FACULTY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CTU IN PRAGUE

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor:	Ing. Jaroslav Šmolík
Student:	Bc. Ondřej Závodný
Thesis title:	Meme Generator
Branch / specialization:	Software Engineering
Created on:	5 June 2023

Evaluation criteria

1. Fulfillment of the assignment

[1] assignment fulfilled
[2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
▸ **[3] assignment fulfilled with major objections**
[4] assignment not fulfilled

All points of the assignment are addressed. However, the quality of execution is subpar in terms of analysis, implementation, and testing.

2. Main written part

25 / 100 (F)

The thesis suffers from serious grammatical, stylistic, and typographical issues. The language deficiencies themselves are so significant that they cannot be easily excused by the fact that the author's native language is not English.

The text appears more like a draft version rather than the final form due to basic typographical and content errors, such as:
- missing period in the last sentence of a paragraph (section 1.1.3.3),
- empty parentheses (section 1.2),
- completely empty sections (2.7.1.1.1, 2.7.1.1.2, List of Tables, List of code listings),
- invalid references (2.12 Deployment),
- mixed Czech & English ("Obsah přiloženého média"),
- unexpanded abbreviations, etc.

Chapters and sections are logically structured, and follow a conventional chapters for an implementation-focused thesis. At the level of subsections and paragraphs, however, the text becomes less fluent and requires greater attention from the reader. Here, both the mentioned language defects and insufficient coherence of the text sections are evident:
- The discussion of existing solutions in the analysis, for example, is followed by the database model with implementation details without further context, instead of discussing the general domain model.

- There is no summary derived from the research of existing solutions, wireframe proposals lack connection to the rest of the text or adequate use of external references supporting the design, etc.

The text consists of 43 content pages, which is below the recommended range. Additionally, the text contains redundant sections (e.g., the "original" architecture described in a similar detail as the final one, individual steps of CLI interaction for project initialization, etc.), descriptions of development events, personal evaluations, and preferences instead of citations.

3. Non-written part, attachments 55 /100 (E)

From the perspective of source code, the software work partially meets some industry standards (e.g., the use of Docker, TypeScript, dynamic configuration). However, it has significant shortcomings, including:
- absence of a README, developer documentation or description of configuration parameters,
- lack of functional tests (except for one integration Cypress test, which fails on the error discussed in "3.1.2 Mocking the SMTP server"),
- unreadable version control system (VCS) history,
- no CI/CD or use of task runner,
- commented out and boilerplate code, etc.

The implementation is well designed from the perspective of chosen technologies, which are a good fit for the project.

From a user's perspective, some essential features are missing (registration and similar operations for account management). Placing texts on images seems to work correctly. The features correspond to the wireframe design.

Due to the absence of documentation, it is relatively problematic to run the application locally and configure it blindly. Both from a developer and a user perspective, it is more of a disposable prototype rather than an MVP or extensible application.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards 50 /100 (E)

Result is a prototype without a clear goal or direction due to underestimation of standard analysis, especially comparison or learnings from the prior art and rushed implementation.

5. Activity of the student

[1] excellent activity
[2] very good activity
[3] average activity
[4] weaker, but still sufficient activity
▸ **[5] insufficient activity**

The student repeatedly deviated from the proposed, discussed, and revised timeline, was not prepared according to the set expectations for few meetings. Student did not provide samples of text to consult during writing in advance, or the final version for review before final submission.

6. Self-reliance of the student

[1] excellent self-reliance
[2] very good self-reliance
▸ **[3] average self-reliance**
[4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
[5] insufficient self-reliance

Student took on most tasks without the need for consultation. In the early stages of implementation, the student independently chose the tools and libraries used and deployed the application in a live environment.

The overall evaluation 42 /100 (F)

The thesis does not meet an acceptable quality in neither the theoretical and practical part, and the standalone text suffers from very serious deficiencies.
Given the simpler nature of the assignment (standard software product with web UI without difficult integrations), it is not possible to easily excuse the subpar quality of the outputs. The thesis has very serious deficiencies in terms of textual aspects.

Instructions

Fulfillment of the assignment

Assess whether the submitted FT defines the objectives sufficiently and in line with the assignment; whether the objectives are formulated correctly and fulfilled sufficiently. In the comment, specify the points of the assignment that have not been met, assess the severity, impact, and, if appropriate, also the cause of the deficiencies. If the assignment differs substantially from the standards for the FT or if the student has developed the FT beyond the assignment, describe the way it got reflected on the quality of the assignment's fulfilment and the way it affected your final evaluation.

Main written part

Evaluate whether the extent of the FT is adequate to its content and scope: are all the parts of the FT contentful and necessary? Next, consider whether the submitted FT is actually correct – are there factual errors or inaccuracies?

Evaluate the logical structure of the FT, the thematic flow between chapters and whether the text is comprehensible to the reader. Assess whether the formal notations in the FT are used correctly. Assess the typographic and language aspects of the FT, follow the Dean's Directive No. 52/2021, Art. 3.

Evaluate whether the relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. Verify that all quotes are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the FT, thus, that the citation ethics has not been violated and that the citations are complete and in accordance with citation practices and standards. Finally, evaluate whether the software and other copyrighted works have been used in accordance with their license terms.

Non-written part, attachments

Depending on the nature of the FT, comment on the non-written part of the thesis. For example: SW work – the overall quality of the program. Is the technology used (from the development to deployment) suitable and adequate? HW – functional sample. Evaluate the technology and tools used. Research and experimental work – repeatability of the experiment.

Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

Depending on the nature of the thesis, estimate whether the thesis results could be deployed in practice; alternatively, evaluate whether the results of the FT extend the already published/known results or whether they bring in completely new findings.

Activity of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, review the student's activity while working on the thesis, his/her punctuality when meeting the deadlines and whether he/she consulted you as he/she went along and also, whether he/she was well prepared for these consultations.

Self-reliance of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

The overall evaluation

Summarize which of the aspects of the FT affected your grading process the most. The overall grade does not need to be an arithmetic mean (or other value) calculated from the evaluation in the previous criteria. Generally, a well-fulfilled assignment is assessed by grade A.