Comments

General observation: the handwriting was the worst I have ever seen. There was quite a lot of stuff I simply could not read (and I did have a reasonable go before giving up). Clearly, illegible answers can’t get any marks.

Q1. Average mark: 10.7/20 (53.4%), STDDEV 5.0. As the average shows, this question was somewhat disappointingly answered. It wasn’t the popular question: only 25% of the class chose this one. This surprised me, because I thought it was quite easy, and I had expected it to be more popular.

Part (a) was generally well-answered, and was the easiest part. I was relieved to know that everyone appeared to know the geometrical properties of a typical courgette, but disappointed that some people could not think of a simple technique for modelling this shape (although one had been described in the lectures and notes).

Part (b) was poorly answered. Diagrams were needed here, but many students had none, or used poor, unhelpful diagrams. It was clear that some students had read the associated research papers, and others had not.

Q2. Average mark: 12.8/20 (64.0%), STDDEV 3.5. As the average shows, this question was quite well-answered, and in retrospect I think I set the level of difficulty a bit too low. 75% of the class chose this question.

Part (a) was straightforward bookwork in parts (i), (ii) and (iii), and was answered as such. Parts (iv) and (v) were bookwork too, but it was clear that in many cases this material was being quoted without true understanding.

Part (b) was easy bookwork. Some people answered this part without diagrams, which is not very sensible when describing the edge-collapse algorithm.

Part (c) was asking for some thinking (but not much), and was shockingly badly answered. Most people got only 1 out of the 3 marks available. The question was basically asking “what are the top-level basic principles of CGI and compositing?”. Yet most students were unable to synthesise their knowledge to answer this. Disappointing.

Question 3 was by far the most popular question, and was generally well-answered. The purpose of shadow feelers was probably the least well-explained component, and marks were often lost pointlessly by explaining Ray Tracing in a general sense rather than in the context of the example given.

Question 4 was only attempted by a few people, and the answers were somewhat bi-model; people either knew what they were doing and score highly, or were obviously chancing it in the hopes of scraping up a couple of marks.

The diagrams this year were better drawn than before, but the handwriting was considerably worse.