

Rubric for the Thesis and Reading List Oral Defense¹

Providing brief comments will give additional feedback to the student as well as inform the post-defense deliberation among committee members.

A student who attains *honors* will typically receive a rating of at least *satisfactory* (4) on each of the dimensions below and on the rubrics connected with other facets of the thesis and defense. This is not an inviolable rule. The post-defense discussion should carefully consider the range and pattern of ratings, the rationale behind each committee member's ratings, and the relative importance of each dimension. Likewise, the ratings of a student who receives *highest honors* are almost always all *outstanding* (6).

THESIS

1. Presentation

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | Satisfactory | | Outstanding |
|---|---|----------|--------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction is interesting and engaging • Speech is clear and articulate • Presentation is well-organized and easy to follow • Media and format are appropriate for content • Presentation appropriately represents the thesis project | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

2. Discussion with Committee

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | Satisfactory | | Outstanding |
|--|---|----------|--------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions are answered well and with reference to thesis student's own work • Demonstrates knowledge of the subject • Comfortably engages committee • Demonstrates understanding of and facility with the content of the thesis • Demonstrates understanding of and facility with the disciplinary context and implications of the thesis • Findings central to the thesis are extended to questions external to the discipline | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

¹ Adapted, with permission, from the rubric of the Washington State University Honors College.

READING LIST

1. List and Annotations

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | Satisfactory | | Outstanding |
|---|---|----------|--------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Works demonstrate a breadth of interests and education as well as intellectual depth• Reading list primarily reflects undergraduate experience• Annotations provide insight into the works and the student• Annotations open doors for engaging conversation | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

2. Conversation with Committee

| Unacceptable | | Marginal | Satisfactory | | Outstanding |
|--|---|----------|--------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student recognizes connections among works• Student expands upon annotations in a thoughtful and meaningful way• Student is comfortable responding to questions from committee• Student is able to explore threads tangential to the works• Texts are clearly demonstrated to have played a significant role in the student's academic development | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |