

CHARLES UNIVERSITY – FACULTY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

REVIEW OF THE DIPLOMA THESIS BY SUPERVISOR

Author of the thesis

Bc. Monserrat Sanchez Martinez

Title of the thesis

Educational implications of the multi-age school in rural Mexico: the case of an elementary school

Author of the review

Doc. RNDr. PhDr. Hana Vonkova, Ph.D. et Ph.D.

	Evaluation criteria	Evaluation 1 – 10 points *)
1.	Formulation of objectives (objectives are clearly formulated and in compliance with the type and nature of the thesis)	9
2.	Means to achieve goals (methods are appropriate to goals and other parameters of the thesis).	8
3.	Writing process (process of writing of the thesis corresponds to chosen goals and methods, the text is clearly and logically structured).	7
4.	Fulfillment of objectives (objectives of the thesis are met to the reasonable extent and at a level that corresponds to the nature of the work).	8
5.	Knowledge of the author regarding discussed issues (the work reflects the knowledge of relevant sources and literature).	8
6.	Originality of writing (the thesis has elements that prove creative interest of the author and his/her independent thinking regarding the issue).	7
7.	Content (the choice of content elements of the thesis is relevant, their interrelations are expressed, context and content make a logical whole).	7
8.	Language quality (the level of orthographic and stylistic quality meets the requirements of the diploma thesis, used terminology is correct and unified).	7
9.	Work with information sources, compliance with formal rules (sources in reasonable quantities are appropriately selected and correctly cited and interpreted; the thesis is properly laid out and in compliance with relevant standards).	7
10.	Thesis contribution (outcomes of the thesis can find a specific meaningful application in theory or practice of the field).	9

*) 1 point expresses the lowest possible level of fulfillment of the relevant criteria, 10 points the highest possible level

Questions for the defence	<p>1) There is some important information in the thesis but it is not clear whether it is a statement of the author of the thesis or of somebody else. For example, on page 18, the author of the thesis claims that multi-age schools have classes only three to four days a week and that „the five hours established for the school day are not met and the schedules are quite irregular“. Could the author clarify this issue?</p> <p>2) How was the interview analysis done? Which coding was chosen?</p> <p>3) Are there implications of author’s results for Czech multi-age schools ?</p>
---------------------------	--

Comments	
	<p><i>The diploma thesis focuses on a very interesting topic of multi-age schools, it describes current practices at this type of schools in Mexico and also shows a case study of a specific school. It is an ethnographic research, the main data collection methods are observation and interviews; appendices consist, among others, of observation sheets and interview questions. However, it is not clear whether interviews transcript have been done and how it has been coded.</i></p> <p><i>Note that there are couple of language issues. For example, in the Czech version of the abstract, there are a few mistakes, Czech language correction was needed. The introduction looks like a list of several terms, their connection is not fully clear.</i></p>

Overall evaluation	<i>The thesis meets the requirements for diploma theses in the field.</i>
---------------------------	--

Date and signature of the author of the diploma thesis review:
September 1, 2022
Hana Voňková