**FACULTY
OF INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
CTU IN PRAGUE**

Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor:	doc. Ing. Hana Kubátová, CSc.
Student:	Aykut Sahin
Thesis title:	Real-time scheduling algorithms applicable for embedded systems
Branch / specialization:	Web and Software Engineering
Created on:	30 July 2021

Evaluation criteria

1. Fulfillment of the assignment

▸ [1] **assignment fulfilled**
  [2] assignment fulfilled with minor objections
  [3] assignment fulfilled with major objections
  [4] assignment not fulfilled

The thesis assignement was fulfilled sufficiently.

2. Main written part   65 / 100 (D)

The text contains all necessary parts, some parts are minimalistic, sometimes there are not precise english sentences, and very simple examples were used. But for the future using in the mandatory subject BIE-SRC as the study material, it is adequate.

3. Non-written part, attachments   70 / 100 (C)

All designed and implemented software and user manual for performing examples are described both in the thesis and in attachement and according my instructions here: https://github.com/aykut4/real-time-scheduling-algorithms.
The main aim was not to write perfect programs for selected scheduling algorithms, but to apply them for embedded systems, typically limited as concern thier memory size, and finally to be applicable in the bachelor's subject.

4. Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards   70 / 100 (C)

This bachelor theses is not research type but it should be practical study material, based on simple examples.

5. Activity of the student

    [1] excellent activity
    [2] very good activity
    [3] average activity
▸ **[4] weaker, but still sufficient activity**
    [5] insufficient activity

The student's activity during the semester was essentially zero. I must state that I did not believe that the work would be completed according to the assignment. It is a pity that the student started working at the last minute, the result could have been much better.

6. Self-reliance of the student

    [1] excellent self-reliance
    [2] very good self-reliance
▸ **[3] average self-reliance**
    [4] weaker, but still sufficient self-reliance
    [5] insufficient self-reliance

Almost after the twelfth, the student nevertheless worked briefly but very actively.

The overall evaluation   70 /100 (C)

Although the student worked at the last minute, he fulfilled the assignment and created usable software. I must say that I was surprised by the speed and, in this respect, in essence with the quality of the result. In particular, I appreciate that the student successfully coped with the assignment intended for the subject, which was not part of his study plan (real-time systems).

Instructions

Fulfillment of the assignment

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.

Main written part

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. 52/2021, 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.

Non-written part, attachments

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.

Evaluation of results, publication outputs and awards

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.

Activity of the student

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.

Self-reliance of the student

From your experience with the course of the work on the thesis and its outcome, assess the student's ability to develop independent creative work.

The overall evaluation

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.