

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Thesis title: | Design of multistorey steel car park |
| Author's name: | Ramazan Koca |
| Type of thesis : | <input type="text"/> |
| Faculty/Institute: | <input type="text"/> |
| Department: | Department of steel and timber structures |
| Thesis reviewer: | Jiří Mareš |
| Reviewer's department: | Department of steel and timber structures |

II. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Assignment | <input type="text"/> |
| <i>How demanding was the assigned project?</i> | |
| Project of a typical multistorey car park with inclined ramps. | |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Fulfilment of assignment | <input type="text"/> |
| <i>How well does the thesis fulfil the assigned task? Have the primary goals been achieved? Which assigned tasks have been incompletely covered, and which parts of the thesis are overextended? Justify your answer.</i> | |
| Objectives of the thesis were met. Student proved his ability to use contemporary software including 3D modelling and orientation in analysis of steel framework. Student created 3D model in Scia software and main details in Tekla Structures. Drawings were produced in Autocad. Drawings could have been worked out more precisely but this was compensated in time invested in 3D modelling if details in Tekla Structures. | |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Activity and independence when creating final thesis | <input type="text"/> |
| <i>Assess whether the student had a positive approach, whether the time limits were met, whether the conception was regularly consulted and whether the student was well prepared for the consultations. Assess the student's ability to work independently.</i> | |
| Student consulted on regular basis although some drawings were left out for last couple of weeks. He is interested in modern tools and demonstrated this when transferred Eurocode procedures in to the code where he evaluated design of members. | |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Technical level | <input type="text"/> |
| <i>Is the thesis technically sound? How well did the student employ expertise in his/her field of study? Does the student explain clearly what he/she has done?</i> | |
| Student understands structural design. Some discrepancies may be found in detailed drawings that could have been done in better detail. | |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Formal level and language level, scope of thesis | <input type="text"/> |
| <i>Are formalisms and notations used properly? Is the thesis organized in a logical way? Is the thesis sufficiently extensive? Is the thesis well-presented? Is the language clear and understandable? Is the English satisfactory?</i> | |
| No major objections here. | |

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Selection of sources, citation correctness | <input type="text"/> |
| <i>Does the thesis make adequate reference to earlier work on the topic? Was the selection of sources adequate? Is the student's original work clearly distinguished from earlier work in the field? Do the bibliographic citations meet the standards?</i> | |

Please insert your comments here.

Additional commentary and evaluation (optional)

Comment on the overall quality of the thesis, its novelty and its impact on the field, its strengths and weaknesses, the utility of the solution that is presented, the theoretical/formal level, the student's skillfulness, etc.

III. OVERALL EVALUATION, QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENSE OF THE THESIS, SUGGESTED GRADE

Summarize your opinion on the thesis and explain your final grading.

The grade that I award for the thesis is

Date: **31-1-22**

Signature:

