Rubric for the Thesis and Reading List Oral Defense

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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:

*Adapted, with permission, from the rubric of the Washington State University Honors College.*
### READING LIST

1. List and Annotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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: