Student Modeling & Enhancement	8	23.53%
Early Warning	5	14.71%
Recommendation System	4	11.76%
Survival Indexing	2	5.88%
Total	**34**	**100%**

As shown in Table 3, some student performance tasks were performed in higher education. EDM is often used to predict student performance, such as identifying and grouping Students (Student Identification & Classification) [17]–[31], measuring student performance for future development (Student Modeling & Enhancement) [11], [32]–[37], providing Early Warning [20], [31], [38]–[40], providing Recommendations [30], [41]–[43], and presents a student success index (Survival Indexing) [44], [45].

TABLE 3. Student Performance Prediction Tasks

Task	Study
Student Identification & Classification	[17], [18], [27]–[31], [19]–[26]
Student Modeling & Enhancement	[11], [32]–[37], [46]
Early Warning	[20], [31], [38], [40], [47], [48]
Recommendation System	[30], [41]–[43]
Survival Indexing	[44], [45]

Student Performance Attributes (Predictor Variables)

At first, student performance factors must be analyzed to perform the best prediction. We categorize student performance predictor variables into internal and external attributes (factors). Internal factor is any factor(s) that happened inside the university (or belongs to the university), while external factors come from the outside (e.g., students' family condition or other environments outside the university). Internal factors are considered to be more flexible because the university members can change them via regulation renewal, rule enhancement, or process improvement, while external factors cannot. In this research, personal factors such as behavioral, psychological, and motivational factors also are examined as well as academic factors.

Student performance factors have been already examined in previous studies, and most of them used specific academic fields [24], [29][44], [46]. Academic and personal attributes have a significant impact on student academic performance. In 2014, [49] tried to add more factors besides academic factors: gender, high school background (secondary school grade), a chosen priority of the program (first, second, or third), and the financial condition (government-financed or self-financed). However, these studies mainly focused on academic factors. Studies of student personal approaches had been emerged to provide a better representation of a student. [50] examined social behavior of the students, resulting in a significant increase in dropout prediction accuracy. [23] analyzed psychological factors related to the personality of students (called the bio-psycho-social level of development) and external factors, consist of students' socio-economic (student demographic), cultural (ethnicity), and educational environments, and stated that psychological factors also provide a significant influence in student academic engagement. These studies also stated that personal factors also have a significant impact on student academic performance.

From Table 4 we can conclude the most-widely used predictors are: student demographic (13.75%), internal assessment (12.50%), admission (8.75%) student achievement index (GPA) (6.25%), psychological factors (6.25%), and social behavior (6.25%). Internal assessment includes test scores and assignments (internal assessment), prerequisite course grades, and course engagement or course attendance.

TABLE 4. Student Performance Prediction Attributes used in Studies

Category	Attributes/Predictor	Number of Studies	%
External	Student Demographic	11	13.75%
Internal	Internal Assessment	10	12.50%
External	Admission	7	8.75%
Internal	CGPA	5	6.25%
External	Financial Condition	5	6.25%
External	Psychological Factors	5	6.25%
External	Social Behaviour	5	6.25%
Internal	Attendance & Delivery Mode	4	5.00%
External	High School Background	4	5.00%
External	Ethnicity (Nationality)	3	3.75%
External	Parent Educational Level	3	3.75%
Internal	English Proficiency	2	2.50%
External	Gender	2	2.50%
Internal	Extra-Curricular Activities	2	2.50%
Internal	Soft Skills	2	2.50%
External	Student Habit	2	2.50%
Internal	Educational Environment	1	1.25%
External	External Assessment	1	1.25%
Internal	Institute Rank	1	1.25%
External	Job Time	1	1.25%
Internal	Number of Students	1	1.25%
External	Religion	1	1.25%
Internal	Scholarship	1	1.25%
Internal	Student Status	1	1.25%
	TOTAL	**80**	**100%**

Student Performance Prediction Methods

Student Performance Prediction Methods used in previous research can be seen in Table 5. One research may perform more than one method and vice versa. The top five frequently used methods are Decision Tree (27.27%), Naïve Bayes (18.18%), K-Nearest Neighbour (12.12%), Neural Network (12.12%), and SVM (12.12%).

