

**California State University, Fresno
General Education Scoring Guide for Critical Thinking**

Scoring Level	Interpretation	Analysis & Evaluation	Presentation
4 - Accomplished	<p>Analyzes insightful questions Refutes bias Critiques content Examines inconsistencies Values information</p>	<p>Examines conclusions Uses reasonable judgment Discriminates rationally Synthesizes data Views information critically</p>	<p>Argues succinctly Discusses issues thoroughly Shows intellectual honesty Justifies decisions Assimilates information</p>
3 - Competent	<p>Asks insightful questions Detects bias. Categorizes content. Identifies inconsistencies Recognizes context</p>	<p>Formulates conclusions Recognizes arguments Notices differences Evaluates data Seeks out information</p>	<p>Argues clearly Identifies issues Attributes sources naturally Suggests solutions Incorporates information</p>
2 - Developing	<p>Identifies some questions Notes some bias Recognizes basic content States some inconsistencies Selects sources adequately</p>	<p>Identifies some conclusions Sees some arguments Identifies some differences Paraphrases data Assumes information valid</p>	<p>Misconstructs arguments Generalizes issues Cites sources Presents few options Overlooks some information</p>
1 - Beginning	<p>Fails to question data Ignores bias Misses major content areas Detects no inconsistencies Chooses biased sources</p>	<p>Fails to draw conclusions Sees no arguments Overlooks differences Repeats data Omits research</p>	<p>Omits argument Misrepresents issues Excludes data Draws faulty conclusions Shows intellectual dishonesty</p>

Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking: Long Form
Washington State University 2009

3. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence/sources.

Absent 0	Minimal 1		Emerging 2		Developing 3		Competent 4		Effective 5		Mastering 6	
	ABSENT	Search and selection are narrow, or loosely connected to information need.		Search and selection suggest sources were evaluated to meet the information need.		Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills demonstrates notable identification of unique and salient resources.						
Most data/evidence or sources are simplistic, or inappropriate / not related to topic. Does not diverge from traditional sources.		Appropriate evidence or sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine; may include an innovative or nontraditional source or interpretation.		Information need is clearly defined and integrated to meet and exceed assignment. May explore and synthesize unconventional sources or interpretations.								
Repeats information provided without question; or may dismiss evidence without adequate justification.		Use of evidence, qualified selective, and appropriate.		Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.								
May consider knowledge as absolute, unassailable, confirmed by one or another authority.		Considers knowledge as relative collection of opinions and perspectives, and makes little attempt to compare.		Views knowledge as the best available evidence within the given context, even in the face of uncertainty and ambiguity.								
Makes limited distinctions among fact, opinion, and value judgments.		Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize some bias in evidence, although may be limited.		Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias.								
Conflates cause and correlation; relationship between evidence and analysis may be unclear.		Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may have minor flaws. Relationship between evidence and analysis is generally clear.		Correlations are distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Relationship between evidence and analysis is clear; subordination reflects, subordinated for importance and impact.								
Comments:												

<https://my.wsu.edu/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/CTLT/CITRUBRIC/CIT%20RUBRIC%202009%20WITH%20RATIO%20SCALE%202009%20FINAL.PDF>
 OR <http://goo.gl/k01kAW>

Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking: Long Form

Washington State University 2009

4. Integrates diverse relevant perspectives.

Absent	Minimal	Emerging	Developing	Competent	Effective	Mastering
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
ABSENT	<p>Adopts a single perspective, with limited discussion of other perspectives. If more than one viewpoint is presented, alternatives are not integrated.</p> <p>Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them. May not consider that other viewpoints and expertise are necessary.</p> <p>Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas.</p> <p>Minimal analysis. May treat other positions superficially or misrepresent them. Little integration of perspectives and little attention to others' views.</p> <p>Mostly uses one way of knowing.</p>	<p>Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis. Multiple viewpoints are mentioned but not thoroughly discussed, explained or qualified.</p> <p>Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way.</p> <p>Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that inflate conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily.</p> <p>Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate. Acknowledges value of multiple perspectives.</p> <p>Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing.</p>	<p>Addresses other perspectives and additional diverse perspectives to qualify analysis. Multiple viewpoints are thoroughly discussed, explained and qualified.</p> <p>Fully integrated perspectives from variety of sources; any analogies are used effectively.</p> <p>Seeks out, weighs and effectively integrates diverse, uncomfortable or contrary views.</p> <p>Analysis of other positions is accurate, nuanced, and respectful.</p> <p>Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological ways of knowing.</p>			
Comments:						

5. Develops, presents, and communicates own perspective, hypothesis or position.

Absent	Minimal	Emerging	Developing	Competent	Effective	Mastering
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
ABSENT	<p>Position or hypothesis is unclear, simplistic, or includes little original thinking.</p> <p>Own position or hypothesis is minimally identified and/or justified. May not clarify the established position relative to own.</p> <p>Little or no risk-taking, lacks exploration.</p> <p>Little evidence of reflection or self-assessment.</p>	<p>Perspective or hypothesis includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects adopted or limited.</p> <p>Presents and justifies own position or hypothesis, although gaps may exist. May not address other views, or does so superficially. Relationship to established positions is clear.</p> <p>May remain within "safe" or predictable parameters.</p> <p>Some evidence of reflection and/or self-assessment</p>	<p>Perspective or hypothesis demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition.</p> <p>Clearly presents and justifies own position or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations. May draw support from experience and information not available from assigned sources. Position or hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated, integrative thought.</p> <p>May explore ideas that stretch conventional parameters; includes innovative thinking, questioning or risk-taking.</p> <p>Evidence of significant reflection and self-assessment</p>			
Comments:						

Rubric for evaluating NEWS REPORTS, EOSC 310

Use this rubric as a guide. Write the categories (left side) on your index card. Evaluate each category on a scale of 0-4. Write comments on reverse side of card.

Category	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)
Opening & intro	Clearly, quickly established the focus of the presentation, gained audience attention	Established focus by the end of the intro, but went off on a tangent or two. Gained attention.	Audience had an idea of what was coming, but the intro did not clarify the main focus.	Little or no intro, such that audience did not know the speaker's main focus.
Clarity & Organization	Main points clearly stated and explained; logical, smooth organization	Main points fairly clear; some missing links or transitions.	Main points must be inferred by audience; holes are evident.	Presentation jumps among random topics. Main points unclear
Content	Evidence clearly presented. Thorough, knowledgeable interesting, logical. Assumptions and interpretations clear, and clearly identified.	Evidence perhaps not quite clearly separated from assumptions and interpretation of evidence, but story is logical.	Evidence, assumptions, and interpretation difficult to untangle from one another.	Lacks key observations. Evidence unclear. Appears largely opinion-based.
Style & Delivery	Audience could see & hear speakers clearly. Effective pauses and verbal intonation.	Audience could see & hear speakers clearly, Most pauses & verbal intonation were effective.	Audience could mostly see & hear speakers. Speakers show some hesitation or uncertainty.	Speakers spoke to the screen or mostly to one person in the audience. Poorly timed. Appears to have not practiced.
Visual Aids	Well-selected, well-placed images and text. Figures clearly support ideas presented without extraneous info.	Reasonable images and text, not always well-placed. Figures clearly support ideas presented. May have some extra/missing info	Some chosen images extraneous to presentation or marginally support presentation. Too much/little extra detail.	Chosen images and text marginally useful. Too much/little extra detail. Lack of connection to topic.
Summary	Conclusions clearly stated. Summary integrated main points and brought the presentation to a logical & effective closure	Conclusions stated. Summary perhaps not quite fully supported by evidence shown, but main points clear.	Summary shown but poorly explained by speaker. Audience has to summarize for themselves.	Summary non-existent or very abrupt. Lack of synthesis.
Addressing questions	Questions handled with confidence and in a knowledgeable way. Speaker clearly demonstrated further depth of knowledge than just the information in his/her presentation.	Questions handled in a knowledgeable way but with some hesitation. Speaker clearly demonstrated further depth of knowledge than just the information in his/her presentation.	Speaker made a strong effort to answer questions, but lacked depth of knowledge beyond what he/she already presented.	Speaker lacked answers to obvious questions the audience would be likely to ask. Speaker struggled to link answer to content of presentation.

Trevor Hanson, Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering, UNB Fredericton,
Eric Garland Award for Excellence in Teaching 2012

Question value	Assessment criteria	Interpretation of student learning
100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer and method correct • All work shown, all parts of the question answered • At most one minor error (i.e. not comprehension related) not affecting final answer or conclusions from answer 	Student demonstrates a clear understanding of the question, pays close attention to detail, and fully and correctly applies the numerical method.
80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct use of method • All work shown, all parts of the question answered with one minor error that is carried through the entire question resulting in an incorrect final answer –or- • All work shown, but a small part of the question was not attempted or answered incorrectly • Some issues with significant digits 	Student demonstrates a clear understanding of the question, attempts to fully and correctly apply the numerical method, but overlooks a component of the question (such as having an error early on that continues through the question or not completing a small, but critical, part of the question).
60%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct method, but incomplete application • Multiple calculation errors, issues with significant digits 	Student demonstrates a basic understanding of the question, attempts to correctly apply the numerical method, but may only successfully employ one part of the method. While there may be some errors throughout the answer, the student is able to recognize whether their results make sense.
40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct method, but incomplete application (just under 50% complete) • > 2 calculation errors • Different method than specified, but correct result 	Student demonstrates a basic understanding of the question, attempts to correctly apply the numerical method, but may only successfully employ one part of the method.
20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct method, but incorrectly applied, and/or missing important steps • Numerous errors due to inattention or incomprehension • Not recognizing that analytical and numerical solutions should be within same order of magnitude 	Student demonstrates a marginal understanding of the question, is able to recall the method sufficiently to begin the question, but does not demonstrate due care and attention in their work, is unable to fully apply the specified method, and/or recognize the relationship between the analytical and numerical method in solving a problem.
0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method only, no work shown • Answer only, no work shown • Incorrect method, incorrect answer • Illegible work • Plagiarized work 	Student demonstrates little to no understanding of the question or of the expectation for professionalism in their work.

property rights and adheres to the laws governing them. Learn more about our permissions policy and submit your request online.

[Policies and Requests](#)
[Translations Rights](#)
[Books in Translation](#)

Criteria	Gradations of Quality			
	4	3	2	1
The claim	I make a claim and explain why it is controversial.	I make a claim but don't explain why it is controversial.	My claim is buried, confused, and/or unclear.	I don't say what my argument or claim is.
Reasons in support of the claim	I give clear and accurate reasons in support of my claim.	I give reasons in support of my claim, but I overlook important reasons.	I give 1 or 2 weak reasons that don't support my claim and/or irrelevant or confusing reasons.	I don't give reasons in support of my claim.
Reasons against the claim	I discuss the reasons against my claim and explain why it is valid anyway.	I discuss the reasons against my claim but neglect some or don't explain why the claim still stands.	I say that there are reasons against the claim, but I don't discuss them.	I don't acknowledge or discuss the reasons against my claim.
Organization	My writing has a compelling opening, an informative middle, and a satisfying conclusion.	My writing has a beginning, a middle, and an end.	My organization is rough but workable. I may sometimes get off topic.	My writing is aimless and disorganized.
Voice and tone	It sounds like I care about my argument. I tell how I think and feel about it.	My tone is OK, but my paper could have been written by anyone. I need to tell how I think and feel.	My writing is bland or pretentious. There is either no hint of a real person in it, or it sounds like I'm faking it.	My writing is too formal or informal. It sounds like I don't like the topic of the essay.
Word choice	The words that I use are striking but natural, varied, and vivid.	I make some fine and some routine word choices.	The words that I use are often dull or uninspired or sound like I'm trying too hard to impress.	I use the same words over and over. Some words may be confusing.
Sentence fluency	My sentences are clear, complete, and of varying lengths.	I have well-constructed sentences. My essay marches along but doesn't dance.	My sentences are often awkward, run-ons, or fragments.	Many run-on sentences and sentence fragments make my essay hard to read.
Conventions	I use correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling.	I have a few errors to fix, but I generally use correct conventions.	I have enough errors in my essay to distract a reader.	Numerous errors make my paper hard to read.

2. [Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, 2nd Edition](#)



3. [The](#)



[Understanding by Design Guide to Creating High-Quality Units](#)

4. [Classroom Instruction That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, 2nd edition](#)



5. [Essential Questions: Opening Doors to Student Understanding](#)



[Video | Audio | Downloads](#)

[More](#)

I describe four levels of quality but do not give them labels. In my experience, satisfactory