

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

