

Undergraduate Thesis Assessment Rubric
Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of West Bohemia

Thesis Author: **Aneta Sedláčková**
 Title: *United States Presidential Election of 2016*
 Length: 43 pages
 Text Length: 36 pages

Assessment Criteria	Scale	Comments
1. Introduction is well written, brief, interesting, and compelling. It motivates the work and provides a clear statement of the examined issue. It presents and overview of the thesis.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Details of land area, population and military spending are completely irrelevant to the topic; the same could also be said of the list of presidential powers.
2. The thesis shows the author's appropriate knowledge of the subject matter through the background/review of literature. The author presents information from a variety of quality electronic and print sources. Sources are relevant, balanced and include critical readings relating to the thesis or problem. Primary sources are included (if appropriate).	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	There is too much extraneous material here (practically the whole of chapters two and three) which has little or no relevance to what purportedly was to be the main focus of the work.
3. The author carefully analyzed the information collected and drew appropriate and inventive conclusions supported by evidence. Ideas are richly supported with accurate details that develop the main point. The author's voice is evident.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	There is no proper analysis as such. The thesis is basically little more than a collection of quotations, most of which are incorrectly formatted.
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See previous comment above.
5. Conclusion effectively restates the argument. It summarizes the main findings and follows logically from the analysis presented.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The conclusion is the most interesting part of the work but, unfortunately, is scarcely justified by anything which precedes it.
6. The text is organized in a logical manner. It flows naturally and is easy to follow. Transitions, summaries and conclusions exist as appropriate. The author uses standard spelling, grammar, and punctuation.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Long quotations are cobbled together with no apparent logic. What little of the main text is actually the student's own work is far from error-free.
7. The language use is precise. The student makes proficient use of language in a way that is appropriate for the discipline and/or genre in which the student is writing.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	See previous note.
8. The thesis meets the general requirements (formatting, chapters, length, division into sections, etc.). References are cited properly within the text and a complete reference list is provided.	Outstanding Very good Acceptable Somewhat deficient Very deficient	The long quotations (which form the bulk of the work) are incorrectly formatted throughout. Just for good measure, the page numbers in the main text have been completely omitted.

Final Comments & Questions

Of all the bachelor final works the current reviewer has had to read in more than twenty years of experience, this is one of the worst. Detailed commentary is not facilitated by the author's omission of page numbers from her main text, though in general terms that is perhaps one of the lesser problems. Section 1.3 may serve to illustrate numerous shortcomings; the following selection is by no means complete but will suffice to make the point.

i) The paragraph on Environment and Science, with its use of the present tense, ignores historical perspective and, even long after the inauguration of Donald J. Trump, implies that the contest for both Republican and Democrat nominees for president is still ongoing.

ii) The paragraph on Gun Control is just one long quotation, not properly introduced and incorrectly formatted.

iii) Most seriously, the contents of the opening paragraph of this section have been lifted, without acknowledgment, from <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/year-ahead-project/>. Thus the author is clearly guilty of plagiarism and on these grounds alone her work should be considered unacceptable.

In conclusion, one can only hope this is a case of an unacceptable work being submitted, as it were, out of necessity in order to enable the student formally to remain within university guidelines and avoid any penalties associated with non-submission.

Otherwise, it must be said that the work in its current form is an insult to both supervisor and reviewer – and, indeed, anyone else who may be forced to read it.

Recommended grade: **fail (nevyhověla)**

Reviewer: Andrew Tollet

Date: 7th June 2017

Signature:

