



CRITICAL THINKING

The ability to pursue and comprehensively evaluate information before accepting or establishing a conclusion, decision, or action.

Notes Regarding the Selection of Artifacts or Application of Rubric:

This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of critical thinking that share common attributes. To that end, this rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analysis of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the *process* components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the final product/project/decision) is important, student reflections might be especially useful.

SLOs:	Advanced (4)	Above Average (3)	Proficient (2)	Beginner (1)
Consider, engage, and analyze opposing viewpoints or arguments	Exceptionally adept at considering, engaging with, and analyzing opposing viewpoints. Exhibits a sophisticated understanding of the complexities inherent in different perspectives. Provides insightful analysis beyond surface-level examination. Integrates diverse viewpoints into their own analysis.	Consistently considers, engages, and analyzes a wide range of opposing viewpoints. Discerns nuanced differences between various arguments. Recognizes the importance of understanding diverse viewpoints in the context of critical thinking.	Shows an ability to consider, engage, and analyze some opposing viewpoints. Shows some understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of opposing arguments. Lacks consistency in considering diverse viewpoints comprehensively.	Demonstrates little ability to consider opposing viewpoints. Shows minimal engagement with opposing perspectives. Analysis of opposing viewpoints is rudimentary or absent.
Evaluate the credibility of information	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. The viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. The viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation.
Support one's own conclusion, decision, or action with sound reasoning and judgment	Conclusion is strongly supported, considering an issue's complexities. Limitations of conclusion are acknowledged. Various points of view are synthesized within position and reasoning is well explained.	Conclusion is well supported, considering an issue's complexities. Various points of view are acknowledged, and reasoning is explained.	Conclusion is somewhat well supported, acknowledging different sides of an issue.	Conclusion is not well supported; reasoning is flawed or simplistic.
Interpret inferences and develop subtleties of symbolic and indirect discourse	Excellent interprets inferences and subtleties. Displays a profound understanding of implied meanings and indirect references. Provides insightful analysis of symbolic elements or indirect messages, uncovering layers of meaning. Develops nuanced interpretations that reveal a deep engagement with the discourse.	Consistently interprets inferences in symbolic and indirect discourse. Shows a thorough understanding of implied meanings and indirect references. Adeptly identifies and analyzes symbolic elements. Recognizes and appreciates subtleties present in discourse.	Demonstrates some ability to interpret inferences. Shows a basic understanding of implied meanings and indirect references. Can identify symbolic elements or indirect messages with accuracy. May occasionally miss subtleties or nuances.	Struggles to interpret inferences. Shows limited understanding of implied meanings or indirect references. Misinterprets symbolic elements. Does not recognize nuanced aspects of discourse.

This rubric is adapted from the AAC&U's VALUE rubric for Critical Thinking.