**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor:	Ing. Stanislav Kuznetsov
Student:	Bc. Tomáš Lenoch
Thesis title:	Automated extraction of personal profiles from a university domain using web scraping and NLP methods
Branch / specialization:	Knowledge Engineering
Created on:	12 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

I consider the assignment to be of average difficulty. The student fulfilled the assignment in its entirety.

2. Main written part   80 / 100 (B)

The work is divided into two parts: theoretical and practical. The theoretical part is satisfactory and covers all the necessary technologies. The practical part includes the system design and the experimental section. However, the last chapter, Deployment, is too short and does not provide sufficient explanation of the application. Overall, the work is not written by a native English speaker, which results in more complex verbal expressions, but it is still understandable and coherent.

3. Non-written part, attachments   75 / 100 (C)

Overall, the software is functional and addresses a specific problem effectively. However, it is unfortunate that it is not designed as a modular application that allows for further development. A modular design would enable the connection of additional modules to enrich the existing data pipeline. Furthermore, the software lacks proper documentation, and the existing documentation is generated automatically without additional comments.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards   80 /100 (B)

The software is currently functional and can be implemented in practical settings. However, further development and enhancement of the software may pose challenges due to the lack of proper documentation

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 cooperation with the student was very good. The student worked independently most of the time, participated in regular consultations and met the agreed deadlines.

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

The student demonstrated creativity by proposing multiple methods and choosing the right solution. The overall focus of the work was primarily engineering-oriented, with the main objective being to solve a specific problem, and the student successfully achieved that goal.

The overall evaluation   80 /100 (B)

Overall, the work is commendable as it successfully combines elements of software engineering and knowledge engineering. The creation of functional software that can be practically implemented is highly appreciated. However, the weaknesses identified include the lack of documentation and the complexity of potential future extensions. Given that this is the work of a knowledge engineering student, it is understandable to encounter programming issues and unfinished components. Taking all these factors into consideration, I would rate the work as a B.

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.