

The Critical Thinking Stages Rubric

← Rating scale →

1

2

3

4

5

Identifying the Issue:

<i>Limited</i>	<i>Emerging</i>	<i>Advanced</i>
<p>W – Does not state any worldview or shows no meaningful connection to their worldview</p> <p>E – No apparent passion or energy for the issues</p> <p>P – No awareness of the broader contexts or the implicit views that impact the issue.</p> <p>H – No awareness of the larger picture; unable to find significance or deeper meaning in the situation.</p> <p>S/L – Cannot clearly identify or define the specific issues in clear terms</p>	<p>W – Presuppositions are stated in vague terms or the connections are superficial</p> <p>E – Shows some interest or engagement but remains somewhat “detached.”</p> <p>P – acknowledges implicit aspects, but does not probe impact of implicit views</p> <p>H – Shows some awareness of the larger picture, but not sure how pieces fit together</p> <p>S/L – Identifies main issues, but terms and boundaries are not clear.</p>	<p>W – Clearly recognizes the importance of the <i>issue</i> and why it needs to be addressed within the context of their worldview</p> <p>E – Exhibits energy and engagement in addressing the issue</p> <p>P – Shows awareness of contextual, or implicit aspects of the issue</p> <p>H – Shows awareness of subsidiary or super-ordinate concepts; able to identify meaning/purpose in the situation</p> <p>S/L – Identifies the main issues in clear terms that lead to answerable questions</p>

Identifying Assumptions:

<p>W – No real articulation of basic presuppositions</p> <p>E – No real commitment or passion for the presuppositions expressed</p> <p>P – No appreciation for diverse views (cultural, ethnical, religious, etc.).</p> <p>H – Little awareness of the broader set of views that are possible</p> <p>S/L – Shows black and white thinking. Positions are just wrong or right but no justification as to why.</p>	<p>W- Able to articulate beliefs, but they appear “borrowed” from others or held in superficial ways</p> <p>E – Shows some passion, but also some diffusion about ideas (it all depends)</p> <p>P- Some acknowledgement of diverse views, but less value is placed on their merit (just wrong)</p> <p>H – Show awareness of various ideas, but not very broad.</p> <p>S/L – May question assumptions but in superficial ways – not clear why they may be a problem. Still shows black/white thinking</p>	<p>W – Articulates a coherent set of personally held beliefs; articulates its relevance to the issue under investigation</p> <p>E – Shows commitment and passion for the <i>personal worldview</i> expressed</p> <p>P – Shows understanding, appreciation for, and the value of diverse views (cultural, ethnical, religious, etc.).</p> <p>H – Shows awareness of the broad scope of ideas and the potential variety of possibilities</p> <p>S/L – Clearly identifies and questions the (logical/scientific) validity of the assumptions and perspectives that influence thinking on the issue.</p>
--	--	--

<i>Articulating a Thesis/Hypothesis:</i>		
<p>W – No real worldview perspective evident; hypothesis is not evident or not connected to any worldview</p> <p>E – No passion or personally owned commitment – it just is</p> <p>P – Very egocentric perspectives – no understanding of how or why others think</p> <p>H – No awareness of the larger picture of potential answers and issues</p> <p>L – Very little logical structure; not need for logical support – it just is</p> <p>S – No clear testable hypothesis or not drawn logically from any existing knowledge or experience</p>	<p>W – Thesis appears consistent with worldview, but not explicit or well defined</p> <p>E – Seems interested and engaged, but commitment is not personally owned (e.g., borrowed from parents)</p> <p>P – Recognizes diverse views, but not clear why or how others come to that thinking.</p> <p>H – Aware of diverse views or ideas, but not sure about the big picture; not creative; uses simple algorithms</p> <p>L – Thinking is clear and logical but arguments & evidence are weak or not clearly connected</p> <p>S – Identifies a thesis or hypothesis, but not clearly defined or is weakly connected to existing knowledge, or</p>	<p>W – Articulates a viable hypothesis and perspective that draws support from, or is consistent with, their own worldview perspective</p> <p>E – Shows commitment and passion for the <i>thesis</i> expressed; thesis draws from personal experience, commitments</p> <p>P – Engages in diverse perspectives and demonstrates clear understanding of others’ ideas and the structure of their thinking.</p> <p>H – Shows awareness of the broad scope of ideas and the variety of potential answers</p> <p>L – Shows clear structure to their own thinking and the thesis follows reasonably (logically) from well established ideas / evidence.</p> <p>S – Has a clearly testable hypothesis that draws from existing knowledge and evidence</p>
<i>Analyzing Evidence / Drawing Conclusions</i>		
<p>W – Mixes opinion with evidence; conclusions are black and white</p> <p>E – Little engagement with the conclusions or solutions; solutions seem self-evident</p> <p>P – Little acknowledgement of alternative judgments, other views are just wrong (without justification)</p> <p>H – sees little deeper meaning in issues or images; solutions are simple</p>	<p>W – Occasionally confuses evidence with opinion; conclusions do not connect with presuppositions</p> <p>E – Engaged, but commitments to conclusions are borrowed and not fully supported</p> <p>P – Acknowledges other claims, but not fully evaluated; not sensitive to the why of other views</p> <p>H – Conclusions are coherent but not related to broader issues; thinking is conventional; meaning in events is superficial</p>	<p>W – Can distinguish between worldviews/perspectives (i.e., opinions/views) from logical inference and scientific evidence</p> <p>E – Shows commitment to, and confidence in, the conclusions based and on the evidence, logic or perspectives provided</p> <p>P – Effectively evaluates claims, arguments, and value judgments; shows respect for diverse conclusions</p> <p>H – Infers coherent conclusions related to broader implications and issues; show divergent thinking/creativity in solutions; can infer meaning and purpose</p>

<p>L – Conclusions are not logically connected or little logical support is generated S – Not cognizant of scientific approaches to answer questions – refers more to authority or self-evident answers; allows bias to shape assessment of research; confuses cause-effect with correlation</p>	<p>L – Inferences are only moderately supported, or arguments not convincing S – Shows some awareness of scientific method and the need for good methods, but may miss elements of good scientific reasoning</p>	<p>in conclusions L – Infers coherent and logically warranted conclusions S – Clearly distinguishes correlation and cause-effect; demonstrates clear appreciation for essentials of proper methods (sampling, measurement, reliability, internal and external validity, statistical inference)</p>
<p><i>Maturity / Metacognition</i></p>		
<p>W – No basis for their perspectives; or perspectives are simplistic and not applied meaningfully E – Not engaged in solutions or positions; remain detached from solutions P – Black and white thinking; worldviews are either right or wrong without justification; does not show charity to other views; cannot communicate effectively to other perspectives. H – Not self-reflective or aware of own thinking process; finds difficulty in seeing deeper meaning to the process or to images; seeks correct answers without causes S/L – Scientific or logical methods are OK as long as they serve the ends of the person’s views; does not consider audience when stating positions; finds it difficult to modify positions or arguments based on feedback</p>	<p>W – Some self-reflection on assumptions is evident; perspectives are consistent but not applied very meaningfully E – Passionate but not sure how they/others play a role; solutions are “out there” P – Recognizes complexity but less comfortable with ambiguity; recognizes bias potential, but less so for their views; accepts correction but not fully sure why; charitable to others but can’t articulate to diverse groups H – Understands broader implications of solutions; but not fully aware of their own thinking; meaning of this process is somewhat superficial S/L – Sees scientific /logical thinking as completely flawed or extremely trustworthy; audience is acknowledge but not effectively; response to feedback is partial and not fully comprehended</p>	<p>W – Able to show a well thought-out basis for their perspectives; able to apply perspectives in meaningful and dynamic ways E – Is passionate about the implications of their position and see themselves and others as being part of the solution P – Recognizes ambiguity and complexity; recognizes how their own worldview (correct or not) may bias observations & conclusions; accepts corrections in thinking with grace; shows ability to communicate to an audience with very different views/perspectives H – Understands broader implications of solutions; shows awareness of their own thinking process and the thinking process of others; able to find deeper meaning in the process of critical thinking S/L – Able to be self-aware of potential flaws and limitations of scientific and deductive thinking; able to identify audience and communicate to it; able to respond to feedback and make adjustments in arguments or methods</p>

