FACULTY OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CTU IN PRAGUE

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student:	Lea Petrášová
Supervisor:	Ing. Jan Černý
Thesis title:	Product Design of Data-driven Solution for Personalizing Static Content on Websites
Branch of the study:	Information Systems and Management

Date: 9. 6. 2018

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.
1. Fulfilment of the assignment	**_1 = assignment fulfilled,_** _2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections,_ _3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections,_ _4 = assignment not fulfilled_

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
All points in the assignment were fullfilled.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*95 (A)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
Structure of the thesis is well written, comprehensive and corresponds to whole product design process. There are no major factual errors or inaccuracies.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*100 (A)*

Criteria description:
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.

Comments:
Design and creation of product landing page to verify interest about new product among customers is very well thought out and expertly made. It explains the product in creative way and has nice design. This page has all production-ready qualities and thus was tested live on customers.
Prototype testing was well done to verify possible approaches, test their viability and to estimate production development costs.

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 thesis itself had such great quality it was evaluated on real customers in real business environment. We gathered real feedback and continuing product development with Lea. Only downside we didn't get enough feedback through product landing page in time for the thesis, but it was gathered at later time for internal business use anyway.

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:

Lea was prepared for all the meetings to minimize other peoples time required and was working independently on all parts of the thesis.

Lea was also coming up with creative good ideas, not relying on me to tell her what she should do.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
6. The overall evaluation	97 (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:

Overall Leas work is amazing and she managed to design product by herself including research, customer meetings, product design and development. This usually takes very experienced people with years of practise in all these fields.

Her work is so well made, that it could be used in a real business environment without any alteration or additional work.

Signature of the supervisor: