



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Bc. Šárka Weberová
Supervisor: RNDr. Ondřej Zýka
Thesis title: Nástroj pro správu číselníků pro datové sklady
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering

Date: 28. 5. 2020

<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> The FT fulfilled all theoretical and practical points of the assignment. I consider the chapter summarizing the position of Reference Data in the area of Data governance to be very interesting. The analysis of the structure and functions of some existing solutions is also detailed and accurate. I appreciate the work associated with the design of the data model and architecture of the target application. It supports the functions of defining new data sets, different approval processes and maintaining history without necessity to change the structure of the data model. Encapsulating all functionality at the database level allows you to test all functions in a uniform way and use them in different applications. Fully functional application was created that exceeds the scope of the functional prototype, as required in the assignment.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
2. Main written part	95 (A)
<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 work covers the following areas of software development: - Analysis of functional and non-functional requirements - Definition of Use cases that the system must allow - Design with detail description for important system components, including the process of their selection - Implementation where critical and non-standard parts of the solution are well documented - Testing - selection of test tool, test strategy and example of test scenario All citations are properly distinguished from the results achieved in the work. Software and other copyrighted works are used in accordance with their license terms.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
3. Non-written part, attachments	80 (B)
<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> The attachments contain code repository with database code and application code and also all tests. The code has a standard quality like similar projects.	

Evaluation criterion:

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

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

95 (A)

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:

The output of FT exceeds the scope of a functional prototype. The result will be integrated into the DATA_FRAME Application and further developed.

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:

The student worked independently. She has proven that she is able to plan her work well and deliver results on time and in the required quality.

Evaluation criterion:

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

6. The overall evaluation

95 (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:

I especially appreciate the following points

- Ability to get an overview of the domain
- Ability to independently manage the entire process of software development in high quality
- Design of the data model and architecture of the target application, which supports the necessary functions without having to change the structure of the data model.
- Solution of technical limitations of used technologies

Signature of the supervisor: