



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Bc. Marek Foltýn
Supervisor: Ing. Filip Křikava, Ph.D.
Thesis title: Shere - notes and document management application
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering

Date: 4. 6. 2018

<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 student developed an OSX application for note taking and management fulfilling all the requirements from the assignment.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
2. Main written part	80 (B)
<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 thesis is adequate in size and covers the main points of the thesis. The student managed to present a synthesis of work - describing what the problems are, what are the possible solutions and how were they implemented. The Section 3 which spans over most of the thesis should be split into smaller sections and some of the subsection shall be rearranged to better follow the structure of the actual work. Overall the written part does a good job to present the resulting application. Student has chosen to write the thesis in English which is very good. On the other hand writing in non-native language, especially if it is done for the first time, require more time and it feels that not sufficient amount has been reserved. I'm sure that with a bit of an editorial work the thesis would read much better.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
3. Non-written part, attachments	90 (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> In order to have a full flexibility in interacting with markdown, the student had to create his own markdown parser and rendering engine. He well studied the existing approaches and presented different implementation strategies and their trade-offs, both at our meetings and in the text. The resulting markdown editor is of a high quality. While it does not support all markdown features, the chosen architecture makes it fairly easy to add them in future.	
<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	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:

I believe that there is some work to polish the prototype so it can be used easily by others, but the application is already very functional. In the last couple meetings, the students had been already using Share for note taking. This was rather an engineering project, but the approach to the markdown editing is definitely interesting and shall be made available in a blog post. The application itself is open sourced on Github.

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:

Working with Marek is a real pleasure. He is very pro-active and for all the interaction we had he was always well prepared. He is not afraid of complex engineering work.

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:

In this thesis Marek has demonstrated both his technical and analytical skills. The resulting application works and can be further extended to other additional use cases from the note-taking business.

What I appreciated a lot was his ability to think about the different problems faced during the design and development, researching possible solutions and understanding their trades-offs. He has been deeply interested in the subject and cares about the quality of the solution. This resulted in an application that presents a fairly unique set of features.

It was great that he has decided to challenge himself to write the thesis in English.

Signature of the supervisor: