

University of Louisville Critical Thinking Rubric (112009)

	4 - Always Evident	3 - Occasionally Evident	2 - Minimally Evident	1-Not Evident
<p>Claim</p> <p>States thesis; Identifies purpose; Demonstrates recognition of problem or question</p>	<p>States a clear, precise, and significant thesis; Demonstrates a clear understanding of the purpose of the assignment, recognition of the problem or question</p>	<p>Clearly states a thesis that is precise, but thesis lacks significance for making an argument; Demonstrates an understanding of the purpose of the assignment or recognition of the problem or question</p>	<p>Clearly states a thesis, but thesis lacks precision and significance; Demonstrates a limited understanding of purpose of the assignment or recognition of the problem or question is unclear</p>	<p>Does not state clear, precise, and significant thesis; Does not demonstrate an understanding of the purpose of the assignment, nor recognize the problem or question</p>
<p>Evidence</p> <p>Uses evidence, information, data, observations, experiences, and/or reasons</p>	<p>Presents strong, credible evidence and interprets evidence defensibly and convincingly and acknowledges and refutes evidence that does not support the claim</p>	<p>Evidence is sufficient to support the claim and evidence is interpreted defensibly and counter-evidence is acknowledged but insufficiently refuted</p>	<p>Evidence is minimally sufficient to support the claim and evidence is usually interpreted defensibly but ignores some of the counter evidence</p>	<p>Evidence is insufficient to support the claim, or misinterprets evidence, or ignores evidence that counters the claim</p>
<p>Inference</p> <p>Makes a logical argument; Develops a line of reasoning based on evidence</p>	<p>Always makes logical connections between evidence and conclusions</p>	<p>Occasionally makes logical connections between evidence and conclusions</p>	<p>Makes illogical and inconsistent connections between evidence and conclusions</p>	<p>Does not show connections between evidence and conclusions</p>
<p>Point of View</p> <p>Identifies and evaluates multiple points of view (different cultural values, a different conceptual model, a different theoretical framework, or a different methodology)</p>	<p>Situates claim or argument in a larger context, acknowledges that there are other perspectives or interpretations of evidence and providing support or reasons in light of opposing perspectives</p>	<p>Situates claim or argument in a larger context and acknowledges that there are other perspectives or interpretations of evidence</p>	<p>Acknowledges that there are other perspectives or interpretations of evidence</p>	<p>Does not situate claim or argument in a larger context; does not acknowledge that there are other perspectives or interpretations of the evidence</p>