

---

## Critical Thinking Rubric

---

**Critical Thinking** - The student will be able to evaluate and apply information gathered from observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication.

Attribute 1. Evaluate the validity and soundness of scientific, mathematical, logical, or other formal disciplinary arguments.

Capstone - 4	Acceptable - 3	Emerging - 2	Ineffective - 1
Understands and explains the argument.	Recognizes the argument and acknowledges its authority.	Recognizes the argument but does not acknowledge its authority.	Does not recognize that an argument is being made.

**OPTIONAL Washington University Rubric:** Identifies and summarizes the problem/question at issue (and/or the source's position).

Capstone - 4	Acceptable - 3	Emerging - 2	Ineffective - 1
Identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem, and addresses their relationships to each other.	Identifies the main problem and related problems but does not discuss their relationship(s).	Identifies the main problem but does not discuss subsidiary or related aspects of the problem.	Does not identify and summarize the problem, is confused or identifies a different and inappropriate problem.
Identifies not only the basics of the issue, but recognizes nuances of the issue.	Identifies the basic issues and is aware of related issues.	Identifies the basic issue but not the related issues.	Is confused by the issue, or represents the issue inaccurately.

**OPTIONAL Washington University Rubric:** Identifies and assesses the key assumptions.

Capstone - 4	Acceptable - 3	Emerging - 2	Ineffective - 1
Identifies and questions the validity of the assumptions and/or ethical dimensions that underlie the issue.	Identifies the assumptions and/or ethical dimensions that underlie the issue.	Mentions assumptions and/or ethical issues without discussing them.	Does not recognize the assumptions and ethical issues that underlie the issue, or does so superficially.

Attribute 2. Analyze and synthesize information from a variety of sources and apply the results to resolve complex situations and solve problems.

Capstone - 4	Acceptable - 3	Emerging - 2	Ineffective - 1
Examines the evidence and source of evidence; questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, completeness.	Recognizes evidence and distinguishes between facts, opinions, & value judgments.	Recognizes evidence but does not distinguish between fact, opinion, and value judgments.	Merely repeats information provided, (takes it as true, or denies evidence without adequate justification.)

Attribute 3. Defend conclusions using relevant evidence and scientific, mathematical, logical, or other formal disciplinary argument(s).

Capstone - 4	Acceptable - 3	Emerging - 2	Ineffective - 1
Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences considering relevant theories, principles, assumptions, data, and evidence.  (reflects upon the their own assertions)	Identifies conclusions and relates them to relevant theories and evidence  (presents the conclusions, evidence and theories clearly)	Mentions conclusions and relevant theories and evidence.  (presents conclusions and mentions evidence and theories)	Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as theories, assumptions, data and evidence.

**OPTIONAL Washington University Rubric:** Identifies and considers the influence of the context on the issue.

Capstone - 4	Acceptable - 3	Emerging - 2	Ineffective - 1
Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis.  Considers other pertinent contexts.	Discusses the context of the issue and the importance of the audience	Mentions the scope and context of the issue without any explanation.	Discusses the problem only in egocentric or socio-centric terms.  Does not present the problem as having connections to other contexts-cultural, political, etc.

**Standardized Critical Thinking Assessment Option:**

Some disciplines might prefer to use the Watson-Glaser Assessment of Critical Thinking. The relationship between the college outcomes and those assessed on the five Watson-Glaser scales follows:

Watson Glaser divides critical thinking into five types of thought:

- Inference - Discriminating among degrees of truth or falsity of inferences drawn from given data.
- Recognition of Assumptions - Recognizing unstated assumptions or presuppositions in given statements or assertions.

- Deduction - Determining whether certain conclusions necessarily follow from information in given statements or premises.
- Interpretation. - Weighing evidence and deciding if generalizations or conclusions based on the given data are warranted.
- Evaluation of Arguments - Distinguishing between arguments that are strong and relevant and those that are weak or irrelevant to a particular issue.

MCC Critical Thinking General Education Outcome: Attributes

Attribute 1. Evaluate the validity and soundness of scientific, mathematical, logical, or other formal disciplinary arguments.

The following Watson-Glaser scales apply:

Deduction - Determining whether certain conclusions necessarily follow from information in given statements or premises.

Recognition of Assumptions - Recognizing unstated assumptions or presuppositions in given statements or assertions.

Evaluation of Arguments - Distinguishing between arguments that are strong and relevant and those that are weak or irrelevant to a particular issue.

Attribute 2. Analyze and synthesize information from a variety of sources and apply the results to resolve complex situations and solve problems.

The following Watson-Glaser scales apply:

Interpretation - Weighing evidence and deciding if generalizations or conclusions based on the given data are warranted.

Attribute 3. Defend conclusions using relevant evidence and scientific, mathematical, logical, or other formal disciplinary argument(s).

The following Watson-Glaser scales apply:

Inference - Discriminating among degrees of truth or falsity of inferences drawn from given data.