

CAL S Critical Thinking Assessment/Reporting Rubric (draft 4)

	<i>Scoring:</i>	<i>9, 8 or 7</i>	<i>6, 5 or 4</i>	<i>3, 2 or 1</i>
(CAL S Reference)	Outcome	<i>Competent: Mostly to totally demonstrates the desired ability.</i>	<i>Developing: Attempts to demonstrate the ability is partially evident.</i>	<i>Emerging: Mostly to totally fails to demonstrate the desired ability.</i>
1	Apply a holistic approach to [identifying and] solving complex issue laden problems	Specifically identifies overt and implicit challenges of a situational problem. Describes integral relationships between these challenges. Delineates pro and con aspects of possible pathways to achieving resolution to situation. Delineates essential pro/con aspects of possible pathways to achieving resolution.	Frames the situational problem and delineates some but not all of the alternative perspective. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over. Delineates some possible pathways to achieving resolution.	Cannot accurately summarize the challenges involved in a situational problem. Nearly or completely misses the nuances of interactions. Fails to identify most or all of the most overt challenges of the problem. Cannot generate the pro and con aspects of any pathway to resolution.
2a	Distinguish fact from value claims.	Identifies all relevant evidence to solve a situational problem and completely delineates that which is fact (supported/justified by scientific discovery or reason) from that supported by normative (ought to) versus those supported by opinion, consensus or value claims.	Distinguishes some but not all arguments supported/justified by fact versus those supported opinion, consensus or value claims.	Does not or rarely can separate/distinguish arguments supported by fact versus those supported opinion, consensus or value claims.
2c	Identify assumptions and detect bias.	Identifies and evaluates all important assumptions and the ones deeper in background; the more abstract ones. Recognizes bias, including selection bias.	Identifies some of the most important assumptions, but does not evaluate them for plausibility or clarity. Cannot identify most of the more abstract assumptions that are implied by the situation.	Fails to identify and evaluate any of the important assumptions behind the claims made by stakeholders in a given situation. Cannot recognizes bias, including selection bias.
2d and 2b	Distinguish relevant from irrelevant information and information accuracy of statements.	Can identify and gather all relevant facts and information critically needed to judge and proceed effectively to address a situational problem. Can fully explain why information is relevant.	Can identify and/or gather only some but not all the critical, relevant facts and information needed to judge and proceed effectively to address a situational problem. Can only partially explain why the information is relevant.	Cannot distinguish relevant from non-relevant information, though all may have reference to the situational problem. Lacks in ability to gather/identify all information needed causes impairment in ability to progress toward solving the situational problem.
2e	Establish priorities [and courses of action] .	Defines clear organizational steps to act or judge a situational problem using all available relevant information. Demonstrates ability define steps on how to proceed to implement chosen courses of action. Demonstrates ability to monitor impact of chosen course of action and to identify corrective action.	Defines some organizational steps to act on or judge a situation; uses some but not all available relevant information. Fails to find gaps in process which may impede progress toward the full implementation of the chosen course of action.	Approach proposed to address a situational problem lacks for structure or priorities. May identify that course of action will be ineffective, but lacks ability to identify why or cannot offer any corrective change in course of action.
3	Summarizes, analyzes and interprets simple research data and policy issues	Use of data is qualified and selective. Distinguishes causality from correlation. Applies appropriate use of summary and analytical statistics and can establish a case for statistical significance. Can apply implications of the research data to formation of policy or justified statements of proposed action.	Use of data is partially qualified, somewhat selective. Distinguishes causality from correlation. Applies appropriate use of summary and analytical statistics. Sometimes establishes a case for statistical significance. Is able to identify policy ideas implied from data but struggles to utilize data/statistics to justify action.	Choice of data/evidence applied to resolving situation is mostly not qualified/justified. Repeats information provided without adequate justification. Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, not related to topic. Not able to consistently distinguish causality from correlation. Not able to accurately imply research data to policy formation or to justify proposed actions.