CMSI 371-01
COMPUTER GRAPHICS
Spring 2013

Assignment 0502 Feedback

Quin Thames

(progress in other parts of the code is noted, but this particular feedback list pertains to lighting only)

2c — No lighting-related code seen. (**O**)

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

3e — No lighting-related code seen. (**O**)

4a — No lighting-related code seen. (**O**)

4b — No lighting-related code seen. (**O**)

4c — No lighting-related code seen. (**O**)

4d — No lighting-related code seen. (**O**)

4e — No lighting-related code seen. (**O**)

4f — Not submitted on time. (**–**)

Updated feedback for commits up to May 10:

2c — You have successfully integrated the lighting computations from the sample code into your scene. This was done correctly, but no further than that—then again, that really was all that was expected for this assignment.

For fun, I took the liberty of implementing a smoother look for your spheres and cylinders, and making the light stationary—if you don't like these changes, just go ahead and revert them; it was mainly me messing around **:-P** If you're curious about how the code I wrote results in those changes, let me know and I can explain. (**+**)

3e — You have successfully used the sample code to expand your fragment shader beyond the trivial "set color" version. This fulfills the requirements for this outcome. As mentioned in *2c*, I tweaked it so that the light does not move with the object, but you can decide on whether or not to keep it. (**+**)

4a — Your code is overall functional and correct, and does comparatively more than expected for this course. A fine achievement for the semester. (**+**)

4b — Separation of concerns has been generally maintained throughout, and remains largely so here. My last I-couldn't-help-myself change to your code was to consolidate your many repeated object calls (shapes, normal arrays, vertices) into single values that are reused throughout. This makes it easy to change things like the "style" of normals for your objects. Again, not a knock on your proficiency; just me entertaining myself on the last Friday of the semester **:-/** (**+**)

4c — Your code is generally clear and easy to read, with the usual occasional spacing disagreement. You also sometimes indent too far; one level per "semantic drill-down" will do. (**+**)

4d — For this go-round, you successfully integrated diffuse and specular lighting from the sample code based on the information given. (**+**)

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