

SUPERVISOR'S REVIEW OF FINAL THESIS

Academic year:

Title of the thesis:	
Author of the thesis:	
Study programme:	
Supervisor of the thesis:	
Workplace of the supervisor:	

Evaluation criteria		Maximum points (100)	Assigned points
Meeting the objectives and tasks set by the methodology, in creative work, inventiveness and skill in the design of thesis	8 – 10 points full fulfilment of objectives and excellent management of the tasks set by the methodology	10	
	4 – 7 points average achievement of objectives and satisfactory management of the tasks set by the methodology		
	0 – 3 points below-average achievement of objectives and below-average management of tasks defined by the methodology		
Literature processing, topicality and adequacy of literary sources: clarity and logical breakdown, relevance in relation to the topic and goal of the work, correctness and accuracy of citation and listing of bibliographic references according to the current standard (STN ISO 690), proportionality of the use of resources of domestic and foreign scientific literature, timeliness. High quality literary sources are considered to be scientific papers published most frequently in journals or works registered in WoS and Scopus databases	16 – 20 points at an excellent level – the condition for the above-mentioned number of points is that the author formally quoted in a correct, clear and precise manner all the used sources, out of which at least 30% represent relevant and high-quality domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 to 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)	20	
	11 – 15 points at a very good level – the condition for the above-mentioned number of points is that the author formally quoted in a correct, clear and precise manner all the used sources, out of which at least 30% represent adequate domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 or 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)		
	6 – 10 points at a good level – the author quoted used sources with minor formal errors, out of which less than 30% are of adequate domestic and foreign sources from the last 5 or 10 years (time definition depends on the topic of work)		
	0 – 5 points below-average level – author quoted insufficient number of literary sources and are of low-quality		
Methodology and material: ability to link methodology to set goals, skill in experimental and creative processes	8 – 10 points at an excellent level	10	
	4 – 7 points at an average level		
	0 – 3 points below-average level		

Evaluation criteria		Maximum points (100)	Assigned points
Results and conclusions: formulation, clarity, relevance in relation to objectives, benefits and usefulness for practice or further development of knowledge	14 – 20 points at an excellent level	20	
	7 – 13 points at an average level		
	0 – 6 points below-average level		
Formal processing of the final work: compliance with the structure of work, evaluation of the proportionality of individual parts of the work, precision of work processing, language and technical processing of the text, correctness of professional terminology, appropriateness of the processing of numerical results into tables and graphs, level of graphic processing, overall level of final work in formal terms	11 – 15 points at an excellent level	15	
	6 – 10 points at an average level		
	0 – 5 points below-average level		
Student's approach to solving the final thesis: student activity, cooperation with the thesis supervisor, ability to work independently, following the directions of the thesis supervisor	19 – 25 points at an excellent level	25	
	13 – 18 points at a very good level		
	7 – 12 points at a good level		
	0 – 6 points below-average level		
Total points (maximum number of points is 100)			
Classification			
The resulting classification: A(1) excellent (93 – 100 points), B (1,5) very well (86 – 92 points), C (2) good (79 – 85 points), D (2,5) satisfactorily (72 – 78 points), E (3) sufficiently (64 – 71 points), FX (4) inadequately (≤ 63 points)			
Recommendation of the final defence of the thesis in front of the National Final Exam Commission			
Protocol on the control of originality (percentage of the text having an overlap with the work index of the CRZP corpus)			
Originality of the final work*			

* – if you would like to comment your view on the originality of the work in more detail and this field does not provide enough space, continue on page 4



Substantive and formal comments on the work *

* – if you would like to comment your view on the work in more detail and this field does not provide enough space, continue on page 4



Additional substantive and formal comments on the work

.....
date

.....
signature