

## SUPERVISOR'S EVALUATION OF THE BACHELOR'S THESIS

**Student:** Eliza Nageb Toma Rassam

**Supervisor:** Assoc. Prof. Jiří Vojtěšek, Ph.D.

Study program: **Software Engineering**

Study course/Specialization: -

Academic year: **2022/2023**

Bachelor's Thesis topic: **Security of Wi-Fi Networks**

### Evaluation:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
Evaluation: A – Best; F - Unsatisfactory						
1. Fulfilment of all points of the assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Suitability of chosen resolution methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Division of work (chapters, subchapters, paragraphs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Working with literature and citations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Level of linguistic elaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Formal level of work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Theoretical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Practical part elaboration quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Achieved results of the work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Contribution of the thesis and its exploitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Cooperation of thesis author with the supervisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Result of the plagiarism test:

The work was assessed in terms of plagiarism with the result 2 % identity. Work is not plagiarism.

### Overall evaluation of the thesis:

The resulting mark is not the average of all of the abovementioned evaluations. The mark is awarded by the thesis supervisor according to their deliberations and the ECTS classification scale:

A – Excellent, B – Very good, C – Good, D – Satisfactory, E – Sufficient, F – Insufficient.  
Grade F also means “I do not recommend this thesis for defence.”

**I recommend this diploma thesis for its defence and suggest the following evaluation:**

**C - Good.**

**In the case of an “F – Insufficient” grade, provide comments and the shortages of the thesis and the reasons for this assessment.**

For the work with the student, I expected more collaboration with the supervisor. The student started working more intensively on the thesis in February. I did not see the final version of the thesis until just before submission, so I could not comment on some parts. On the other hand, the student worked very hard on the practical part in the end and all the points of the assignment were fulfilled.

Date: 1. 6. 2023

Assoc. Prof. Jiri Vojtesek m. p.