



gtPATHWAYS COMPETENCY: CRITICAL THINKING
Required in gtPathways Categories: CO1, CO2, CO3, SS1, SS2

Criteria for Critical Thinking

Competency in critical thinking addresses a student's ability to analyze information and ideas from multiple perspectives and articulate an argument or an opinion or a conclusion based on their analysis.

Student Learning Outcomes (students should be able to...):

Explain an Issue

- Use information to describe a problem or issue.

Utilize Context

- Evaluate the relevance of context when presenting a position.
- Identify assumptions.
- Analyze one's own and others' assumptions.

Create a Personal Response

- Identify a specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) that takes into account the complexities of an issue.
- Synthesize other points of view within their own position.

Incorporate Evidence

- Including primary and secondary, to the scope and discipline. Connect evidence to claim/thesis.
- Interpret sources to develop an analysis or synthesis.
- Evaluate sources to develop an analysis or synthesis.

Understand Implications and Make Conclusions

- Establish a conclusion that is tied to the range of information presented.
- Reflect on implications and consequences of stated conclusion.





CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

*This rubric is meant to be an **optional** course design and assessment tool. Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one performance criteria.*

	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issue(s)	Issue/ problem to be critically considered is stated clearly and described comprehensively, deliver all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/ problem to be critically considered is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/ problem to be critically considered is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguous, unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/ or connections unknown.	Issue/ problem to be critically considered is stated without any clarification or description.
Context (i.e., cultural/social, educational, technological, political, scientific, etc.)	Thoroughly and carefully identifies and evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies several relevant contexts and offers a brief evaluation of their influences when presenting a position.	Identifies but does not evaluate relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Identification and Influence of assumptions	Thoroughly analyzes and evaluates all (one's own and others') assumptions including some of the more hidden, more abstract ones.	Identifies and evaluates one's own and others' assumptions, but not the ones deeper in the background – the more abstract ones.	Identifies some of the most important assumptions, or may be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa), but does not evaluate them for plausibility or clarity.	Attempts to identify an assumption behind the claims and recommendations made, but overlooks other relevant assumptions.



	4	3	2	1
Frames personal response (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) offers a clear and precise personal point of view and takes into account the complexities of an issue. Limitations of (or objections to) position are acknowledged and others' points of view are synthesized within position with convincing replies provided.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) offers a clear personal point of view and takes into account minimal complexities of an issue. Limitations of (or objections to) position and others' points of view are acknowledged within position and replies were provided.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) offers a vague or indecisive personal point of view and acknowledges different sides of an issue. Anticipates objections to position but does not respond to them.	Attempts to formulate a personal point of view, but fails to anticipate objections to his/her point of view or fails to consider other perspectives and position.
Evaluation of Evidence	Information is from reliable source(s); interpretation/ evaluation rigorous enough to develop a comprehensive and coherent analysis or synthesis.	Information is from reliable source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Reliability or relevance of sources is questionable and/or information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/ evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Reliability and relevance of sources is questionable and/or information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/ evaluation.
Evaluates Implications, Conclusions, and Consequences	Identifies a conclusion and thoroughly evaluates implications, conclusions and consequences, while considering all relevant assumptions, contexts, data and evidence.	Identifies a conclusion and briefly evaluates implications, conclusions and consequences while considering most relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence.	Identifies a conclusion, however, information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion and relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence are not considered.	Identifies a conclusion that is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence are oversimplified or not considered.

This rubric was adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) VALUE rubrics and is also aligned with the Interstate Passport Initiative Learning Outcomes. The original VALUE rubrics may be accessed at <http://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics>. The Interstate Passport Initiative Learning Outcomes can be accessed at <http://www.wiche.edu/passport/learningOutcomesCriteria>.