**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

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

2. Main written part   80 / 100 (B)

The written part documents all steps of the student's work, from the initial analysis through implementation to testing and documenting. It provides enough detail for a person unfamiliar with the project to understand all steps and includes diagrams and code snippets where appropriate. There are some minor factual inaccuracies and occasional typographic issues. The text is written in decent English, though at times, it feels a bit artificial. The sources used are relevant and properly cited.

3. Non-written part, attachments   85 / 100 (B)

The non-written part is the main part of the thesis. The implementation covers key requirements, is sufficiently tested and documented, and follows the project's code style rules. Unfortunately, as it was finished at the last minute, there was no time for a regular code review process with the project maintainers, so some minor changes and improvements are still needed before the feature is integrated into the project.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards   90 / 100 (A)

The thesis adds a long-requested feature to an existing OSS project and will undoubtedly benefit its users.

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 required more than the average amount of consultations but was always very well prepared for them. A considerable part of the work was done shortly before the deadline.

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

See the previous comment.

The overall evaluation   85 /100 (B)

To put the overall rating into perspective, I'll start by saying that I consider the assignment to be on the easier side as far as the scope of the implementation goes, but I felt this was balanced by the need for high-quality work, as the goal was extending an existing OSS project.

The delivered solution covers all key requirements but still needs some minor changes before it can be integrated. Similarly, the written part is certainly sufficient, but I would not call it "excellent". As such, my overall rating is B - very good.

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.