Review report of a final thesis

Czech Technical University in Prague   **Faculty of Information Technology**

Student:	Jan Kodera
Reviewer:	Ing. Robert Latýn
Thesis title:	CMS for the CTU navigator
Branch of the study:	Information Systems and Management

Date: 30. 1. 2017

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.
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*

Criteria description:
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.)

Comments:
Author had to explore an internal structure of CMS MODx, which is compared to the user documentation at a very low level. He had also to analyze algorithms for map transformation and analyze a bunch of 3rd party tools.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
2. Fulfilment of the assignment	*1 = assignment fulfilled,* *2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,* ***3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,*** *4 = assignment not fulfilled*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
Student has created an API according to requirements. However, some support's integration processes hasn't been satisfactorily completed due to lack of time. In this case he would made a local copy of CMS for debug purposes. Fair usage of map editor is rather clumsy, but can be used with certain drawbacks.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
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*

Criteria description:
Evaluate the adequacy of the extent of the final thesis, considering its content and the size of the written part, i.e. that all parts of the thesis are rich on information and the text does not contain unnecessary parts.

Comments:
Thesis describes all issues defined in instructions, however an inplementation's problems should be cited according to finding e. g. developer's forums. Thesis is primarily aimed for practical part.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Factual and logical level of the thesis	87 (B)

Criteria description:
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:
The message of the thesis is straight and describes all major areas.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
5. Formal level of the thesis	70 (C)

Criteria description:
Assess the correctness of formalisms used in the thesis, the typographical and linguistic aspect s, see Dean's Directive No. 14/2015, Article 3.

Comments:
Thesis contains very short result and deserves to be more described.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
6. Bibliography	75 (C)

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:
Author describes a lot of problems that are not sufficiently cited. It's not clear if the problems are caused by author's inexperience or real lack of informational sources.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
7. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards	*60 (D)*

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:
Thesis is at a good theoretical level. Practical part, however it seems the student spent much time at, has quite user unfriendly interface.

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:
Map editor should be used with some limitations and needs lot of improvements.

Evaluation criterion:	*No evaluation scale.*
9. Questions for the defence	

Criteria description:
Formulate any question(s) that the student should answer to the committee during the defence (use a bullet list).

Questions:
- describe a process of extending modx interface (e. g. Map editor)

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
10. The overall evaluation	*68 (D)*

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:
The text is quite sufficient but the real usage is debatable and deserves more tests. Author recommend to use a different CMS, however there is not mentioned which one. That's also debatable because we could face a similar problems with alternative technology.

Signature of the reviewer: