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| Type of thesis: | Bachelors |
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II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

**Activity and independence in the processing of thesis**

Mark: E

Assess whether the student was active during the solution, whether he/she met the agreed deadlines, whether he/she consulted his/her solution continuously and whether he/she was sufficiently prepared for the consultation. Assess the student’s ability to work independently.

The student was quite active during the winter semester, consultations took place, also due to the pandemic situation, rather in the form of email or online. The deadlines were kept. As the submission deadline approached, the consultations became rather hectic. However, the problem was not meeting the deadlines, but the autonomy in processing the thesis. The student was not able to work independently on the assigned topics - the consultations often revolved around the same topic (for example, the calculation of heat loss took several months...) and the solution did not move forward. The student was absolutely unable to actively search for the necessary documents and all had to be provided.

**Professional level**

Mark: F

Assess the professional level of the student, i.e. the use of knowledge acquired through study and from professional literature, the use of documents and data obtained from practice, the ability to orientate in the assigned problem.

From my point of view, the professional level is insufficient - the student was not able to convince me during the whole academic year that he is able to independently use the knowledge acquired through his studies. Even after repeated detailed explanations and provision of supporting documents, the results were often incorrect or misrepresented. The student submitted the thesis for internal review by the supervisor later than agreed, however, even after my review the student did not accept (or incorrectly incorporated) the comments and thus the thesis remained fundamentally flawed in calculations or in the presentation of the results. I could not check the drawings independently, as they were not delivered.

**Selection of sources, correctness of citations**

Mark: F

Comment on the student’s activity in obtaining and using study materials to solve the thesis. Characterize the selection of sources. Assess whether the student has used all relevant sources.

The student was completely dependent on what I provided as a supervisor. In the submitted thesis, there are almost no citations (and in some places inappropriately) other than the presentations from the relevant exercises and what I referred the student to - which is not sufficient. Citations were incorrectly (or not at all) given in the text. The formality of the in-text citations was later greatly corrected, but it still shows major flaws and the sources of some figures are still not given. The thesis also contains a higher than appropriate percentage of text based on the presentations provided.

III. OVERALL EVALUATION AND CLASSIFICATION PROPOSAL

Considering, in comparison with other students, the really weak professional level, but also the formal level of the submitted thesis, I evaluate the student’s work as a whole as follows:

I evaluate the submitted thesis with a classification grade **F (failed)**
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