

Name of the student:	Olha Rybak
Title of the thesis:	Transitional Justice During Ongoing Conflicts: the Case of Donbas in Ukraine
Reviewer:	Zdzisław Mach

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The fact that the research deals with the current processes, which are also of a very difficult political nature because of the ongoing war, makes the study much more difficult but also in a way more interesting. I believe that Olga deserves recognition for her decision to choose such a difficult topic and for her determination to bring it to a successful conclusion.

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

Olha demonstrated competence in theory and good knowledge of European policies, which is significant for a degree in European studies.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

The conclusions are relevant and persuasive. I think it is also worth mentioning that Olha was able to avoid the demonstration of excessive emotional and political involvement in the topic, which speaks well of her maturity as a researcher.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

No problems here

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

This is a very ambitious, original, and interesting thesis, which led to very valuable results. The subject is very well-justified for its academic as well as political and social relevance. The theoretical background and framework of the research are rich and appropriate, and the methodology is well-chosen and applied.

Grade (A-F):	A
Date:	Signature:
09.09.2023	Zdzisław Mach

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	Range	%	Mean	%	Range	%	Range	%
A (91-100)	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';

Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';

Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';

Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';

Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';

Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.