

CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC 2008-2009 (simplified from elaborated Washington State Univ. rubric)

CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC 2008-2009 (simplified from elaborated Washington State Univ. rubric)			
(1) - Identifies and summarizes the problem/question at issue			
<i>scant, 1 point</i>	<i>minimally developed, 2 points</i>	<i>moderately developed, 3 points</i>	<i>substantially developed, 4 points</i>
Missing, confusing, inaccurate, or inappropriate.	Shows basic understanding but does not recognize subsidiary or implied aspects of the problem.	Shows good understanding of the assignment and related course material, but not the complexities or nuances of the problem.	Identifies clearly the main, subsidiary, and implied aspects of the problem; recognizes nuances.
(2) - Identifies and presents perspectives and positions that are important to the analysis of the issue			
<i>scant, 1 point</i>	<i>minimally developed, 2 points</i>	<i>moderately developed, 3 points</i>	<i>substantially developed, 4 points</i>
Addresses a single source or view of the argument; fails to consider valid counter arguments or establish other critical distinctions.	Identifies own position on the issue, but fails to provide supporting evidence or fails to present the case for other perspectives.	Identifies own position, drawing support from experience and information from course materials. Appropriately addresses multiple perspectives but omits at least one important perspective.	Identifies own position, drawing support from experience and information beyond assigned sources. Recognizes and responds to counter arguments. Addresses additional perspectives drawn from outside information.
(3) - Identifies and assesses key assumptions and the influence of context on the issue.			
<i>scant, 1 point</i>	<i>minimally developed, 2 points</i>	<i>moderately developed, 3 points</i>	<i>substantially developed, 4 points</i>
Does not surface assumptions or ethical issues that underlie the issue or does so superficially. Does not present any connection to other contexts (cultural, political, economic, etc.).	Identifies some but not all assumptions made. Considers validity of assumptions superficially. Recognizes the importance of context, but does not discuss impact.	Identifies assumptions made and considers their validity, yet fails to surface important ethical issues. Analyzes the issue considering relevant contexts, but fails to consider one important context.	Identifies and questions validity of assumptions, addresses underlying ethical dimensions. Analysis is clear in scope and context and pertinent to the audience. Fully considers appropriate contexts, such as social, political, economic.

(4) - Identifies and assesses the quality of supporting data/evidence and provides additional data/evidence related to the issue.			
<i>scant, 1 point</i>	<i>minimally developed, 2 points</i>	<i>moderately developed, 3 points</i>	<i>substantially developed, 4 points</i>
Merely repeats information provided, taking it as truth, or denies evidence without adequate justification. Does not distinguish between fact, opinion, and value judgments. Does not identify sources or uses inappropriate sources.	Provides significant supporting evidence for only one perspective. Does not examine evidence for bias or incompleteness. Does not recognize value judgments. Identifies sources but has some questionable sources.	Provides significant evidence for multiple perspectives. May have some problems with cause and effect. May fail to identify properly some opinions and value judgments. Uses and cites appropriate sources.	Provides significant evidence for multiple perspectives. Examines the evidence and its sources; questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, and completeness. Correctly identifies cause and effect. Clearly distinguishes between fact and opinion, and acknowledges value judgments. Uses and cites appropriate sources.
(5) - Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences.			
<i>scant, 1 point</i>	<i>minimally developed, 2 points</i>	<i>moderately developed, 3 points</i>	<i>substantially developed, 4 points</i>
Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships among other elements of the problem, such as context, implications, assumptions, or data, and evidence. Fails to reflect upon own work.	Draws incomplete conclusions or considers only some of the consequences of the conclusions. Fails to reconsider assumptions identified earlier. Fails to reflect upon own work.	Draws appropriate conclusions from evidence/data. Identifies and discusses some, but not all, consequences of these conclusions. Fails to consider the limitations of own work. Identifies some directions for future inquiry.	Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences considering context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Objectively reflects upon own assertions. Acknowledges the value judgments on which own position is based. Identifies appropriate directions for further inquiry.