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

Thesis Author: *Eva Mlejnská*

Title: Nature,   Assessing Readability of English Language Teaching Texts

Length: 68

Text Length: 46

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	Very well written but too brief. A project of this complexity deserves more context.
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	This is a high point of the thesis.
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	Again, very good, but I can't help but feel the thesis is overly technical. What is the argument of the thesis exactly? This is a report, but little recommendation as how to utilize its findings.
4. The thesis displays critical thinking and avoids simplistic description or summary of information.	Outstanding Very good **Acceptable** Somewhat deficient Very deficient	Again see comments above. I am afraid that the author does not " avoid simplistic description or summary of information" though it is not a simple project.
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	Again, like the introduction, a bit short. Report findings are very interesting, but the author doesn't guide the reader to a "conclusion".
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	

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	
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	Capitalization in the References page is not always consistent.

Final Comments & Questions

The author is to be congratulated on the hard-won knowledge that supports this research and the meticulous detail and painstaking effort that clearly went into the thesis composition. One can only guess the number of hours it took the author to compare and contrast *Text Inspector*, *Coh-Metrix 3.0*, *Readable*, and *Vocab Kitchen* etc. and to quantify the data in the text's numerous graphs and charts which make a handy tool for teachers interested in incorporating digitals services into their lessons. In addition to this, the author must also be complimented on her writing ability which is clearly on a high professional level. Rarely one might point to some inversion of syntax or passive construction that strikes an odd note, but for the most part this was a result of the technical, almost clinical, diction the author brought to the project. The student deserves the highest praise for her efforts in the presentation of her findings.

However, there is a lack of argumentation in the report. Aside for a preference for "pre-reading" exercise and "authentic materials" it was hard to get a sense of what kind of teaching the author advocates and in what ways these digitals tools could promote the author's preferred methodology. As to how these tools should be used most efficiently or even ethically the author seems to remains agnostic. The author makes a nod to correcting the problem in section **V. Implications** where we learn "When it comes to intensive reading . . . one where more focus is given to grammar and lexis that appears in the text, the software tools could be useful as well" (42). It was precisely at this point I hoped the author would start making recommendations. When the author points out, "It was already established that a lack of vocabulary is often very limiting for readers of low proficiency, which means that the identification of potentially problematic lexical items before the lesson increases the chances of success for the students" one expects some sense of preference (42). It seems that at this point the author should have been making distinctions about which service would be best to identify problematic lexical items and exactly how the best service or services could increase the chances of student success. Clearly the data shows that *Text Inspector* and *Coh-Metrix 3.0* are the most functional of the four services evaluated, but it has been a long held value of this department that argumentative writing is the hallmark of excellence. Ideally argumentation would begin in the introduction with a thesis sentence which is why context is also very important in the initial few pages. I could imagine a thesis in which all of this testing and research could have been conducted with various classroom scenarios informed by the author's pedagogical values. Then she would not have merely reported her raw quantitative data points, but made qualitative evaluations as well. Until the defense I must reluctantly recommend at grade of 2: *velmi dobře,* but am open to grading upwards depending on the student performance and the assessment of the director. For the defense the student should create two or three desirable classroom scenarios and explain which digital service would best aid teachers with a particular lesson, set of lessons, methodology, or pedagogical philosophy.

Supervisor/Reviewer: Brad Vice

Date: 21.8.2019

Signature: