Critical Thinking Skills Rubric

| Category | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identifies & explains ISSUES | Clearly identifies and summarizes main issues and successfully explains why/how they are problems or questions; and identifies embedded or implicit issues, addressing their relationships to each other. | Successfully identifies and summarizes the main issues, but does not explain why/how they are problems or create questions. | Identifies main issues but does not summarize or explain them clearly or sufficiently. | Fails to identify, summarize, or explain the main problem or question. (OR) Represents the issues inaccurately or inappropriately. |
| Recognizes stakeholders and CONTEXTS (i.e., cultural/social, educational, technological, political, scientific, economic, ethical, personal experience) | Not only correctly identifies all the empirical and theoretical contexts relevant to all the main stakeholders, but also finds minor stakeholders and contexts and shows the tension or conflicts of interests among them. | Correctly identifies all the empirical and most of the theoretical contexts relevant to all the main stakeholders in the situation. | Shows some general understanding of the influences of empirical and theoretical contexts on stakeholders, but does not identify any specific ones relevant to situation at hand. | Fails accurately to identify and explain any empirical or theoretical contexts for the issues. (OR) Presents problems as having no connections to other conditions or contexts. |
| Frames personal responses and acknowledges other PERSPECTIVES | Not only formulates a clear and precise personal point of view, but also acknowledges objections and rival positions and provides convincing replies to these. | Formulates a clear and precise personal point of view concerning the issue, and seriously discusses its weaknesses as well as its strengths. | Formulates a vague and indecisive point of view, (OR) anticipates minor but not major objections to his/her point of view, (OR) considers weak but not strong alternative positions. | Fails to formulate and clearly express own point of view, (OR) fails to anticipate objections to his/her point of view, (OR) fails to consider other perspectives and position |
| Evaluates ASSUMPTIONS | Not only identifies and evaluates all the important assumptions, but also some of the more hidden, more abstract ones. | Identifies and evaluates all the important assumptions, but not the ones deeper in the background – the more abstract ones. | Identifies some of the most important assumptions, but does not evaluate them for plausibility or clarity | Fails to identify and evaluate any of the important assumptions behind the claims and recommendations made. |
| Evaluates EVIDENCE | Not only identifies and rigorously evaluates all important evidence offered, but also provides new data or information for consideration. | Identifies all important evidence and rigorously evaluates it. | Successfully identifies data and information that counts as evidence but fails to thoroughly evaluate its credibility. | Fails to identify data and information that counts as evidence for truth-claims and fails to evaluate its credibility. |
| Evaluates IMPLICATIONS, conclusions, and consequences | Identifies and thoroughly discusses implications, conclusions, and consequences, considering all relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence. | Identifies and briefly discusses implications, conclusions, and consequences considering most but not all the relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence. | Suggests some implications, conclusions, and consequences, but without clear reference to context, assumptions, data, and evidence. | Fails to identify implications, conclusions, and consequences of the issue, (OR) the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as context, assumptions, or data and evidence. |

**Developed by the General Education Committee, with special involvement of members of the Philosophy department and of the CTL. University of Rhode Island.** Based on a work at Washington State University.