



Supervisor's statement of a final thesis

Supervisor: Ing. Jakub Žitný
Student: Thanh Hung Le
Thesis title: Exams management and UX in LearnShell
Branch / specialization: Web and Software Engineering, specialization Web Engineering
Created on: February 1, 2022

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

2. Main written part 75 /100 (C)

Not great, not terrible.

3. Non-written part, attachments 85 /100 (B)

Student did a lot of great maintenance work at the beginning, as described in Chapter 6, upgraded and used the right tools for implementing the new functionality. There are, however, small design and user experience issues before this is fully suitable for production usage. At the same time, the implemented solution is already an improvement compared to existing production functionality.

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

Functional requirements are fulfilled, but the quality lacks in a lot of places. Many UX and design issues are not improving the overall enjoyment of using LearnShell. But these can be thought of as being out of scope for an engineering work. There are other insufficiencies tough - unit tests are very brief, Cypress end-to-end tests are not stable, user-testing is not documented properly and overall documentation is very limited as well. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the implementation is a move to the right direction and already an improvement compared to existing solution.

5. Activity of the student

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

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

The overall evaluation

80 /100 (B)

Student was very active during his work and provided the LearnShell repository with a lot of important updates, technology choices and configurations that help with development and stability of the application. The functional requirements of the thesis have been met and although their ideal looks and certain development practices could be better, the final mixture of all the aspects leads me to grade this thesis with 80 points - B.

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.