



# Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

**Student:** Sanan Pashayev  
**Supervisor:** Ing. Tomáš Hradský  
**Thesis title:** Synchronized database storage  
**Branch of the study:** Software Engineering

**Date:** 28. 8. 2019

<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i>
<b>1. Fulfilment of the assignment</b>	<b><u>1 = assignment fulfilled,</u> 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = assignment not fulfilled</b>
<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> Theoretical part finished without objections – actually contains more information than expected. Practical part is missing a server side part of software but that is not an issue from my point of view as only a prototype was requested anyway.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>2. Main written part</b>	<b>80 (B)</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 theoretical part contains a lot of information but it uses some terms which are not defined previously so it feels confusing sometimes. Some citations are done correctly but others in a non-standard way.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>3. Non-written part, attachments</b>	<b>82 (B)</b>
<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> The practical part is quite large, but most of it is manipulation with SQLite database and the actual synchronization part is just a small portion and it feels unfinished.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i>
<b>4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards</b>	<b>81 (B)</b>
<i>Criteria description:</i> 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.	
<i>Comments:</i> The whole title was assigned to the student with the idea that it'll be merged to a real-world production software. There's still some work that needs to be done but I believe the student is capable in finishing the task properly.	
<i>Evaluation criterion:</i>	<i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 5.</i>

**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:*

5a – The student himself suggested that I set deadlines for partial tasks and was consistent in hitting those deadlines  
5b – At times it felt like the the student is asking unnecessary questions which he could have answered himself. I believe this has a connection with his work position (junior software engineer) and his effort to do everything the right way.

*Evaluation criterion:*

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

**6. The overall evaluation**

82 (B)

*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 ideas presented in practical part are worthy for a bachelor thesis. Although I think they could have been presented a clearer way.

Signature of the supervisor: