

Critical Thinking Assessment 2013-2104 AY

Critical Thinking – Working Definition:
“The ability to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and purposes of a text—created by you or someone else—according to accepted standards of reasoning and evidence.”

This Critical Thinking analytic rubric accounts for the following traits:

1. Purpose:

- Does the writer address the assignment’s objectives/parameters/goals?
- Does the writer recognize the significance or exigency of the problem/issue she is addressing?
- Does the writer develop an argument with a purpose that is made explicit to the reader?
- Is there an identifiable thesis that addresses a stated problem/issue?
- Does the writer unflinchingly address and meet the audience’s expectations?

2. Analysis of Problem/Issue:

- Are the writer’s claims, conclusions, and evidence related and synthesized into a cohesive whole?
- Did the writer select an appropriate method to investigate the problem/issue?
 - *Note: “Investigative Methods” take on distinctive forms in different disciplines (i.e. close reading, executive summaries, proposals, recommendations, reports, etc.)*

3. Credibility of Sources/Source Materials:

- Is the argument fully supported with relevant and credible evidence?
- Was the source material adequately evaluated within the essay?
- Did the writer place a reasonable degree of confidence in the source materials?
- Do the sources move the purpose and analysis forward?

4. Conclusions/Solutions:

- Are the ideas integrated into coherent and reasonable assertions and conclusions?
- Are appropriate, conclusive inferences drawn with regard to the stated problem/issue?
- Does the writer make his reasoning explicit?

5. Self-Assessment:

- Does the writer self-consciously and critically monitor and reflect on her choices as a writer? Her own reasoning?
- Does the writer move beyond summarizing her essay by explaining instead why he made particular rhetorical choices?
- Does the writer demonstrate an awareness of her creative process?

University Critical Thinking Rubric

<i>Trait:</i>	<i>Poor/No Attainment</i>	<i>Minimal Attainment</i>	<i>Average Attainment</i>	<i>Good Attainment</i>	<i>Superior Attainment</i>
<p>Purpose: Addresses the assignment. Clearly articulates a focus/thesis that addresses a problem or issue. Writes with an awareness of the audience's expectations.</p>	<p>Disregards assignment. No discernible focus/thesis. Unaware of audience's expectations.</p> <p>Score: 0</p>	<p>Seems aware of the assignment's objectives, but does not consistently meet them. Focus/thesis shifts frequently, making the purpose unclear. Audience awareness feels erratic.</p> <p>Score: 1</p>	<p>Effort to address assignment. Focus/thesis usually discernable, but occasionally strays off topic. Writes with an eye toward audience, but some inconsistencies prevail.</p> <p>Score: 2</p>	<p>While the assignment is addressed, some elements may not be fully developed. Focus/thesis is discernable. Demonstrates some awareness of the audience's expectations and attempts to cater the prose accordingly.</p> <p>Score: 3</p>	<p>Assignment's goals are shared by the writer, though the writer does not seem confined by them. Fully controls thesis throughout the essay and consistently meets, if not exceeds, the audience's expectations.</p> <p>Score: 4</p>
<p>Analysis of Problem: Claims, evidence, and conclusion are synthesized. Appropriate method was chosen for investigating/analyzing the problem/issue.</p>	<p>No attempt to synthesize essay's components; investigative approach seems unclear. Essay lacks cohesion.</p> <p>Score: 0</p>	<p>Preliminary attempts to synthesize components; yet, analysis feels sloppy at times. Investigative method occasionally made clear.</p> <p>Score: 1</p>	<p>Some attempts to synthesize components, but cannot sustain the effort. Discussion of investigative method is identifiable, but underdeveloped.</p> <p>Score: 2</p>	<p>Synthesizes components with some expertise and begins to formulate a cohesive look at the problem, but lacks some sophistication. Some lapses with investigative method.</p> <p>Score: 3</p>	<p>Synthesizes components with expertise and formulates a sophisticated, complex analysis of the problem. Investigative method feels deliberate, developed, and complements the analysis.</p> <p>Score: 4</p>
<p>Credibility of Sources: Assertions/conclusions are supported with credible and relevant source materials. Efficacy of sources is addressed within the argument.</p>	<p>Assertions/conclusions are difficult to locate and seem unsupported. No evaluation of source materials.</p> <p>Score: 0</p>	<p>Assertions /conclusions are identifiable, but are not supported by credible, relevant evidence. Sources seem under evaluated within argument.</p> <p>Score: 1</p>	<p>Assertions/conclusions are sporadically supported by credible evidence. Some evaluation of source materials, showing their relevancy.</p> <p>Score: 2</p>	<p>Assertions/conclusions are frequently supported with credible evidence, but some errors in logic are detectable. Development supported by more consistent evaluation of relevant source materials.</p> <p>Score: 3</p>	<p>Fully-developed assertions and logical conclusions are supported by credible evidence. Unfailingly includes evaluation of relevant sources that point to the complex nature of the argument.</p> <p>Score: 4</p>
<p>Conclusions: Conclusions/solutions are sound and coherent. Inferences seem appropriate. Reasoning is made explicit.</p>	<p>Unclear how conclusions are drawn. Argument feels illogical and/or incoherent. Reasoning is ambiguous.</p> <p>Score: 0</p>	<p>Attempts to show how conclusions are reached, but argument still lacks logical framework. Reasoning lacks coherency and refinement.</p> <p>Score: 1</p>	<p>Demonstrates general adeptness in showing how conclusions are drawn; logic is clearer. Reasoning is present, but lacks depth and complexity.</p> <p>Score: 2</p>	<p>Conclusions and inferences appear reasonable, yet would be stronger and more persuasive with greater complexity. Some attempts to make reasoning explicit.</p> <p>Score: 3</p>	<p>Conclusions are reasonable and supported with logical inferences; reasoning is clearly articulated. Conclusions highlight complexity/depth of problem.</p> <p>Score: 4</p>
<p>Self-Assessment: Self-consciously and critically reflects on choices made when constructing argument. Moves past summary.</p>	<p>Fails to critically reflect on own reasoning/choices. Relies primarily on summary.</p> <p>Score: 0</p>	<p>Fledgling attempts to reflect on choices, but lacks depth. Summary overshadows analysis.</p> <p>Score: 1</p>	<p>Some attempts to reflect critically, but cannot sustain the effort. Summary and analysis are more balanced.</p> <p>Score: 2</p>	<p>A strong attempt at critical reflection is made. Reflection shows some depth. Summary is present, but not overwhelmingly so.</p> <p>Score: 3</p>	<p>A fully, self-aware effort made to reflect critically. Choices and reasoning are self-consciously reflected upon. Summary is minimal.</p> <p>Score: 4</p>