

ITS 365 critical thinking rubric for weekly briefings of the cases.  
Jeanne Hey

Does the brief

1. recognize the material and ideological interests that serve each actor's policy position?
  - a. Fully articulated – A
  - b. Articulates but does not flesh out these interests – B
  - c. Articulates material or ideological interests, but not both, OR marginally articulates interests – C
  - d. Mentions interests – D
  - e. No mention of interests - F
  
2. compare the relative validity, strengths and weaknesses of the actors' respective positions?
  - a. Fully articulated – A
  - b. Marginally articulated – B
  - c. Discusses strengths and weaknesses but without a comparative conclusion – C
  - d. Minor discussion of strengths and weaknesses – D
  - e. No discussion - F
  
3. criticize the blameworthy and praise the praiseworthy?
  - a. Assign blame and praise appropriately and clearly according to analysis – A
  - b. Assign blame and praise but with weak foundation – B
  - c. Assign blame and praise, or only one, but with little or weak foundation – C
  - d. Minor discussion of blame and praise – D
  - e. No discussion – F
  
4. place the issue within its appropriate contexts?
  - a. Fully articulated discussion of contexts within which the case falls – A
  - b. Some discussion of appropriate contexts – B
  - c. Discussion of contexts that is either off-case or limited – C
  - d. Limited discussion of contexts – D
  - e. No discussion – F
  
5. develop conclusions and informed opinions about how to solve the problem?
  - a. Articulate and thoughtful conclusions and solutions provided – A
  - b. Clear attempt to reach conclusions and solutions, but not fully articulated or thought out – B
  - c. Some conclusions and solutions offered – C
  - d. Mention of conclusions and solutions, but not substantiated – D
  - e. No discussion - F