

Washington State University Critical Thinking Rubric – Modified by Jerry Stonewater & Susan Wolcott (Draft 10/18/05)

Critical Thinking Skill	Very Weak (Confused Fact-Finder) 0	Partially Developed (Biased Jumper) 1	Substantially Developed (Perpetual Analyzer) 2	Excellent (Pragmatic Performer and Strategic Revisoner) 3
1) Identifies and summarizes the problem/question at issue (and/or the source's position).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not identify and summarize the problem; is confused or identifies a different or inappropriate problem Problem stated in dichotomous terms such as yes/no, good/bad, or right/wrong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies the problem from a set of information in which the problem is clearly evident Does not identify subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem Problem stated unidirectionally, e.g. "We will prove that x is true" or "To me, x is true" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem, and addresses their relationships to each other Identifies not only the basics of the issue, but recognizes nuances of the issue Problem stated in terms of a process of examining evidence from multiple points of view 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problem stated as in Level 2, but with emphasis also on prioritizing across viable alternative solutions Identifies nuances and implicit aspects of the problem; also identifies the most important problem or most important aspects of the problem Identifies problems arising from limitations of current solutions; anticipates future problems
3) Identifies and considers OTHER salient perspectives and positions that are important to the analysis of the issue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not acknowledge the existence of multiple perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledges the existence of multiple perspectives/positions provided in assigned sources, but deals primarily with a single perspective; fails to objectively discuss other possible perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compares and contrasts/ provides arguments for and against different perspectives or positions Addresses additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information 	<p>In addition to Level 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develops new insights based on complex evaluations of other salient perspectives or positions
5) Identifies and assesses the quality of supporting data/evidence and provides additional data/evidence related to the issue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Merely repeats information provided, taking it as truth Does not interpret data/evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies data/evidence to support own conclusion Ignores data/evidence from other perspectives (which are missing) or that disagree with own solution Equates unsupported personal opinion with other forms of evidence Stacks up evidence quantitatively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examines the evidence and source of evidence from multiple perspectives Questions evidence accuracy, precision, relevance, completeness Draws on additional data/evidence from outside sources 	<p>In addition to Level 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranks data/evidence in terms of importance, relevance, reliability, or other qualitative factors Describes process for systematically generating new data/evidence or for reinterpreting the significance of data/evidence over time
7) Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications and consequences .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides facts, definitions, or other "authoritative" information that mask as conclusions instead of own conclusion Does not address implications or consequences beyond dichotomous characterizations such as yes/no, good/bad, or right/wrong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly states conclusions and reasons, but limited to supporting one perspective Considers implications and consequences only superficially Fails to address key relationships among context, assumptions, data, evidence, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyzes alternative conclusions, implications, and consequences Conclusions incorporate previously discussed problem statement, as well as key relationships among context, assumptions, data, and evidence Reluctant to select and defend a single overall solution as most viable; may provide inadequate support for solution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes criteria to apply across alternatives to reach a well-founded conclusion Conclusions incorporate previously discussed problem statement, as well as key relationships among context, assumptions, data, and evidence Articulates how problem solving approach and criteria can be refined, leading to better solutions or greater confidence over time

Contexts for Consideration in 6):

- a. Cultural/Social: Group, national, ethnic behavior/attitude
- b. Scientific: Conceptual, basic science, scientific method
- c. Educational: Schooling, formal training
- d. Economic: Trade, business concerns costs

- e. Technological: Applied science, engineering
- f. Ethical: Values
- g. Political: Organizational or governmental
- h. Personal Experience: Personal observation, informal character