

Assessment proposed by the supervisor:

**Excellent minus**

Assessment proposed by the reviewer:

**Excellent**

**Course of the defence:**

**Questions of the supervisor – Podaras**

What do we mean by the terms „Iterative“ and „Incremental“ approach? Is there any difference between these two terms?

**Answered**

**Questions of the external examiner**

The number of respondents was relatively small. What is the reliability of the conclusions drawn from them.

**Answered**

**Brabec**

How you estimated the financial impact of your solution proposed to the company?

**Answered partially**

**Vávrová**

What specific agile methodology would you recommend for Škoda Auto? Are you aware of the current methodology Škoda Auto uses in IT?

**Answered partially**

**Maršíková**

How did you select the respondents? Where did you get the model of Škoda Auto?

**Answered**

**Hovorková Valentová**

Did you carry out the pilot survey before sending the questionnaire to managers? Which way was the questionnaire sent to managers?

**Answered**

**Maršíková**

Significant shortages in the methodology (format of questionnaire, formulation of questions etc.), using old methods for solutions; no recommendations with the economic proposal; the format of thesis (one subchapter is just one figure without a text); no clear presentaion of the results

**Examination board members:**

doc. Ing. Kateřina Maršíková, Ph.D.

Ing. Zdeněk Brabec, Ph.D.

prof. Dr. Stefan Eckert

Ing. Vladimíra Hovorková Valentová, Ph.D.

Ing. Natalie Pelloneová, Ph.D.

Ing. Jitka Vávrová, Ph.D.

Mgr. Anastasiia Mazurchenko

Assessment: **Very Good minus**

Date of defence: **June 13, 2023**

doc. Ing. Kateřina Maršíková, Ph.D.

committee chairman

---