

REAL-TIME GRAPHICS (VIS3070-N)

ASSIGNMENT 1

DETAILS

Title:	<i>The Rendering of Translucent Materials</i>
Assessment Type:	Summative (40%)
Submission Date:	Thursday 17 th January 2013
Submission Method:	<i>Blackboard</i>
Feedback Method:	You will receive individual electronic feedback on your work. This feedback will include comments and marks that are provided to help you improve. Your marks will not be final until they are combined with the marks from the other assignments and then approved by the assessment board at the end of the academic year.
Feedback Date:	Thursday 14 th February 2013

INSTRUCTIONS

You are to write a literature review about the rendering of translucent materials. The aim of this review is to provide an overview of what the current recommended methods are for the subject using the academic and industry literature. You should reach a conclusion regarding what you will demonstrate and how you will implement it within the next assignment. You should focus the review upon the literature appropriate to real-time rendering and be mindful that you are required to use a deferred rendering strategy.

Be aware of the following expectations:

- An academic style of writing will be used;
- The document will be approximately 2000 words;
- References will be cited within the text and a complete reference list provided at the end;
- Most, if not all, references will be within the last 10 years;
- References will generally be of good quality (e.g. peer-reviewed journals, conference papers, text books, conference presentations, articles written by recognised subject leaders);
- There will be at least 8 references of which at least 4 will be journal or conference papers.

You are not to implement the application for this assignment task.

This is an individual assignment so what you submit must be your own work and not that created in collaboration with others.

GUIDANCE

Consider using the following article to get you started (this does not imply this is the “correct” answer but simply a convenient route into the literature):

Dachsbacher, C. and Stamminger, M. (2003) Translucent shadow maps, *Proceedings of the 14th Eurographics workshop on Rendering*. Leuven, Belgium, Aire-la-Ville, Switzerland: Eurographics Association, pp. 197-201.

Make use of the LIS Computing Subject Guide (<http://tees.libguides.com/computing>), particularly the sections on *Literature Review* (including how to use a given source as a launch pad to others), *Finding Academic Papers*, and *How to Reference*.

Make the literature review concept-centric rather than author-centric. Don't just list what authors have contributed, instead integrate and contrast their thoughts and opinions.

DELIVERABLES

You must submit your work as a *PDF* document via *Blackboard*.

CRITERIA

Review (25%)	
16-25	An exemplar review of the subject. The literature review is quite comprehensive featuring good quality, appropriate, and up-to-date references. The material has been integrated to present it in a concept-centric manner. The proposed implementation is credible and justified by the review.
8-16	A reasonable attempt at reviewing the subject. The literature review addresses the major techniques but it is mostly author-centric. There are sufficient references to good quality publications although some are questionable and/or slightly old. The proposed implementation is appropriate but not well justified by the review.
0-8	A cursory attempt at reviewing the subject. There is very little evidence of research using the literature. What information is presented is basic and no attempt at integrating it is evident.

Format (15%)	
10-15	An exemplary formatted literature review of the correct length without unnecessary padding. Citations and the reference list are in the correct format. There is only the occasional flaw in the document structure.
5-10	A satisfactorily formatted literature review. The word count is appropriate although there may be some padding. The writing style is generally academic. References are cited within the text and a reference list is provided although the formatting may be incorrect.
0-5	A poorly formatted literature review. The word count differs substantially from the requirement and/or contains excessive padding. There are few citations and/or no reference list.