

# CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



## Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

|  | <b>Capstone</b><br>4  | <b>Milestones</b>   |   | <b>Benchmark</b><br>1   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
|  |   | 3   | 2   |   |
| <b>Explanation of issues</b>   | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.                                 | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.   |
| <b>Evidence</b><br><i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.  | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. 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. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.                         |
| <b>Influence of context and assumptions</b>  | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.   | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.  | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).   | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| <b>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</b>   | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.  | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.  |
| <b>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</b>                                | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.  | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.                               | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.                      | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.                  |