CMSI 371-01

COMPUTER GRAPHICS

Spring 2013

Assignment 0502 Feedback

Britain Southwick

2c — You have successfully integrated the lighting computations from the sample code into your scene. This was done correctly, plus accounted for a moving light source. The moving light source, though, reveals some points of improvement—e.g., the wireframe orb's lit side "travels" with its rotation instead of just the "sun," and the sun itself looks faceted and not smooth. This outcome gets maximum proficiency because it fulfills the letter of the requirement, but there are certainly some lighting tweaks that remain. (+)

2d — You were in class to hear me talk about clipping and hidden surface removal. Yay! (+)

3e — You have successfully used the sample code to expand your fragment shader beyond the trivial "set color" version. Again, a sense of lost opportunity here because more can clearly be done, but you did fulfill the requirements for this outcome. (+)

4a — Your code is overall functional and correct, and fulfills the baseline functionality expected for this course. At this closing stage, loose ends include missing unit tests for the camera matrix and still-not-quite-bulletproof composite object functionality (based on an email you sent me, it looks like you've figured out the fix in spirit—but the way you fixed it, with just changing variables around, is at best fragile). (|)

4b — Separation of concerns has been generally maintained throughout, and remains largely so here. (+)

4c — Your code has now accrued assorted indentation, spacing, and linebreak inconsistencies. In addition, many of my inline comments can conceivably go now, or else be converted into actual contextual documentation for your code. Enough of this has accrued that the reading experience suffers now. (/)

4d — For this go-round, you successfully integrated diffuse and specular lighting from the sample code based on the information given. Plus you got the light source to move. Well done. (+)

4e — Commit habits are great, and have always been. (+)

4f — Submitted on time, with some important fixes shortly after the deadline. (+)

Updated cumulative feedback with regard to code cleanup, recursion, projection, and polygon meshes, based on commits up to May 7:

1b — Your polygon meshes have cleaned up nicely and your work now shows that you have a good handle on how they are built. (+)

1c — Better late than never, you have finally cleaned up the recursion semantics of your scene composition code. Upon closer examination though, your scene composition code still isn't quite right; when a parent object has children, the parent object disappears. Also, the effect that a parent object's transform has on its children is not clear. (|)

2b — Your projection code is correct and correctly used. (+)

3d — Your library of matrices is functionally complete, but incompletely tested. You have instance and camera transform functions that don't have unit tests. (|)

4c — Your core code is generally more readable now, although you missed an incorrect indent here and there, plus a few other files could still use a cleanup pass (e.g., *matrix4x4.js*, *matrix4x4-test.js*). The result is a notch better, but still not perfect. (|)