

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

This rubric is designed to evaluate the extent to which undergraduate students evaluate claims, arguments, evidence, and hypotheses. Results will be used for program improvement purposes only.

Course:

Instructor:

Student:

Date:

Component	Component Fully Met (Rating = 3)	Component Met (Rating = 2)	Component Partially Met (Rating = 1)	Component Not Met (Rating = 0)	Rating
Accurately interpret evidence and thoughtfully evaluate alternative points of view	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.	
Draw judicious conclusions, justify results, and explain reasoning	Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution. 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.	Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem. Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem. Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem. Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.	

Engage in skepticism, judgment, and free thinking	Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.	Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.	Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.	Reformulates a collection of available ideas.	
Engage in abstract reasoning, questioning and understanding	<p>Actively seeks out and follows through on untested and potentially risky directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</p> <p>Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.</p>	<p>Incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</p> <p>Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a exploratory way.</p>	<p>Considers new directions or approaches without going beyond the guidelines of the assignment.</p> <p>Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.</p>	<p>Stays strictly within the guidelines of the assignment.</p> <p>Acknowledges (mentions in passing) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas.</p>	
Notes:					