**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student:	Bc. Alexander Bublik
Supervisor:	Ing. Filip Křikava, Ph.D.
Thesis title:	Grammatica - an app for practicing grammar
Branch of the study:	Web and Software Engineering

Date: 3. 6. 2019

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:
The application works and does what it should on a sample set of a prepared input. However, both the written and the implementation part has a lot to be desired for.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
2. Main written part	*60 (D)*

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:
The thesis is written in English and the author's level is quite good. Therefore it is a pity that it has been written at the very last moment and it feels that the aim was mainly to fulfil the page limit. As such the manuscript is filled with lot of unnecessary sentences, long code listing, enumerations and exceedingly large screenshots (many of which are not even referenced). It could have been half the size and one would learn the same. Another thing that contributes a lot of a very sloppy impression is the large number of formatting errors.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
3. Non-written part, attachments	*60 (D)*

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:
In its essence, this assignment is not hard. The potential difficulty is in the details of how to properly handle rendering of the different exercises that might vary in lengths and style, designing a flexible format for the exercises and handling errors. None of this was done. There is not much of error handling, the format is inflexible and there is no smart rendering. Overall, the implementation does the minimum for the very basics to work. Furthermore, the application is written in a way that will not make it easy for testing which might be a reason why there are no tests.

Evaluation criterion:	The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).
4. Evaluation of results, **publication outputs and awards**	*60 (D)*

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:

There is a lot of work remaining to make it a publishable application.

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:

I did try, but it was impossible to communicate with this student. He would disappear for a long periods of time (he has already missed the deadline last year) so any kind guidance was more less impossible. This was disappointing, because it seems that he could have done so much better.

Evaluation criterion:	*The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).*
6. The overall evaluation	*60 (D)*

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 application does the minimum of what the requirements. The student made me a demo of the client using a set hard-coded input. There are no tests no documentation. The written part is in English, but bloated with unnecessary text, code listing and figures with wrong formatting.

Signature of the supervisor: