

CMSI 371-01

COMPUTER GRAPHICS

Spring 2014

Assignment 0130 Feedback

Abdulrahman M. Alzaid

AbdulZaid / mr.d7oom@gmail.com

1a — You were certainly able to represent some visual information in terms of pixels and geometric primitives here. My main issue though is the lack of intentionality in what you drew—they are very abstract, almost random. You are missing out a little bit by not trying to draw something that requires more control and produces something more recognizable. (|)

4a — Your code generally works well, although you have some general-level programming issues, one much more severe than the other. These are noted inline. Make sure to take heed. The proficiency here takes a bigger hit than you might expect due to the severity of one of the issues (when you read the inline comments, it will be pretty clear which one took things down the most). (/)

4b — Also as mentioned in the inline comments, your code works as written for standalone drawing, but needs a little more structural work so that it is reusable by other code (e.g., the keyframe tweening library). You did, however, implement separation between data and drawing code, which is good. (|)

4c — Your code is generally readable, with useful comments here and there. I wish you would be more consistent with your spacing though; some constructs are formatted differently in different places (for example, look at your for loops). On the one hand, true, it is “just spacing,” but on the other hand, this really should be second nature to you by now. (|)

4d — You were able to pick up on canvas drawing on your own, beyond what was shown in class. (+)

4e — Commit frequency and messages are appropriate for the work done. (+)

4f — Submitted on time. (+)

Updated feedback based on your commits up to 2/22/2014. Only re-evaluated outcomes are listed:

1a — Your sprites do come together better in your animated scene, but in isolation they remain conceptually fairly simple, and do not demonstrate the fine control that would merit an increase in proficiency. (|)

4a — Your code is cleaner and more direct, without the “novice” issues seen previously. (+)

4b — You have succeeded in restructuring your code for reusability. I’m sure the presence of a concrete example, in the form of the next “toon” assignment, helped to reinforce the kind of structure that was needed. In future work, try to anticipate this structure so that you code for reusability sooner rather than later. (+)

4c — Code readability is somewhat better, but mainly because of the structural improvements in *4a* and *4b*, and not because you have improved the way you format your code. Most noticeable is your spacing—it is very inconsistent, enough to be noticeable (and distracting). e.g., How do you space symbols like =, <, <=, and +=? The answer, looking at your code is...anything! Sometimes there is a space before but not after; sometimes there is no space at all; sometimes there is a space before *and* after. I personally prefer the latter, but I prefer more that you are *consistent*. Show me that, then we will talk conventions next.(and don’t even get me started on your parenthesis spacing or comment indentation!) (|)