



# Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

**Supervisor:** Ing. Ondřej Guth, Ph.D.  
**Student:** Yaroslav Borovyk  
**Thesis title:** "Chronosite" – application for the timetable slots assigning  
**Branch / specialization:** Software 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

The assignment is not hard to fulfil: it requires an analysis of requirements, thinking about the data relations, and implementing a web user interface as a prototype. No complex algorithm is needed. The student has accomplished all the goals.

### 2. Main written part 90/100 (A)

The text contains all required parts. There is no inaccuracy, the logical structure works well and I find the text comprehensible. The use of language and typography is acceptable (with exceptions mentioned later). There is no issue with citations. However, some readers might find the use of quoted fragments of text unusually frequent.

Below find some issues:

- figures 2.1 and 2.2 (use case diagrams) do not show any relations among use cases and thus contain almost no information value
- section 2.3.2: Java is among non-functional requirements while there is no reason for it (the reason for Java is stated later in the Design chapter)
- (typo) section 2.1.1, the last paragraph: raw → row
- (typography) p. 36: code listing overflows out of visible part of the page, therefore, it cannot be read properly (and looks ugly)
- (typography) p. 38: code listing overflows into bottom margin

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

The prototype (implementation) is just fair and minimalistic. It fulfils the assignment. There is no big issue, the application works, and the sources are well structured.

#### 4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

79 /100 (C)

The prototype cannot be deployed in practice due to its low user friendliness. However, it works well as a proof of concept. The idea how to approach the overall problem (each teacher submits multiple schedules to express their wishes) is the biggest result of the thesis.

#### 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 was normally active at the beginning and very active near the deadline for submitting, when the majority was done. If more effort was invested, the thesis and the results could have been much better.

#### 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 came up independently with a very good idea how to approach the problem.

### The overall evaluation

85 /100 (B)

The student started with creative approach resulting in an excellent general idea how to approach the problem of specifying constraints on timetable by teachers (so that the timetable is later computed). Unfortunately, the effort invested into the thesis was quite low. However, the result is fair and the student shows the ability to develop software.

## **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.