

## CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

	4-EXEMPLARY	3-PROFICIENT	2-EMERGING	1-NOVICE
<b>Understands Problem</b>	<p><b>Clearly defines</b> the issue or problem</p> <p><b>Accurately identifies</b> the core issues/key concepts</p> <p><b>Appreciates</b> depth and breadth of problem</p> <p><b>Identifies</b> relevant, significant points of view</p> <p><b>Demonstrates</b> fair-mindedness toward the problem and all relevant points of view</p>	<p><b>Defines</b> the issue</p> <p><b>Identifies</b> the core issues/key concepts, but may not fully explore the depth and breadth</p> <p><b>Identifies</b> relevant points of view</p> <p>Demonstrates fair-mindedness</p>	<p><b>Defines</b> the issue, but superficially or narrowly</p> <p><b>May overlook</b> some core issues/key concepts</p> <p><b>May focus</b> on irrelevant or insignificant points of view</p> <p><b>May identify</b> other points of view but <b>struggles</b> with maintaining fair-mindedness</p>	<p><b>Fails</b> to clearly define the issue or problem</p> <p><b>Does not recognize</b> the core issues/key concepts</p> <p><b>Ignores</b> alternate points of view</p> <p><b>Fails to maintain</b> a fair-minded approach toward the issue or problem or other points of view</p>
<b>Acquires Information</b>	<p><b>Identifies</b> sufficient, credible, relevant information</p> <p><b>Considers</b> information that opposes as well as supports the argued position</p> <p><b>Distinguishes</b> between information and inferences drawn from it</p>	<p><b>Identifies</b> sufficient, credible, relevant information</p> <p><b>Considers</b> some information from opposing points of view</p> <p><b>Distinguishes</b> between information and inferences drawn from it</p>	<p><b>Identifies</b> some credible information, but not enough; some information may be irrelevant</p> <p><b>Ignores</b> strong counter-arguments</p> <p>Sometimes <b>confuses</b> information and the inferences drawn from it</p>	<p><b>Relies</b> on insufficient, irrelevant, or unreliable information</p> <p><b>Fails to identify</b> or dismisses relevant counter-arguments</p> <p>Confuses information and the inferences drawn from it</p>
<b>Utilizes Information</b>	<p><b>Accurately explains/uses</b> the relevant key concepts</p> <p><b>Accurately identifies</b> assumptions</p> <p><b>Makes assumptions</b> that are consistent, reasonable, and valid</p>	<p><b>Explains</b> and <b>uses</b> the key concepts, but may lack depth and precision</p> <p><b>Identifies</b> assumptions</p> <p><b>Makes</b> valid assumptions</p>	<p><b>Identifies</b> some key concepts, but use of concepts is superficial and inaccurate at times</p> <p><b>Fails</b> to identify or explain assumptions, or the assumptions are irrelevant, unclear, and/or invalid</p>	<p><b>Misunderstands</b> key concepts</p> <p><b>Fails to identify</b> assumptions</p> <p><b>Makes</b> invalid assumptions</p>
<b>Makes Valid Conclusions</b>	<p><b>Follows</b> where evidence and reasoning lead to obtain defensible, thoughtful, logical conclusions or solutions</p> <p><b>Makes</b> deep rather than superficial inferences</p> <p><b>Makes</b> inferences that are consistent with one another</p> <p><b>Identifies</b> the most significant implications and consequences of the reasoning (positive or negative)</p> <p><b>Distinguishes</b> probable from improbable implications/solutions</p>	<p><b>Follows</b> where evidence and reasoning lead to obtain justifiable, logical conclusions or solutions</p> <p><b>Makes</b> valid inferences, but may lack depth</p> <p><b>Identifies</b> significant implications and consequences, but may lack insight and precision</p> <p><b>Distinguishes</b> probable from improbable implications/solutions, but may lack insight and precision</p>	<p><b>Follows</b> some evidence to conclusions or solutions</p> <p><b>Makes</b> inferences that are often unclear, illogical, inconsistent, and/or superficial</p> <p><b>Has trouble</b> identifying significant implications and consequences</p> <p><b>Identifies</b> improbable implications</p>	<p><b>Uses</b> superficial, simplistic, or irrelevant reasoning and unjustifiable claims</p> <p><b>Makes</b> illogical, inconsistent inferences</p> <p><b>Maintains or defends</b> views based on self-interest, regardless of the evidence</p> <p><b>Ignores</b> significant implications, consequences, or solutions</p>
<b>Supporting Materials/ Information Literacy (if applicable)</b>	<p><b>Selects</b> authoritative, accurate, reliable, and timely scholarly and/or trade sources that are relevant to the topic; adjusts topic accordingly</p> <p><b>Integrates</b> and <b>balances</b> paraphrasing, summarization, and quotation to support thesis and points, while respecting source material's original context</p> <p><b>Uses</b> proper references &amp; citations for all sources</p>	<p><b>Selects</b> authoritative, accurate, reliable, and timely scholarly and/or trade sources that are relevant to the topic</p> <p><b>Integrates</b> paraphrasing, summarization, and quotation to support thesis and points</p> <p><b>Uses</b> proper references &amp; citations for all sources</p>	<p><b>Selects</b> sources that are relevant to the topic, but some may lack authority, accuracy, reliability, or timeliness</p> <p><b>Relies</b> too heavily on paraphrasing or summarization or quotation of information supporting thesis and points</p> <p><b>Uses</b> references &amp; citations for sources with a minimum of errors or problems</p> <p><b>May plagiarize</b> incrementally</p>	<p><b>Selects</b> sources that are irrelevant or only marginally relevant to the topic and lack authority, accuracy, reliability, and timeliness</p> <p><b>Omits</b> information supporting thesis and points, or sources were quoted only, or sources were improperly quoted</p> <p><b>Neglects</b> references or citations, or references or citations have significant errors</p> <p><b>May plagiarize</b> egregiously, whether deliberate or not</p>

Adapted from Foundation for Critical Thinking. (n.d.) Critical Thinking Grid. Retrieved from <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/critical-thinking-testing-and-assessment/594>. Used by permission.

March 2013