Anotace předmětu typu projekt

Týká se přímo A4B33SVP, A4M33SVP, A3B33IND, A3M33IND, A6M33IP, A7B33PRO. Přepodkládám, že rady jednotlivých programů prodiskutují sjednocení na celém stud. programu.

Samostatná práce na problému-projektu pod vedením školitele. V rámci tohoto předmětu je možné (obvyklé) řešit dílčí problém bakalářské (diplomové) práce. Proto doporučujeme zvolit si téma bakalářské (diplomové) práce nejpozději počátkem 5. (3.) semestru a jeho včasný výběr nepodcenit. Téma práce musí souviset s hlavním oborem studia. Jste-li na pochybách, typicky tehdy, když zapisujete předmět na katedře, která není katedrou, kde budete obhajovat, kontaktujte garanta vašeho oboru. Absolovování předmětu musí mít jasně definovaný výstup, například technickou zprávu či programový produkt, který je ohodnocen klasifikovaným zápočtem. Důležité upozornění: - Standardně není možné absvolovat více než jeden předmět tohoto typu. Výjimku může udělit garant hlavního (major) oboru. Možný důvod pro udělení výjimky je, že práce-projekt má jiné téma a je vedena jiným vedoucím. Typickým příkladem může být práce na projektu v zahraničí. Kontaktní email v případě dalších dotazů: [TS: doporučuji, aby byl pro každý program jiný, OI má oi@fel.cvut.cz]

poznámky z jednání:
Externisté, mohou být i z katedry, která negarantuje program. Mimo pracovniky kateder, ktera se podili na programu - pro určitý program je potřeba sepsat.
Garant oboru podepise zadani pred tim, nez se dostane vedoucimu katedry na stul.
Včasné odevzdání explicitně zdůraznit v kritériích hodnocení.
Hodnocení “změkčit”.

Oponenti

Oponent je nezávislým odborníkem na problematiku práce. Oponent diplomové práce nemá být členem stejné katedry. Oponent bakalářské práce nemá být členem stejného oddělení katedry.

Pokud je, pak: 1) oponent nesmí být členem společného projektového týmu uvnitř katedry, 2) oponent nesmí být s vedoucím práce ve vztahu školitel-student nebo podobném.

Dodržení nezávislosti garantuje garant oboru a ved. katedry.

Guidelines concerning bachelor and master theses

Tomas Svoboda, 2012-09-27, (inspired by several sources, most notably perhaps by the Guideline of Helsinki University of Technology)

Provisions on the theses are laid down in http://www.fel.cvut.cz/rozvoj/smerniceBSZZ.html (bachelor) http://www.fel.cvut.cz/rozvoj/smerniceMSZZ.html (master).
This guideline is intended for students (thesis writers), supervisors, and the approving authorities at the Department of Cybernetics.
The extent of the bachelor thesis shall be 20 credits, equivalent to approximately 500-600 working hours. The extent of master thesis shall be 25 credits equivalent to approximately 625-750 working hours. If the student significantly exceeds the time agreed the grading may be affected.

Thesis Topic

The thesis topic must correspond to the major branch of the student. When negotiating the topic, the student is advised to contact the branch guarantor in case of doubts. The guarantor co-signs the final assignment with the head of the department.

Thesis Advisor

WHO CAN BE A THESIS ADVISOR? The advisor must hold a PhD and must be an employee of the University [jk]. Not necessarily. If the advisor is not a CTU employee, it should be an expert in the field and [rs] a liason for the advisor must be appointed [jm]

- IMHO, the PhD degree is too strict - 2 years (bachelor thesis) / 4 years (master thesis) research/engineering experience related to the topic should be enough [zk]

Rozdelit na bak a dip

Thesis Referee

- requirements are missing - should be derived from advisor requirements [zk]

Evaluation

An academic thesis must meet the following criteria to at least satisfactory level. The final grade depends on the extent the criteria have been met.

1. Definition of (research) scope and goals
2. Command of the topic
3. Methods, conclusions
4. Knowledge of the state of the art [rs]
5. Contribution to the knowledge
6. Thesis structure
7. Presentation and language

- One of the criteria for individual grades (see below) is how independently the student

worked on his thesis. That is why this criterion should be listed among those introduced above. Applicable to advisor's review, not applicable to referee's review [zk].

Excellent (A)

An exceptional thesis demonstrating very good ("very good" -> "excellent" [zk]) skills in creating technical or scientific knowledge.

1. Goals presented clearly. Scope defined in a way which indicates thorough understanding of the topic. Goals are met to the full extent.
2. Student uses appropriate and justified methods, reports research/development [zk] process and methods accurately and precisely and justifies the choices made.
3. Cited works selected not only appropriately but discussed [rs] critically. The critical discussion seems to me too ambitious [zk]
4. The (master) thesis brings at least a small contribution to the (engineering) field and [rs] meets criteria of an international conference publication even though it does not necessarily [rs] have sufficient scientific/engineering [zk] novelty.
5. Thesis structure follows the established standards of reporting/documenting technical or scientific work [rs]
6. Presentation clarity [rs] and language excellent.
7. Thesis submitted on time [zk].

Very good (B)

A meritorious thesis. The thesis is very [zk] well structured and it is independently written.

1. Goals and scope clearly defined.
2. Goals met [zk]
3. Appropriate state of the art.
4. The work clearly demonstrates good engineering skills [rs]
5. The results are of theoretical interest or have practical relevance.
6. The thesis is very [zk] well written. Typos exceptional, imprecise formulation seldom [zk].

Alternative for B: One or more of the "A" criteria were not met in full extent. [rs]

Good (C)

A well structured and independently written. The thesis has all necessary elements but no particular merits. Needs for improvements are clearly identifiable.

Satisfactory (D)

An acceptable thesis with significant shortcomings. If at least one of the conditions below is met, the thesis can not be classified better than D [zk].

1. References are few and poor. Source evaluation is lacking
2. Some methodology is present but methods are used inconsistently
3. The goals are generally not met. The own contribution is weak, most of the work is based

on references
4. The thesis text is not coherent and well-organized as a whole. It contains unexplained conclusions

Sufficient (E)

A poor thesis with significant shortcomings in meeting the basic requirements. Completing the thesis has required a great deal of supervisor support. The student has failed to correct the shortcomings. If at least one of the conditions below is met, the thesis can not be classified better than E [zk].

1. The choices of methodology and material and inappropriate or poor. The chosen methods have been applied erroneously.
2. The student does not demonstrate ability to conduct independent research or engineering work.
3. There are significant shortcomings in the text of the thesis.

Failed (F)

The thesis has many essential shortcomings and thus fails to meet the minimum requirements specified above.