

CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

DEFINITION

Critical thinking is the ability to use information, ideas and arguments from relevant perspectives to make sense of complex issues and solve problems. Degree

graduates will create, evaluate, interpret, and combine information to reach well-reasoned conclusions or solutions.

FRAMING LANGUAGE

This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Critical

thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life.

GLOSSARY

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Context:** Conditions in which something exists or occurs (Merriam-Webster); the circumstances that form the setting for an event, statement, idea and in terms of which it can be fully understood and assessed (Dictionary.com).
- **Degree of Credibility:** Acknowledgement that some sources are more accurate than others. Endure scrutiny through authority in the field (TCC Faculty).
- **Probative Value:** Sufficient and relative facts or data to prove/support the issue, establish the existence of other

facts, and weighed against alternative points of view. Evaluates the strengths and relevance of arguments on a particular question or issue within a given context (adapted from the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy).

- **Rationale:** An explanation of controlling principles, opinion, belief, practice or phenomena; an underlying reason (Merriam-Webster).
- **Reasoning:** The process of thinking about something in a logical way to form a conclusion or judgement (Merriam-Webster).

*Note to assessor: Source(s) are determined by the assignment. Student may not be required to do research. Not all sources may be academic and/or popular sources may be appropriate. See assignment instructions.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information contact value@aacu.org

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

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Topic/issue identification	Topic/issue to be considered is clearly stated and the relevance of context is acknowledged and comprehensively explained. The descriptions are extensive, delivering all relevant information for full understanding.	Topic/issue to be considered is stated and the relevance of context is acknowledged and explained. The descriptions are clear, unambiguous and/or well defined terms, minor omissions.	Topic/issue to be considered is stated and the relevance of context is acknowledged. The descriptions are unclear, ambiguous and/or undefined terms, serious omissions.	Topic/issue to be considered is stated without any clarification, relevance of context, or descriptions.
Information use	Information is derived from source(s) to support the topic/issue completely, is accurately quoted and/or correctly paraphrased and conveys intended meaning.	Sufficient information is derived from source(s) to support the topic/issue, is accurately quoted and/or correctly paraphrased and conveys intended meaning.	Some information is derived from source(s) to support the topic/issue, is accurately quoted and/or correctly paraphrased and mostly conveys intended meaning.	Little to no information is derived from source(s) to support the topic/issue, is not accurately quoted and/or correctly paraphrased and/or does not convey intended meaning
Conclusion(s)	Conclusion(s) is well developed, strongly supported, based upon the probative value of evidence/information, and reflects student's informed evaluation.	Conclusion(s) is well developed and supported, but value of evidence is not weighed to differentiate degrees of credibility when informing student's evaluation.	Conclusion(s) is based upon partial support or with weak evidence, data may be incorrectly interpreted, or does not support all claims, data reflects some informed evaluation but mostly superficial.	Conclusion(s) is based upon little to no support, evidence/information seems unconnected, and reflects little to no informed evaluation beyond restating topic/issue.
Rationale	Rationale demonstrates a well-reasoned justification for the conclusion(s), connecting it to the topic/issue being considered. The reasoning is coherent, comprehensively explained and consistent.	Rationale demonstrates a reasoned justification for the conclusion(s). The reasoning is coherent, explained clearly, and consistent.	Rationale demonstrates some coherency and consistency to justify the conclusion(s) but is not explained clearly or is disconnected from identified topic/issue being considered.	Rationale is incoherent and inconsistent. Conclusion(s) are not justified.