



Department:	112 - Management
Author:	Jan Burian
Title:	Recommendations for the Future Development of Vinný sklípek - galerie, s.r.o.
Supervisor:	Ing. Sylvie Formánková, Ph.D.

Part I – Basic requirements for bachelor thesis

Instructions:

- The first part of the review concentrates on critical parts of bachelor thesis that are required to recommend the thesis to be defended. These aspects could be evaluated only by answers yes-no.
- If at least one aspect is evaluated in the negative way, the thesis may not be recommended for defense. The reasons for the negative decisions should be specified and the second part of the review does not have to be completed.

1. Does the thesis contain objective defined correctly and does the objective correspond to the common requirements for the bachelor thesis?	YES
2. Is the review of literature including the citations and references elaborated correctly from the methodological and formal point of view?	YES
3. Does the thesis include precise description of used methods and are these methods suitable for defined objective?	YES
4. Does the thesis covers the clear conclusions, reasoned recommendations, justified suggestions, etc. that bring new knowledge or information?	YES

Reasons for negative answers, specification of missing or unsatisfactory parts:

--

Part II – Quality of bachelor thesis

Instructions:

- The second part of the review regards with quality evaluation of selected aspect of the thesis. The thesis could obtain 0-60 points in total. Zero points correspond to thesis meeting only the minimal requirements, while thesis evaluated by 60 points is excellent and inventive in all evaluated aspects.
- The evaluation scale has five levels:
 - accomplished, at the level of minimum of requirements given in part I (0 points)
 - accomplished with significant but not critical imperfections (2 points)
 - accomplished, the imperfections do not influence the merit of the thesis and mainly the results (5 points)
 - accomplished fully without any reservations and in the exhausting way (8 points)
 - excellent, extraordinary, originative and completely correct accomplishment (10 points)

5. Contribution, originality, demandingness of the thesis	Points: 2
(frequency of the issue, non-existence of conventional solution, unavailability of solution for researched conditions, expected and real contribution of the thesis, extent of the specific knowledge needed to meet the objective, ...)	

6. Quality of the review of the literature	Points: 0
(extent of surveyed literature and its up-to-dateness and representativeness, use of foreign and cardinal sources, suitability of survey for own research,, discussion of alternative approaches, analysis of citations and references, synthesis of theoretical knowledge for own research,...)	

7. Methodology and its application	Points: 0
(discussion of suitability of chosen method, comparison of alternative attitudes, possibility to verify the results, correctness of application of methods, suitability of data samples used, preventing errors and shortages of applied methods, comparison of results, variations reasoning, ...)	
8. Own research	Points: 2
(depth and complexity of performed analysis, extent of use of knowledge from literature review, proving facts, suitability of samples and sources used, treatment of data errors, level of meeting the thesis objective, hypotheses answering, ...)	
9. Conclusions and recommendations	Points: 5
(correctness of conclusions, explicit formulations, adequacy of suggestions, generalizing conclusions, applicability of recommendations, ...)	
10. Logical framework, formal requirements	Points: 0
(correct structure, logical coherence of text, correctness of terminology, explicitness and clarity of graphics, accurateness of language, ...)	

Part III – Summary and final evaluation

Instructions:

1. After summarizing the points the reviewer marks with a cross the appropriate final evaluation according to corresponding interval of points.
2. The clear final decision has to be stated in the conclusion. The thesis can be recommended to be defended only in the case, when there is no negative evaluation in the part I of this review.
3. In the following part the reviewer has the opportunity to give his/her opinion to thesis as a whole and give further suggestions and comments.

Total points: 9 points

Final evaluation:

X	0–12 points	accomplished at the level of minimum of requirements given in part I
	13–24 points	accomplished with significant but not critical imperfections
	25–36 points	accomplished, the imperfections do not influence the merit of the thesis and mainly the results
	37–48 points	accomplished fully without any reservations and in the exhausting way
	49–60 points	excellent, extraordinary, originaive and completely correct accomplishment

Final decision: **I RECOMMEND** thesis to be defended.

Further comments and suggestions the author should discuss within the defense of the thesis:

Contribution, originality, demandingness of the thesis:

- The solution in the thesis is important mostly for the company presented. Nevertheless, due to the pure analysis and evaluation the contribution for the company and the society could be seen only in the suggested recommendations that aren't clearly justified in the thesis.

Quality of the review of the literature:

- The author works with literature sources that are not properly cited in the thesis. Complete links are missing in the List of literature (e.g. Korab); the author has one book in the list two times and so on.
- The author uses as a source www.wikipedia.org which is not a verified source.
- The literature review should discuss alternative approaches which is missing.
- The literature review is very chaotic with wrong titles of chapters, very hard for orientation as well as the whole thesis. He adds the internal environment of the company in the branch industry analysis which is wrong (a. external environment = macro environment and branch/industry environment x b. internal environment).
- Only a small part of the literature review was really used in the own research.

Methodology and its application:

- The methodology description is very pure. There is no explanation how the thesis was elaborated. Only two methods are mentioned.
- There is the Porter's value chain set in the thesis proposal - the auhtor doesn't include it in the analysis and there is no decription or methodology described how he got the entrance data for the strengths and

weaknesses identification.

Own research:

- There is a very pure analysis of the internal environment - if it is even possible to call it "analysis". The set method (Porter's value chain) wasn't used, the author describes only strengths and weaknesses. The part of external environment analysis is done on a basic level.

Conclusions and recommendations:

- This part is probably the most beneficial one. It is obvious it comes from the praxis of the author and not from the analyses done in the thesis. Here the practical impact could be seen and some suggestions can be even generalized for other companies from the wine industry.

Logical framework, formal requirements:

The thesis has a very chaotic structure with wrong titles of the chapters, very hard for orientation, no logical coherence. Some paragraphs miss the sources (e.g. p.20-21). Wrong citations, unnecessary space between paragraphs.

Question:

1. How did you get the information for the identification of the strengths and weaknesses? What are the parts of the company's value chain and how would you evaluate them (the level of achievement in the company)?

Date: 31.5.2017

Name and signature of the supervisor: Sylvie Formánková

Date: 31.5.2017

Name and signature of the head of the department: doc. Ing. Ida Rašovská, Ph.D.