



CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3 2		Benchmark 1	0
Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.	Issue/problem is not evident.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. When appropriate, viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. When appropriate, viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. When appropriate, viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. When appropriate, viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.	Information from sources is not presented.
Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.	Lacks awareness of assumptions.

Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is comprehensive, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. When appropriate, others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. When appropriate, others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.	Specific position is not stated.
Conclusions	Conclusion is logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives, if appropriate for the assignment, discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of evidence and perspectives, including opposing viewpoints, if appropriate for the assignment.	Conclusion is logically tied to evidence and perspectives (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion).	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the evidence and perspectives discussed.	Conclusion is not present or lacks alignment.

Revised 10/27/21