

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Thesis title:	Smart Battery Test Station
Author's name:	Rubin Hao
Type of thesis :	bachelor
Faculty/Institute:	Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FEE)
Department:	Dept. of Microelectronics
Thesis reviewer:	Vladimír Janíček, MSc., Ph.D.
Reviewer's department:	Dept. of Microelectronics

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

Assignment	ordinarily challenging
<i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i>	
The aim of the work was to design a monitoring charging station for the characterization of secondary cells. Purely practical work with the realization of the prototype. Due to the range of functions, it is moderately demanding.	

Fulfilment of assignment	unfulfilled
<i>How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.</i>	
The thesis contains the design of the charging station, but with different parameters than agreed with the student. Likewise, the achieved parameters are basically insufficient and the work has not been practically implemented.	

Activity and independence when creating final thesis	F - failed.
<i>Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.</i>	
The assignment itself took place hectically on the last possible day. During the solution of the work, the student did not consult the procedure, submitted the work a week before submission and did not respond to my criticisms about the content and form and submitted the work in its original state.	

Technical level	F - failed.
<i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i>	
The thesis does not meet even the minimum requirements for the level of final theses.	

Formal level and language level, scope of thesis	F - failed.
<i>Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?</i>	
The work is written in English, but written rather chaotically, when some sentences can not even be understood.	

Selection of sources, citation correctness	F - failed.
<i>Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?</i>	
The author cites a large number of sources, but certain parts of the work appear to be copied and without citing the source.	

**Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)**

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

Please insert your comments here.

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Due to the basically zero communication of the student with the supervisor, ignoring the requirements for changing the work, the absence of evidence of the actual existence of the prototype and the resulting content of the thesis, I have to say that the thesis does not meet the minimum requirements for defensibility in many evaluation criteria, I do not recommend the work for defense and I evaluate it with a grade F - insufficiently.

Date: **9.6.2021**

Signature: