

Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

Rating Criteria	Rating Scale					
	Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
Summarized problem, question, or issue	Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize accurately.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Considers context and assumptions	Approach to the issue is in egocentric and socio-centric terms. Does not relate to other contexts. Analysis is grounded in absolutes, with little acknowledgement of own biases. Does not recognize context and underlying ethical implications.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Communicates own perspective, hypothesis, or position.	Position is clearly adopted with little consideration. Addresses a single view of the argument, failing to clarify the position relative to one's own. Fails to justify own opinion or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Analyzes supporting data and evidence	No evidence of selection or source evaluation skills. Repeats information without question or dismisses evidence without justification. Does not distinguish between fact and opinion. Evidence is simplistic, inappropriate or not related to topic.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Uses other perspectives and positions	Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss others' perspective. Adopts a single idea with little question. Alternatives are not integrated. Ideas are obvious. Avoids discomforting ideas. Treats other positions superficially. No evidence of self-assessment.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences	Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary. Conclusions are absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Conclusions consider evidence of consequences extending beyond a single issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues. Presents conclusions as only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Begins to relate alternative views. Rough integration of multiple viewpoints. Ideas are investigated in a limited way. May overstate conflict or dismiss alternative views hastily. Analysis of other views mostly accurate. Some evidence of self-assessment.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Position demonstrates ownership. Appropriately identifies own position, drawing support from experience and information not from assigned sources. Justifies own view while integrating contrary interpretations. Hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated thought.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Evidence of source evaluation skills. Examines evidence and questions accuracy and relevance. Recognizes bias. Sequence of presentation reflects clear organization of ideas, subordinating for importance and impact.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Addresses diverse perspectives from a variety of sources to qualify analysis. Any analogies are used effectively. Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others. Analysis of other positions is accurate and respectful. Evidence of reflection and self-assessment.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are developed and consider ambiguities.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6

Communicates effectively	<p>In many places, language obscures meaning. Grammar, syntax, or other errors are distracting or repeated. Little evidence of proofreading. Style is inconsistent or inappropriate.</p> <p>Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent or distracting.</p> <p>Few sources are cited or used correctly.</p>		1	2	3	4	5	6
	<p>In general, language does not interfere with communication.</p> <p>Errors are not distracting or frequent, although there may be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice.</p> <p>Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Format is appropriate although at times inconsistent.</p> <p>Most sources are cited and used correctly.</p>							
<p>Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. May at times be nuanced and eloquent.</p> <p>Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience.</p> <p>Organization is clear; transitions between ideas enhance presentation. Consistent use of appropriate format. Few problems with other components of presentation.</p> <p>All sources are cited and used correctly, demonstrating understanding of economic, legal, and social issues involved with the use of the information.</p>								

©2006 – Center for Teaching, Learning, & Technology at Washington State University