

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague

Faculty of Information Technology

Student: Vojtěch Udržal
Supervisor: Dr.Ir. René van der Heijden
Thesis title: Android mobile client for an inquire system
Branch of the study: Software Engineering (Bachelor)

Date: 11. 5. 2015

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i> |
| 1. Difficulty and other comments on the assignment | 1 = extremely challenging assignment, 2 = rather difficult assignment, 3 = assignment of average difficulty, 4 = easier, but still sufficient assignment, 5 = insufficient assignment |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> Characterize this final thesis in detail and its relationships to previous or current projects. Comment what is difficult about this thesis (in case of a more difficult thesis, you may overlook some shortcomings that you would not in case of an easy assignment, and on the contrary, with an easy assignment those shortcomings should be evaluated more strictly.) | |
| <i>Comments:</i> I am not sure about this evaluation being correct as I cannot compare the project to other projects, the grades to other grades given, or the student to other students from the University of Prague. Still, I do have quite some experience with other international students in other fields of expertise, both from my work at the University of Delft, as in my role as coach for students that do a commercial intern. Relying on that experience, I think that Vojtech did a great job. The assignment involved the design and actual implementation of a fully working Android application, including the server side, based on functional specs. Some of these specs could be regarded as challenging. The application required to communicate with a database server, mediated by a php shell, over an SSL line. It should also work when an Internet connection is lacking, storing results for later uploads. While the database had largely been designed, some of the more complicating details still had to be filled in. At the start of the project, Vojtech helped out in specifying these details and shared his usually pretty useful ideas. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i> |
| 2. Fulfilment of the assignment | 1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis meets the assignment statement. In Comments indicate parts of the assignment that have not been fulfilled, completely or partially, or extensions of the thesis beyond the original assignment. If the assignment was not completely fulfilled, try to assess the importance, impact, and possibly also the reason of the insufficiencies. | |
| <i>Comments:</i> The app and its server side counterpart, as described above, was delivered, tested and approved by the customer. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i> |
| 3. Size of the main written part | 1 = meets the criteria, 2 = meets the criteria with minor objections, 3 = meets the criteria with major objections, 4 = does not meet the criteria |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> Compare the size of the written part with the expected size (without appendices), see the Dean's Directive No. 9/2011, Article 3. To evaluate the thesis it is also important that all parts of the written part are rich on information and necessary for a final thesis. The text should not contain unnecessary parts. | |
| <i>Comments:</i> When I received the first draft of the thesis report, I was positively surprised by the apparent quality of the work done. I especially hadn't been aware of the research done to consider alternative technologies. I had a thorough look at the thesis report, and found that it was well structured, well written and reasonably complete. Still, this first version required some corrections with respect to the English language, which I consider to be minor. Even though there were many such corrections, most of them had to do with the correct use of articles. In particular, I had very few remarks with respect to the structure and contents of the first draft of the thesis. I believe that the final version is well acceptable, not to say quite good. This appraisal extends to the app itself. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> |
| 4. Factual and logical level of the thesis | 95 (A) |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> Assess whether the thesis is correct as to the facts or if there are factual errors and inaccuracies. Evaluate further the logical structure of the thesis, links among the chapters, and the comprehensibility of the text for a reader. | |

Comments:

I commented on this already above.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

5. Formal level of the thesis

95 (A)

Criteria description:

Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspects, see Dean's Directive No. 9/2011, Article 3.

Comments:

Here too, I would like to refer to my comments above. I can add, though, that the setup of the thesis was entirely up to Vojtech, while in my experience not everyone (including academically trained people) is capable of doing so

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

6. Bibliography

85 (B)

Criteria description:

Evaluate the student's activity in acquisition and use of studying materials in his thesis. Characterize the choice of the sources. Discuss whether the student used all relevant sources, or whether he tried to solve problems that were already solved. Verify that all elements taken from other sources are properly differentiated from his own results and contributions. Comment if there was a possible violation of the citation ethics and if the bibliographical references are complete and in compliance with citation standards.

Comments:

Please regard my rating as provisional as I am not proficient in Czech, cannot read the Dean's Directives, and hence, do not know exactly what is meant here.

To my opinion, the thesis is well written and well structured. The English in the first draft was good, certainly good enough, but not perfect, especially with respect to the use of articles ("the", "a"). To my opinion, he could (and did) improve this. In addition, I made some remarks on his style, where he should to my opinion evade sentences with "I" by taking a more distant "scientific" position. "It was done ..." instead of "I did ...". Also, Vojtech seemed to presume that the reader had in debt knowledge of common design patterns. Irrespective of that, I advised him to include references with respect to such common design patterns, while using capitals when referring to any. For the final version, Vojtech added a couple of sentences that makes the text more accessible to readers not being software developers, which is appreciated.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

80 (B)

Criteria description:

Comment on the achieved level of major results of the thesis and indicate whether the main results of the thesis extend published state-of-the-art results and/or bring completely new findings. Assess the quality and functionality of hardware or software solutions. Alternatively, evaluate whether the software or source code that was not created by the student himself was used in accordance with the license terms and copyright. Comment on possible publication output or awards related to the thesis.

Comments:

Again, I don't feel comfortable in grading this. Vojtech operated quite independently, communicating when necessary and delivering as promised. I have very little information on the background material that he used, or resources he studied. Still, the book "Design Patterns" from Erich Gamma et al, seems an excellent resource. The given grade is based on my general impression about his work, where I presume that 80 is conservative (on the low -safe- side).

Evaluation criterion:

No evaluation scale.

8. Applicability of the results

Criteria description:

Indicate the potential of using the results of the thesis in practice.

Comments:

This thesis did not involve research, and hence was not aimed at new findings. Still, the work delivered a well designed and fully operational Android app, which was tested and approved by the customer. The app has already been successfully applied in one of the projects from the customer.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.

9. Activity and self-reliance of the student

9a:

- 1 = excellent activity,**
- 2 = very good activity,
- 3 = average activity,
- 4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,
- 5 = insufficient activity

9b:

- 1 = excellent self-reliance,**
- 2 = very good self-reliance,
- 3 = average self-reliance,
- 4 = weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance,
- 5 = insufficient self-reliance.

Criteria description:

Review student's activity while working on this final thesis, student's punctuality when meeting the deadlines and consulting continuously and also, student's preparedness for these consultations. Furthermore, review student's independency.

Comments:

This grade is based on two major observations. The first is that, after a kick-off period in The Netherlands, Vojtech worked pretty independently on the project. Whenever required, he communicated with me about certain issues or questions, often accompanied by a proposal. I don't recall examples of having to recall him on any aspect of his work. The second is that he planned his work well, which becomes clear from the fact that he always met deadlines (though usually soft deadlines) and delivered as promised. This not only holds for the final app, but also for intermediate steps, bug corrections and other team communications.

Evaluation criterion:

The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).

10. The overall evaluation

95 (A)

Criteria description:

Summarize the parts of the thesis that had major impact on your evaluation. The overall evaluation **does not** have to be the arithmetic mean or any other formula with the values from the previous evaluation criteria 1 to 9.

Comments:

Considering all of the above, it has been a congenial experience to work with Vojtech. He responds well to any remarks, either by successfully opposing them (which I like), or by meeting them with a solution (which I like too). Most design decisions have been taken by him, but he let them to me whenever the user experience or database design was involved. This included some lecturing about "the Android look and feel", which was important as the customer was not well acquainted with the Android platform.

Signature of the supervisor: