



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Bc. Dmitry Vanyagin
Supervisor: doc. Ing. Štěpán Starosta, Ph.D.
Thesis title: Homework management system in Jupyter
Branch of the study: Software Engineering

Date: 8. 6. 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 assignment is fulfilled.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
2. Main written part	64 (D)
<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 main issue of the text is its brevity. The essentials are given and explained, but a lot of details are missing, or are badly connected with each other. I would appreciate much more details in Chapter 3 (for instance, some installation details are missing), and wish more space was given to testing and tuning the implementation. I also miss a better connection between the (software) requirements and their fulfillment. Some decisions that were taken miss their reason, for instance, in Section 2.6.3, the essential choice of nbgrader is not preceded by some survey of other possibilities. It is not crucial since, to my knowledge, these important choices are the best choices. The language level is satisfactory: there are mostly subject verb agreement problems, a few sentences are hard to follow. There are minor text writing issues: for instance some figures (2.6, 2.7) are not referenced in the text and there is sometimes a new page where it should not.	
<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 result of the implementation is a working applications that satisfies the given criteria. There are some missing details on installation, but they can be filled in with some effort, and the application can be tested. As it is a collection of more open-source solutions and their extensions, it lacks tuning based on user experience (mostly the UI could be improved).	
<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	80 (B)

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 goal of the application is clear (given by the assignments), and the main users are teachers and students. In order for the application to be used and deployed, few more steps would need to be taken. Although the text misses some information that would be helpful, the essentials are covered and it can server as a fine basis for a final deploy-able version.

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 has worked mostly on his own and was able to solve the given problem in a good way. I wish we could have worked more regularly with not so much time pressure in the end (that would also have allowed to spend more time on the testing and tuning).

Evaluation criterion:

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

6. The overall evaluation

72 (C)

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 text is missing some details and I find it too brief. The essentials are covered and well understandable. The result is a working application that is a good basis for a future final version. The requirements were fulfilled.

Signature of the supervisor: