UG Exam Performance Feedback
Second Year
2018/2019 Semester 2

COMP27112 Computer Graphics and Image Processing

Toby Howard
Tim Morris

Comments

Q1-Q20 MCQs

Q21. 1.9/3 = 63%. Mostly well-answered but a large number of students inappropriately proposed solutions using image processing techniques, when the question was about tessellation.

Q22 2.3/3 = 77%. This was an easy question, and was generally very well-answered. Students were able to think of many ways in which approximations are used in CG.

Q23 2.1/4 = 53%. The least well-answered question by a long way. It was not a difficult question, and tested understanding of the basic concept of the duality of viewing and modelling. It did not ask for detail beyond knowing what sequence of transformations was necessary, and yet many students were unable to address this.

Q24 2.4/4 = 60%. A straightforward question asking for an explanation of normal-vector interpolation (aka Phong). It was curious that some students ignored this and instead gave an explanation of intensity interpolation (aka Gouraud).

Q25 4.6/6 = 77%. A bookwork question that tested understanding of how the local illumination model incorporates specular reflection. The question asked for ranges of values, but many students did not provide this information, and therefore lost marks.

Q26
1.0/2 = 50%
Generally well answered, exceptions being answers that said it's due to noise.

Q27
1.9/4 = 47.5%
Reasonable answers for defining the filters and their performances

Q28
2.6/6 = 43%
Most students answered this question badly. Some mentioned convolution and explained it, few mentioned the need for multiple templates

Q29
3.4/6 = 57%
Reasonably well answered. Sensible approaches were suggeste d. Candidates lost marks for answers that lacked detail, or sequences of operators that were nonsensical.

Q30
1.1/2 = 55%
Most answers successfully described the problem, many failed to suggest a possible solution