

## University of Houston Critical Thinking Rubric 2009

<b>Identifies problem, question, or issue</b> (raises questions, formulated clearly and precisely)		
<p><b>Unacceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize accurately.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Summarizes issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exemplary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the issue.</li> </ul>
<b>Presents, interprets, and analyzes relevant information, data, or evidence</b> (gathers relevant information, using disciplinary concepts to interpret it effectively)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Little or no evidence of search, selection or source evaluation skills.</li> <li>- Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification.</li> <li>- Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.</li> <li>- Use of evidence is qualified and selective.</li> <li>- Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize bias in evidence, although attribution is inappropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence of proficient and effective search, selection, and source evaluation skills.</li> <li>- Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.</li> </ul>
<b>Considers context, assumptions, and other perspectives</b> (thinks open-mindedly, considering multiple sources and options, assessing the credibility and authority of sources)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach to the issue is in egocentric or socio-centric terms.</li> <li>- Analysis is grounded in absolutes, with little acknowledgment of own biases.</li> <li>- Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides some recognition of context and consideration of assumptions and their implications.</li> <li>- Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that overstate the conflict.</li> <li>- May dismiss alternative views hastily.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analysis acknowledges complexity and bias of vantage and values, although may elect to hold to bias in context.</li> <li>- Identifies influence of context and questions assumptions, addressing ethical dimensions underlying the issue.</li> <li>- Integrates own and others' ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification.</li> <li>- Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others.</li> </ul>

<b>Develops and presents argument, position or hypothesis, with implications</b>		
<p><b>Unacceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Argument, position, or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration.</li> <li>- Fails to present and justify or forward argument, position, or hypothesis.</li> <li>- Argument, position, or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Argument, position, or hypothesis includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exemplary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presents and justifies clearly and in sufficient detail own argument, position, or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations.</li> </ul>
<b>Draws meaningful or justified conclusions</b> (comes to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, tested against relevant criteria and standards)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary.</li> <li>- Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.</li> <li>- Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance.</li> <li>- Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context.</li> <li>- Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed, and consider ambiguities.</li> </ul>
<b>Communicates with regard to complex problems</b> (adapts communication to target audience and disciplinary conventions)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Grammar, syntax, or other errors are distracting or repeated. Little evidence of proofreading. Style is inconsistent or inappropriate.</li> <li>- Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent or distracting.</li> <li>- Few sources are cited or used correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Errors are not distracting or frequent, although there may be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice.</li> <li>- Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Format is appropriate although at times inconsistent.</li> <li>- Most sources are cited and used correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience.</li> <li>- Organization is clear; transitions between ideas enhance presentation. Few problems with format or other components of presentation.</li> <li>- All sources are cited and used correctly, demonstrating understanding of economic, legal and social issues involved with the use of information.</li> </ul>

This rubric incorporates substantial portions of the Washington State University Scoring Guide for Critical and Integrative Thinking and outcomes identified for a well cultivated critical thinker by the National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking Instruction.