



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Jan Sliacký
Supervisor: Ing. Petr Máj
Thesis title: Implementation of lambda expressions evaluator
Branch of the study: Knowledge Engineering

Date: 31. 5. 2019

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i> |
| 1. Fulfilment of the assignment | <u>1 = assignment fulfilled,</u> 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> 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. | |
| <i>Comments:</i> Student implemented the lambda calculus evaluator with features requested. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> |
| 2. Main written part | 70 (C) |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> 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. | |
| <i>Comments:</i> The written part of the thesis certainly has room for improvement. Although some language errors are present throughout and sometimes the text is not easy to follow, none of these actually change the meaning, or substantially hinder the understanding of the presented material. That said, I commend the student for writing the thesis in English, since especially for a work of this scope, where international adoption is a real possibility, imperfect English is orders of magnitude better than perfect Czech. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> |
| 3. Non-written part, attachments | 100 (A) |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> 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. | |
| <i>Comments:</i> There is hardly anything to criticize in the actual work. The code is very polished, the overall design and API is well thought and the realization is excellent. The author certainly has experience with developing applications for the web and the technical means used are flawless. Furthermore the functionality of the application itself has been created with insight in the domain and fully utilize author's past experience with the course his thesis is supposed to help. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> |
| 4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards | 100 (A) |
| <i>Criteria description:</i> 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:

In this part, the work exceeds my expectations in almost every aspect. Throughout the development the student actively tested & implement new features which greatly enhance the usability of the evaluator. The results have already been integrated in the BIE-PPA course, greatly improving its online materials.

The work may seem to lack in UI design and experience where the current minimalism is extreme. However, the student has obtained a grant for developing the application after the thesis is defended and we have agreed that the hard, feature enabling work will be done for the thesis itself and the grant will be spent on the UX improvements.

Furthermore, the work was informally discussed with international lecturers of relevant courses and I believe the student has a fairly high chance of presenting his results on an international conference, an outstanding achievement for a bachelor.

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:

Although a lot of mentoring was done during the development of the thesis, this was inherently due to the nature of the task at hand where close cooperation with teachers was required. The student is keenly aware of his own abilities and was consistently setting realistic deadlines. When prioritizing the work he performed above and beyond the requirements often surprising me with extra features being developed on top of the set goals.

His motivation throughout the work was flawless as well.

Evaluation criterion:

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

6. The overall evaluation

100 (A)

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:

The only criticism I can come up with goes towards the written part, however, I'd like to reiterate the fact that the student was forced to work in a language that is not native to him on a document whose scope outmatched anything previously done. With that in mind my comments are merely meant as hints and advices for the future.

In all other aspects the work vastly exceeds the expectations set forth and I look forward to using it in Fall 2019 courses already. In light of this, any evaluation different than A feels unfair and I only wish the student similar success with his future endeavours.

Signature of the supervisor: