

RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING CRITICAL THINKING (from the University of Louisville)

Criterion	Not Evident (1)	Occasionally Evident (2)	Evident (3)	Clearly Evident (4)	Score
Demonstrates recognition of problem or question.	No discernible thesis or does not identify and state the nature of the problem or related issue(s). Represents the issues inaccurately or inappropriately.	The thesis states and identifies the main question but does not explain why/how the main question is a problem or question. Represents the issues accurately and appropriately.	The thesis identifies the main question and subsidiary aspects of the problem or question. Articulates some understanding of the scope of the problem and the related issue(s) involved.	Thesis articulates a clear understanding of the scope of the problem and issue(s) involved. Identifies embedded or implicit issues, addressing relationship of issue(s) to the thesis.	
Uses reasoning skills to develop and analyze arguments and evidence.	Does not develop an argument based on available information or evidence. Does not identify the key assumptions and/or evaluate the given information underlying the issue.	Applies relevant thinking skills (e.g., comparing, contrasting, classifying, abstracting, analyzing, criticizing) in presenting information but without clear reference to context, assumptions, data, and evidence.	Applies relevant thinking skills (e.g., comparing, contrasting, classifying, abstracting, analyzing, criticizing) in presenting information with reference to context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Suggests implications and consequences but without development.	Applies relevant thinking skills in presenting information. Develops solutions by using all available and applicable information. Identifies and clearly discusses implications and consequences, considering relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence.	
Shows awareness of multiple points of view and integrates knowledge gained from different sources.	Does not acknowledge other possible perspectives or evidence of considering other options in developing the argument. Does not acknowledge and integrate information derived from other sources.	Acknowledges other possible perspectives although not clearly stated, developed, or evaluated. Acknowledges information derived from other sources but does not evaluate or integrate such information into the argument.	States clearly other salient perspectives and positions important to the analysis of the issue. Acknowledges and examines information derived from other sources and integrates such information into the argument.	Clearly states and develops responses to other salient perspectives and positions important to analysis of the issue. Acknowledges, examines, and evaluates information from other sources and integrates the information and points of view into the argument.	
Draws conclusions based on evaluation of reasons, arguments, and evidence.	Conclusions are not provided. Fails to reflect, identify, or develop implications, consequences, and conclusions.	Conclusions are provided but without discussion of implications or consequences. Little or no effective thought is provided for assertions or to key relationships between the other elements, e.g., context, assumptions, or data and evidence.	Conclusions are stated and discussed. Implications and consequences of the conclusion are reflected in context, assumptions, and supporting evidence.	Stated conclusions are based on a thorough examination of evidence, a clear explanation of reasonable alternatives, and/or an evaluation of possible consequences. Reflection and evaluation develop and challenge solutions by using relevant information.	
Total Score:					