

**Northeastern Illinois University**

<http://flightline.highline.edu/socc/ToolsResources/Tools/Critical%20Thinking-short-NEI.pdf>

**Critical Thinking Rubric**

<b>Quality Criteria</b>	<b>No/Limited Proficiency</b>	<b>Some Proficiency</b>	<b>Proficiency</b>	<b>High Proficiency</b>
1. Identifies & Explains Issues	Fails to identify, summarize, or explain the main problem or question. Represents the issues inaccurately or inappropriately.	Identifies main issues but does not summarize or explain them clearly or sufficiently	Successfully identifies and summarizes the main issues, but does not explain why/how they are problems or create questions	Clearly identifies and summarizes main issues and successfully explains why/how they are problems or questions; and identifies embedded or implicit issues, addressing their relationships to each other.
2. Recognizes Stakeholders and Contexts (i.e., cultural/social, educational, technological, political, scientific, economic, ethical, personal experience)	Fails accurately to identify and explain any empirical or theoretical contexts for the issues. Presents problems as having no connections to other conditions or contexts.	Shows some general understanding of the influences of empirical and theoretical contexts on stakeholders, but does not identify any specific ones relevant to situation at hand.	Correctly identifies all the empirical and most of the theoretical contexts relevant to all the main stakeholders in the situation.	Not only correctly identifies all the empirical and theoretical contexts relevant to all the main stakeholders, but also finds minor stakeholders and contexts and shows the tension or conflicts of interests among them.
3. Frames Personal Responses and Acknowledges Other Perspectives	Fails to formulate and clearly express own point of view, (or) fails to anticipate objections to his/her point of view, (or) fails to consider other perspectives and position.	Formulates a vague and indecisive point of view, or anticipates minor but not major objections to his/her point of view, or considers weak but not strong alternative positions.	Formulates a clear and precise personal point of view concerning the issue, and seriously discusses its weaknesses as well as its strengths.	Not only formulates a clear and precise personal point of view, but also acknowledges objections and rival positions and provides convincing replies to these.

4. Evaluates Assumptions	Fails to identify and evaluate any of the important assumptions behind the claims and recommendations made.	Identifies some of the most important assumptions, but does not evaluate them for plausibility or clarity.	Identifies and evaluates all the important assumptions, but not the ones deeper in the background – the more abstract ones.	Not only identifies and evaluates all the important assumptions, but also some of the more hidden, more abstract ones.
5. Evaluates Evidence	Fails to identify data and information that counts as evidence for truth-claims and fails to evaluate its credibility.	Successfully identifies data and information that counts as evidence but fails to thoroughly evaluate its credibility.	Identifies all important evidence and rigorously evaluates it.	Not only identifies and rigorously evaluates all important evidence offered, but also provides new data or information for consideration.
6. Evaluates Implications, Conclusions, and Consequences	Fails to identify implications, conclusions, and consequences of the issue, or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as context, assumptions, or data and evidence.	Suggests some implications, conclusions, and consequences, but without clear reference to context, assumptions, data, and evidence.	Identifies and briefly discusses implications, conclusions, and consequences considering most but not all the relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence.	Identifies and thoroughly discusses implications, conclusions, and consequences, considering all relevant assumptions, contexts, data, and evidence.