Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Marek Alexa
Supervisor: Ing. Vratislav Zima
Thesis title: Cestovní seznam pro Android
Branch of the study: Software Engineering

Date: 7. 6. 2018

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

Comments:
Student fulfilled assignment. There were no missing parts in the thesis and overall quality was very good. Student is aware that software product could be improved - this came as a result from user testing. Thesis is meeting necessary standards that are demanded from final thesis.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*85 (B)*

Criteria description:
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. 26/2017, 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.

Comments:
Overall written quality is very high. I have minor objections in Implementation part where there is description of Android activity lifecycle. I would place this section in state-of-the art or Analysis section. Quotes and citations were used correctly.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*95 (A)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
Student used state of the art technologies to create this program. Application is written well and is usable.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Evaluation of results, **publication outputs and awards**	*70 (C)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:

Google play market already contains similar solutions to what student made as a thesis. Student was able to determine what benefits his application brings in comparison with other projects. Deployment on the Google play market would require UI improvements - this cannot be part of the thesis from CTU student since that is very expensive process and you need graphic designer to do that.

Today's user is very demanding in quality of design of the app. That is why I don't see benefit in distributing the app to the store. Otherwise I believe that application can be used for the purpose that it was designed to.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.*
5. Activity and self-reliance of the student	*5a:* *1 = excellent activity,* *2 = very good activity,* ***3 = average activity,*** *4 = weaker, but still sufficient activity,* *5 = insufficient activity* *5b:* ***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:
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 (5a). Assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work (5b).

Comments:

Student was very working very well. All my demands for the work and the thesis were met. Sometimes student did not meet the deadline that we agreed on. In general I was satisfied with student's work approach.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
6. The overall evaluation	*85 (B)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:

General quality of work and outcome was very good. I had just few minor objections that were specified in sections above.

Written part of the thesis was very easily readable. I believe it can serve for other people as a guide how to create mobile applications of this type.

Analytical part when comparing with other application was very important. Even if student understand differences from the other apps of this type, I don't think that this should be uploaded to Google Play since there is no UI and marketing team behind the project.

Signature of the supervisor: