

Guide to Rating Critical Thinking
Washington State University
2001

- 1) Identifies and summarizes the problem/question at issue (and/or the source's position).**

<i>Scant</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
Does not identify and summarize the problem, is confused or identifies a different and inappropriate problem.	Identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem, and identifies them clearly, addressing their relationships to each other.
Does not identify or is confused by the issue, or represents the issue inaccurately.	Identifies not only the basics of the issue, but recognizes nuances of the issue.

- 2) Identifies and presents the STUDENT'S OWN perspective and position as it is important to the analysis of the issue.**

<i>Scant</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
Addresses a single source or view of the argument and fails to clarify the established or presented position relative to one's own. Fails to establish other critical distinctions.	Identifies, appropriately, one's own position on the issue, drawing support from experience, and information not available from <i>assigned</i> sources.

- 3) Identifies and considers OTHER salient perspectives and positions that are important to the analysis of the issue.**

<i>Scant</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
Deals only with a single perspective and fails to discuss other possible perspectives, especially those salient to the issue.	Addresses perspectives noted previously, and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information.

- 4) Identifies and assesses the key assumptions.**

<i>Scant</i>	<i>Substantially Developed</i>
Does not surface the assumptions and ethical issues that underlie the issue, or does so superficially.	Identifies and addresses the validity of the key assumptions and ethical dimensions that underlie the issue.

- 5) Identifies and assesses the **quality of supporting data/evidence** and provides additional data/evidence related to the issue.

Scant

Substantially Developed

Merely repeats information provided, taking it as truth, or denies evidence without adequate justification. Confuses associations and correlations with cause and effect. Does not distinguish between fact, opinion, and value judgments.	Examines the evidence and source of evidence; questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, completeness. Observes cause and effect and addresses existing or potential consequences Clearly distinguishes between fact, opinion, & acknowledges value judgments.
--	---

- 6) Identifies and considers the influence of the **context *** on the issue.

Scant

Substantially Developed

Discusses the problem only in egocentric or sociocentric terms. Does not present the problem as having connections to other contexts—cultural, political, etc.	Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis. Considers other pertinent contexts.
--	---

- 7) Identifies and assesses **conclusions, implications and consequences**.

Scant

Substantially Developed

Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as context, implications, assumptions, or data and evidence.	Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences considering context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Objectively reflects upon their own assertions.
--	--

Contexts for consideration

Cultural/social Group, national, ethnic behavior/attitude	Scientific Conceptual, basic science, scientific method
Educational Schooling, formal training	Economic Trade, business concerns costs
Technological Applied science, engineering	Ethical Values
Political Organizational or governmental	Personal Experience Personal observation, informal character