TABLE 5. Student Performance Prediction Methods used in Previous Studies

Methods	Number of Studies	%
Decision Tree	9	27.27%
Naïve Bayes	6	18.18%
K-Nearest	4	12.12%
Neural Network	4	12.12%
SVM	4	12.12%
Random Forest	3	9.09%
Ruled-Based	2	6.06%
Regression	1	3.03%
TOTAL	**33**	**100%**

Methods accuracy results for each prediction method used in previous works are shown in Table 6. The top five methods with best accuracy were performed using Neural Network (97.00%) [34], Random Forest (96.01%) [40], Decision Tree (92.80%) [25], Decision Tree (90%) [35], [43], and Random Forest (88.00%) [28].

TABLE 6. Accuracy of Prediction Methods

Method	Accuracy	Study	Year
Neural Network	81.00%	[41]	2002
K-Nearest	82.00%	[17]	2003
SVM	80.00%	[18]	2006
Regression	70.60%	[32]	2006
Decision Tree	92.80%	[25]	2007
Naïve Bayes			
Decision Tree	73.00%	[26]	2008
Naïve Bayes	76.00%		
Neural Network	71.00%		
Neural Network	97.00%	[34]	2013
Decision Tree	66.00%	[27]	2014
K-Nearest	83.00%		
Naïve Bayes	73.00%		
SVM	80.00%		
Decision Tree	90.00%	[35]	2014
Decision Tree	90.00%	[43]	2014
Decision Tree	88.00%	[28]	2014
Random Forest			
K-Nearest	70%	[45]	2014
Decision Tree	69.23%	[20]	2017
Neural Network	62.50%		
K-Nearest	74.04%		
Ruled-Based	55.77%		
Naïve Bayes	83.65%		
Random Forest	71.15%		
Naïve Bayes	83.20%	[51]	2018
SVM (SMO)	81.00%		
Decision Tree	80.00%		
Ruled-Based	79.00%		
Decision Tree	85.75%	[40]	2019
Random Forest	96.01%		

Method	Accuracy	Study	Year
SVM (SMO)	86.03%		
Naïve Bayes	85.51%		

Student Performance Prediction Tools

Many researchers use tools to conduct prediction analyses in EDM [1]. Based on its objective, the student performance prediction tool is categorized into three categories: Data Manipulation, Analysis of Algorithm, and Data Visualization [10]. The frequently used tools in this research are elaborated from EDM tools reviews by [10], [52]–[54]. Tools for Data Manipulation are Microsoft Excel (Google Sheets), EDM Workbench, Phyton & Jupyter Notebook, SQL, SAP HANA, eLAT, while analysis of algorithm tasks using Rapid Miner, WEKA, SPSS, KNIME, Orange, KEEL, Spark MLLib, EDAIME, MMT (Moodle Mining Tool). For Data Visualization, they use Tableau, D3.js, EPRules, GISMO, TADA-Ed, Synergo/CoIAT, PDinamet, and SNAPP. Frequently tools used by EDM analysts and researchers to perform student performance prediction can be seen in Table 7.

TABLE 7. Frequently Used Tools in Student Performance Prediction

Objective	Tools
Data Manipulation	Microsoft Excel (Google Sheets)
	EDM Workbench
	Phyton & Jupyter Notebook
	SQL
	SAP HANA
	eLAT
Analysis of Algorithm	Rapid Miner
	WEKA
	SPSS
	KNIME
	Orange
	KEEL
	Spark MLLib
	EDAIME
	MMT (Moodle Mining Tool)
Data Visualization	Tableau
	D3.js
	EPRules
	GISMO
	TADA-Ed
	Synergo/CoIAT
	PDinamet
	SNAPP

CONCLUSION

This review finds that student academic prediction played an essential role in providing opportunities and solutions to various academic institution problems, mainly student dropout mitigation. In general, most data mining techniques are well suited to perform student academic prediction. According to the review result, we suggest Random Forest, Neural Network, Decision Tree, and Naïve Bayes methods to perform student performance prediction because the techniques have high accuracy results. Furthermore, we find that academic factors are frequently used in EDM fields. There is still limited research using personal characteristics - such as psychological and social/behavioral factors - to conduct student performance predictions. Hence, it needs to be explored in the future so that the dropout rate can be decreased as well.

REFERENCES

1. I. Nirmala and A. N. R. Attamimi, *Buku Statistik Pendidikan Tinggi Tahun 2017 (Higher Education Statistical Year Book 2017)*, 1st ed., vol. PT 17, no. 1. Jakarta: Pusat Data dan Informasi Iptek Dikti, 2017.
2. H. Aldowah, H. Al-Samarraie, and W. M. Fauzy, "Educational data mining and learning analytics for 21st century higher education: A review and synthesis," *Telemat. Informatics*, vol. 37, no. January, pp. 13–49, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.tele.2019.01.007.
3. A. Dutt, M. A. Ismail, and T. Herawan, "A Systematic Review on Educational Data Mining," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, no. c, pp. 15991–16005, 2017, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2654247.
4. L. Khanna, S. N. Singh, and M. Alam, "Educational data mining and its role in determining factors affecting students academic performance: A systematic review," *India Int. Conf. Inf. Process. IICIP 2016 - Proc.*, 2017, doi: 10.1109/IICIP.2016.7975354.
5. S. M. Muthukrishnan, N. B. M. Yasin, and M. Govindasamy, "Big data framework for students' academic performance prediction: A systematic literature review," *ISCAIE 2018 - 2018 IEEE Symp. Comput. Appl. Ind. Electron.*, pp. 376–382, 2018, doi: 10.1109/ISCAIE.2018.8405502.
6. A. M. Shahiri, W. Husain, and N. A. Rashid, "A Review on Predicting Student's Performance Using Data Mining Techniques," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 72, pp. 414–422, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.12.157.
7. M. A. Ghazal, O. Ibrahim, and M. A. Salama, "Educational process mining: A systematic literature review," *Proc. - 2017 Eur. Conf. Electr. Eng. Comput. Sci. EECS 2017*, pp. 198–203, 2018, doi: 10.1109/EECS.2017.45.
8. A. Almasri, E. Celebi, and R. S. Alkhawaldeh, "EMT: Ensemble meta-based tree model for predicting student performance," *Sci. Program.*, vol. 2019, 2019, doi: 10.1155/2019/3610248.
9. M. A. Jayanthi, R. L. Kumar, A. Surendran, and K. Prathap, "Research contemplate on educational data mining," *2016 IEEE Int. Conf. Adv. Comput. Appl. ICACA 2016*, pp. 110–114, 2017, doi: 10.1109/ICACA.2016.7887933.
10. S. Slater, S. Joksimović, V. Kovanovic, R. S. Baker, and D. Gasevic, "Tools for Educational Data Mining: A Review," *J. Educ. Behav. Stat.*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 85–106, 2017, doi: 10.3102/1076998616666808.
11. C. Dewberry and D. J. R. Jackson, "An application of the theory of planned behavior to student retention," *J. Vocat. Behav.*, vol. 107, no. August 2017, pp. 100–110, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2018.03.005.
12. P. J. A. C. van der Zanden, E. Denessen, A. H. N. Cillessen, and P. C. Meijer, "Domains and predictors of first-year student success: A systematic review," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. December 2017, pp. 57–77, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2018.01.001.
13. A. Hellas *et al.*, "Predicting academic performance: a systematic literature review," pp. 175–199, 2019, doi: 10.1145/3293881.3295783.
14. M. Suhaini, "Factors Influencing Student Achievement: A Systematic Review," *Int. J. Psychosoc. Rehabil.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 550–560, 2020, doi: 10.37200/ijpr/v24i5/pr201720.
15. A. Namoun and A. Alshanqiti, "Predicting student performance using data mining and learning analytics techniques: A systematic literature review," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 2021, doi: 10.3390/app11010237.
16. R. Alamri and B. Alharbi, "Explainable Student Performance Prediction Models: A Systematic Review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 33132–33143, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3061368.
17. B. Minaei-Bidgoli, D. A. Kashy, G. Kortemeyer, and W. F. Punch, "Predicting student performance: An application of data mining methods with an educational web-based system," *Proc. - Front. Educ. Conf. FIE*, vol. 1, p. T2A13-T2A18, 2003, doi: 10.1109/FIE.2003.1263284.
18. W. Hamalainen and M. Vinni, "Comparison of machine learning methods for intelligent tutoring systems," *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. (including Subser. Lect. Notes Artif. Intell. Lect. Notes Bioinformatics)*, vol. 4053 LNCS, pp. 525–534, 2006.
19. N. Iam-On and T. Boongoen, "Generating descriptive model for student dropout: a review of clustering approach," *Human-centric Comput. Inf. Sci.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–24, 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13673-016-0083-0.
20. R. Asif, A. Merceron, S. A. Ali, and N. G. Haider, "Analyzing undergraduate students' performance using educational data mining," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 113, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2017.05.007.
21. K. T. Chui, D. C. L. Fung, M. D. Lytras, and T. M. Lam, "Predicting at-risk university students in a virtual learning environment via a machine learning algorithm," *Comput. Human Behav.*, no. December 2017, pp. 0–1, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2018.06.032.

22. A. Sandoval, C. Gonzalez, R. Alarcon, K. Pichara, and M. Montenegro, "Centralized student performance prediction in large courses based on low-cost variables in an institutional context," *Internet High. Educ.*, vol. 37, no. January, pp. 76–89, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2018.02.002.
23. A. Sarra, L. Fontanella, and S. Di Zio, "Identifying Students at Risk of Academic Failure Within the Educational Data Mining Framework," *Soc. Indic. Res.*, pp. 1–20, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s11205-018-1901-8.
24. J. -P. Vandamme, N. Meskens, and J. -F. Superby, "Predicting Academic Performance by Data Mining Methods," *Educ. Econ.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 405–419, 2007, doi: 10.1080/09645290701409939.
25. N. T. Nghe, P. Janecek, and P. Haddawy, "A comparative analysis of techniques for predicting academic performance," *Proc. - Front. Educ. Conf. FIE*, no. November, 2007, doi: 10.1109/FIE.2007.4417993.
26. E. Osmanbegović and M. Suljic, "Data Mining Approach for Predicting Student Performance," *Econ. Rev. J. Econ. Bus.*, vol. X, no. 1, pp. 3–12, 2012.
27. M. Mayilvaganan and D. Kalpanadevi, "Comparison of classification techniques for predicting the cognitive skill of students in education environment," *2014 IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Intell. Comput. Res. IEEE ICCIC 2014*, pp. 113–118, 2014, doi: 10.1109/ICCIC.2014.7238346.
28. T. Mishra, D. Kumar, and S. Gupta, "Mining students' data for prediction performance," *Int. Conf. Adv. Comput. Commun. Technol. ACCT*, pp. 255–262, 2014, doi: 10.1109/ACCT.2014.105.
29. A. Pradeep and J. Thomas, "Predicting College Students Dropout using EDM Techniques," *Int. J. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 123, no. 5, pp. 26–34, 2015, doi: 10.5120/ijca2015905328.
30. M. A. Salahli, T. Gasimzade, F. Alasgarova, and A. Guliyev, "The Use of Predictive Models in Intelligent Recommendation Systems," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 102, no. August, pp. 515–519, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.436.
31. C. J. Villagrá-Arnedo, F. J. Gallego-Durán, F. Llorens-Largo, P. Compañ-Rosique, R. Satorre-Cuerda, and R. Molina-Carmona, "Improving the expressiveness of black-box models for predicting student performance," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 72, pp. 621–631, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2016.09.001.
32. P. Golding and O. Donaldson, "Predicting academic performance," *Proc. - Front. Educ. Conf. FIE*, pp. 21–26, 2006, doi: 10.1109/FIE.2006.322661.
33. D. Delen, "A comparative analysis of machine learning techniques for student retention management," *Decis. Support Syst.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 498–506, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.dss.2010.06.003.
34. P. M. Arsad, N. Buniyamin, and J. L. A. Manan, "A neural network students' performance prediction model (NNSPPM)," *2013 IEEE Int. Conf. Smart Instrumentation, Meas. Appl. ICSIMA 2013*, no. November, pp. 26–27, 2013, doi: 10.1109/ICSIMA.2013.6717966.
35. S. Natek and M. Zwilling, "Student data mining solution-knowledge management system related to higher education institutions," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 41, no. 14, pp. 6400–6407, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2014.04.024.
36. N. D. Paterson, "Predictors of first year retention rates at the university of the West Indies, Jamaica," *Int. J. Educ. Dev.*, vol. 55, no. June, pp. 63–68, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.06.001.
37. D. Delen, K. Topuz, and E. Eryarsoy, "Development of a Bayesian Belief Network-based DSS for predicting and understanding freshmen student attrition," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, no. xxxx, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2019.03.037.
38. H. Hamsa, S. Indiradevi, and J. J. Kizhakkethottam, "Student Academic Performance Prediction Model Using Decision Tree and Fuzzy Genetic Algorithm," *Procedia Technol.*, vol. 25, pp. 326–332, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.protcy.2016.08.114.
39. A. S. Hoffait and M. Schyns, "Early detection of university students with potential difficulties," *Decis. Support Syst.*, vol. 101, pp. 1–11, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.dss.2017.05.003.
40. C. C. Gray and D. Perkins, "Utilizing early engagement and machine learning to predict student outcomes," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 131, no. December 2018, pp. 22–32, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2018.12.006.
41. T. Wang and A. Mitrovic, "Using neural networks to predict student's performance," *Proc. - Int. Conf. Comput. Educ. ICCE 2002*, no. October, pp. 969–973, 2002, doi: 10.1109/CIE.2002.1186127.
42. I. Lykourentzou, I. Giannoukos, V. Nikolopoulos, G. Mpardis, and V. Loumos, "Dropout prediction in e-learning courses through the combination of machine learning techniques," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 950–965, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2009.05.010.
43. Elakia, Gayathri, Aarthi, and Naren J, "Application of Data Mining in Educational Database for Predicting Behavioural Patterns of the Students," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 4649–4652, 2014.

44. C. Bruffaerts, C. Bruffaerts, C. Dehon, and B. Guisset, “Can Schooling and Socio-Economic Level Be a Millstone to a Student ’ s Academic Success ? Can schooling and socio-economic level be a millstone to a student ’ s academic success ? ∗,” 2011.
45. R. J. Oskouei, M. Askari, and P. R. P. Sajja, “Perceived internet usage behaviours as predictor to outlier detection in students’ communities in academic environments,” *Indian J. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 4923–4935, 2013.
46. S. Huang and N. Fang, “Predicting student academic performance in an engineering dynamics course: A comparison of four types of predictive mathematical models,” *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 133–145, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2012.08.015.
47. C. Márquez-Vera, A. Cano, C. Romero, A. Y. M. Noaman, H. Mousa Fardoun, and S. Ventura, “Early dropout prediction using data mining: A case study with high school students,” *Expert Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 107–124, 2016, doi: 10.1111/exsy.12135.
48. A. Hoffait and M. Schyns, “Early detection of university students with potential difficulties,” *Decis. Support Syst.*, vol. 101, pp. 1–11, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.dss.2017.05.003.
49. L. Paura and I. Arhipova, “Cause Analysis of Students’ Dropout Rate in Higher Education Study Program,” *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 109, pp. 1282–1286, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.625.
50. J. Bayer, H. Bydzovská, and J. Géryk, “Predicting Drop-Out from Social Behaviour of Students.,” *Proc. 5th Int. Conf. Educ. Data Min.*, no. Dm, pp. 103–109, 2012, [Online]. Available: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED537184.
51. L. Liu *et al.*, “Predicting academic performance by considering student heterogeneity,” *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, vol. 161, no. December 2017, pp. 134–146, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.knosys.2018.07.042.
52. S. Ray and M. Saeed, “Applications of educational data mining and learning analytics tools in handling big data in higher education,” *Appl. Big Data Anal. Trends, Issues, Challenges*, pp. 135–160, 2018, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-76472-6_7.
53. K. Venkatachalapathy, V. Vijayalakshmi, and V. Ohmprakash, “Educational data mining tools: A survey from 2001 to 2016,” *Proc. - 2017 2nd Int. Conf. Recent Trends Challenges Comput. Model. ICRTCCM 2017*, no. 14, pp. 67–72, 2017, doi: 10.1109/ICRTCCM.2017.53.
54. S. N. Bonde and D. K. Kirange, “Educational Data Mining Survey for Predicting Student’s Academic Performance,” *Lect. Notes Data Eng. Commun. Technol.*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 293–302, 2020, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-24643-3_35.