



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Boris Pazdera
Supervisor: Ing. et Ing. Martin Švík Ph.D.
Thesis title: Offline call center analysis
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering

Date: 31. 5. 2019

<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 overall thesis has very well defined objective and is in line with the assignment. All objectives are formulated correctly and sufficiently fulfilled.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
2. Main written part	97 (A)
<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> I appreciate that Boris accepted challenge to write bachelor thesis in English. The FT is correct without factual errors and inaccuracies. The overall logical structure is good. The thematic flow between chapters is consistent. Even for the reader that is not expert in this particular area the text is comprehensible. I did not find any errors in the formal notations as student used university template. Regarding typography - the overall structure is very good. I have some complaints regarding beginning of chapters that there is no offset but it is not problem of student but defined template. Relevant sources are properly used, quoted and cited. I did not find any violation of citation ethics. I was looking in some terms and conditions of the software used - Cogniware Data Collector, Phonexia Voice to Text Translation Service as well as IBM OneWEX and all terms and conditions of license terms were used properly.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
3. Non-written part, attachments	95 (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> Non-written part. Student had to analyze market and prepare quite complex solution for call center analysis. He was able to work with different software portfolio - from Voice to Text transcription APIs to Data Collector to Enterprise Search technology where he had to develop some custom widgets in combination with standard ones. The overall example is functional. I was able to use it as MVP - Minimum viable product and demonstrate to couple of clients. The entire experiment was already couple of times reused.	
<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	100 (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 would like to thank a lot to Boris for his approach to prepare a solution that can be deployed in practice. It is Bachelor Thesis so not all Exceptions are properly handled but most of the solution and code was already reused for Proof Of Concept purposes and is being used as a starting point for production system. The area itself is already known but Boris was able to choose unique combinations of best of breed technologies on the market like Voice to Text Transcription service and Nature Language Processing solution (Enterprise search) and via third party components integrates them together. Boris demonstrated good architectural skills as well integration capabilities.

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 know Boris couple of years and from the first moment Boris is highly independent. He was often validating his findings and decisions he made. He was always working on time. And he was always very well prepared for consultations. He is highly independent creative person.

Evaluation criterion:

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

6. The overall evaluation

94 (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 Boris overachieved most of the criteria. His Bachelor Thesis can be used as well as good Master thesis. He analyzed a problem, designed and implemented a solution that works and is reusable. It has been already used to demonstrate to couple of clients with positive feedback. He demonstrated high autonomy of solving a problem as well as working with the literature and citation. There are very minor typos within bachelor thesis and in some pictures description was missing. But overall I am evaluating Boris Bachelor Thesis with the grade A

Signature of the supervisor: