CMSI 371-01

COMPUTER GRAPHICS

Spring 2012

Assignment 0315 Feedback

Lisa Rosenbaum

Note from 9/22/2013: Initial matrix code seen; will wait until things are more complete before doing a full evaluation. Some notes on what I did see though: Make sure to use JavaScript's prototype mechanism so that functions behave like methods. Also, remember now that WebGL expects matrices in column major order. And finally, a better starting point for your work (at this stage of the game) would be *matrices-webgl* and not just *hello-webgl*.

Final feedback based on commits up to 4/11/2014:

2b — The structure your code shows is primarily derived from sample code; when you were left to write out other parts of the graphics system, they ended up in the wrong places (e.g., your matrix code). (/)

2c — You have successfully gotten a scene on the screen, but your code does not show a good understanding of the sequence that got you here. A lot of code has been commented out with no clear future intent; your matrix use is very limited; your sphere implementation is not a full-fledged polygon mesh. (/)

2d — As mentioned in *2c*, your matrix use is minimal, still derived primarily from the sample code. The expectation was for you to go well beyond this. (/)

3c — Your matrix library is sorely incomplete, and parts that should go there are actually in your main code. Further, no demonstration or unit test page exists to show your library's correctness. (/)

3d — You have basic implementations for *translate*, *scale*, and *multiply*, but you don't use them in your code nor you have standalone demonstrations of their functionality. (/)

3e — Your vertex shader shows a basic projection + modelview matrix setup, but you don't really do anything with those outside of initialization for the projection matrix and rotation for the modelview matrix, which in turn was merely derived from the sample code. (/)

4a — Your code is correct for what it tries to do, but the issue is that what it does falls short of what is requested. Your sphere code goes to a rudimentary level but does not function as a generalized polygon mesh; your matrix code is all over the place and generally underutilized (e.g., your shapes have hardcoded locations, rather than all being centered about the origin then repositioned by a matrix). (/)

4b — Most of your comments are commented-out code—exactly the *wrong* use of comments. In fact I don't see any good use of [non-sample code] comments at all; there is no documentation for your intent, your plans, or other commentary about the code that you wrote. (/)

4c — Your code is generally well-spaced and indented. The main spoiler for this structure is the prevalence of commented-out code, as mentioned in *4b*. You are using version control; if you don't want code to run anymore, then just take it out. The presence of these blocks completely detracts from your code's readability and intent. (/)

4d — Your work shows some use of available resources but only a rudimentary understanding of how to move forward from that information. (/)

4e — Commit frequency and messages appear to be commensurate for the work done. (+)

4f — Not submitted on time. (–)