



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Student: Bc. Petr Bárta
Supervisor: doc. Dr. André Sopczak
Thesis title: Web Application for Discoveries with the ATLAS Forward Proton Detector at CERN
Branch of the study: Web and Software Engineering

Date: 3. 3. 2020

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 1 to 4.</i> |
| 1. Fulfilment of the assignment | 1 = assignment fulfilled, 2 = assignment fulfilled with minor objections, 3 = assignment fulfilled with major objections, 4 = <u>assignment not fulfilled</u> |
| <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 work is incomplete. The student realized only shortly before the submission deadline that he had to submit earlier than expected. Currently, he is making good progress in his thesis work towards a new future submission date for his second attempt. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> |
| 2. Main written part | 10 (F) |
| <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 text is incomplete in large parts. The student knows about this and is working to fulfill all aspect of the assignment and to complete the main part of the thesis. | |
| <i>Evaluation criterion:</i> | <i>The evaluation scale: 0 to 100 points (grade A to F).</i> |
| 3. Non-written part, attachments | 10 (F) |
| <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 content is incomplete, the work is clearly in progress. The thesis requires more sections and chapters. The English is adequate, but needs further attention by the student. | |
| <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 | 10 (F) |
| <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 results and output of the thesis are outlined, but not yet developed. The student is making good progress and needs more time for scientific results. | |
| <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:

The student is very reliable, attending in-person meetings once or twice a week. He is very responsive on suggestions, making own suggestions and initiatives for the development of the project.

Evaluation criterion:

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

6. The overall evaluation

10 (F)

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:

Owing to the submission deadline, which was unexpected soon for the student, his work is currently incomplete, and this is reflected in his thesis submission. It is rather a description of the outline than the final thesis. The student is well engaged in his project and making good progress towards a new later submission deadline for his second attempt.

Signature of the supervisor: