# The UCL logoNSCI0011 Prototype submission form

**LONDON’S GLOBAL UNIVERSITY**

**Part A. Student to Complete:**

**(Please limit each response to no more than 200 words)**

|  |
| --- |
| Provide a short summary of your submission. What functionality does the prototype demonstrate, and to what extent do you think it fulfils the given objectives?  My submission provides a detailed investigation of the Morris-Lecar model. I show the system behaviour, identify and classify the fixed point. I show the limit cycle and show when it emerges using bifurcation analysis, though I do not show its precise position on the bifurcation diagram.  I commenced the investigation of the Chay-Keizer model and plotted some graphs, the time dependence of the 3 variables, though my graphs do not exhibit the behaviour I would expect given the parameters chosen. This is where I got stuck.  I’ve tried to modularise my project, though I’ve had issues with importing my functions so a “function bank” file exists and contains all the function definitions, but I redefine the functions in my main files.  My investigation of the Morris-Lecar model is systematic, I believe I investigated all the features of the system thoroughly. I know this from the phase space plot and nullclines plot, only 1 fixed point exists, and for certain values of applied current a limit cycle emerges and there is a Hopf bifurcation. |

***Why are you being asked this?***By providing an outline of your work, you can demonstrate how well you have understood the assignment objectives and help the marker to provide an accurate assessment.

|  |
| --- |
| Are there any aspects of your work that you would particularly like to receive feedback on?  1. Chay-Keizer model  2. Structure of the Morris-Lecar investigation  3.  If you are aware of any deficiencies with your submission, you can provide further information about them here. Please also indicate if you would like to receive feedback to remedy these deficiencies.  1. Modularisation – please provide feedback  2. Chay-Keizer model not working as expected – please provide feedback |

***Why are you being asked this?***Providing this information helps the marker to focus their feedback where it is likely to be most useful. You will still receive feedback on other features of your work identified by the marker.

**Part B. Student to Complete:**

This is a [category 2 assessment](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/teaching-learning/generative-ai-hub/three-categories-genai-use-assessment#%20AI%20tools%20can%20be%20used%20in%20an%20assistive%20role*): You are permitted to use generative AI (GenAI) tools in a **limited**, **critical** and **responsible** way. GenAI should be limited to supporting and assisting you in completing the assessment and should not be completing the assessment (entirely or only in part) on your behalf.

**AI statement**

|  |
| --- |
| Please outline any ways that you have used GenAI tools for this assignment. If you have used GenAI, provide a reason for your choice. Guidance to help you with completing this section can be found at the following link: [Acknowledging and referencing GenAI](https://library-guides.ucl.ac.uk/referencing-plagiarism/acknowledging-genAI)  **I have not used GenAI tools, stackoverflow and the documentation were sufficient resources. Now that I am stuck, I may venture to use them…** |

***Why are you being asked this?*** *Inappropriate use of GenAI is viewed as plagiarism. This is defined as the representation of other people’s work or ideas as your own without appropriate referencing or acknowledgement. This includes the use of GenAI tools that exceeds that permitted in the assessment brief.*

**Part C. Supervisor to Complete:**

**(Please limit each response to no more than 200 words)**

**Mark justification feedback:**

To what extent does the prototype fulfil the given objectives? What are the main strengths and deficiencies?

**Developmental feedback:**

Targeted feedback for the student based on their responses in Part A:

Further feedback, suggestions for improvement, or next steps:

**Part C. Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Adequate** | | | **Good** | | | **Excellent** | | | **Outstanding** | | | |
| **Raw mark** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** |
| **Percentage** | **40** | **45** | **50** | **55** | **60** | **65** | **70** | **75** | **80** | **85** | **90** | **95** | **100** |

**8-10: Adequate**

Work that partially fulfils the prototype objectives, but shows only limited progress or contains notable errors.

**11-13: Good**

A submission that fulfils the essential prototype objectives, but is somewhat under-developed or contains some errors.

**14-16: Excellent**

Work that fulfils all of the prototype objectives, containing no notable errors.

**17-20: Outstanding**

Work that fulfils all of the prototype objectives and demonstrates significant advancement towards the intended project outcomes.

**Part D. Feedback prompts**

Strengths:

* Does the work demonstrate a good understanding of the project details?
* Is there a particularly innovative or well-executed aspect of the work?
* Does the student demonstrate good coding practices?

Improvements:

* Are there any specific errors that need to be fixed?
* Are there any oversights or omissions that require immediate attention?
* Are there areas where clarity or structure can be enhanced?

Next steps:

* Are there specific features or objectives the student should focus on next?
* How might they expand or refine the functionality of their code?

General comments:

* E.g general advice or resources to support the student’s learning.