

Part 1: In two to three sentences respond to a client/patient query using lay language (like you are talking to a family member who has no experience in exercise science “lingo”).

Part 2: Evaluate a newsletter article related to your internship site experience using the rubric provided and attached.

Part 3: Develop your own newsletter article of between 350 and 500 words based on a patient/client query you receive during your internship experience. Use the rubric provided and attached to develop this article.

Holistic Critical Thinking Rubric based on the Paul-Elder Critical Thinking Framework*

Text in Red

Indicates the infusion of the **Elements of Reasoning**

Text in Blue

Indicates the infusion of the **Intellectual Standards**

Text in Green

Indicates the infusion of the **Intellectual Traits**

[Bracketed Text]

Indicates the indirect use of critical thinking *[Elements]*, *[Standards]*, or *[Traits]*

[View more about the Paul-Elder Framework of Critical Thinking](#)

Consistently does all or most of the following:

4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a <i>clear</i> understanding of the assignment’s purpose • Gathers <i>sufficient, credible [Accurate], relevant information</i>: observations, statements, logic, data, facts, questions, graphs, themes, assertions, descriptions, etc.; includes information that opposes as well as supports the argued position • Identifies and <i>accurately</i> explains/uses the relevant key concepts • Follows where evidence and reason in order to obtain <i>defensible, thoughtful, logical conclusions</i> or solutions; makes <i>deep inferences</i> that are consistent with one another
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an understanding of the assignment’s purpose • Gathers <i>sufficient, credible [Accurate], and relevant information</i>; includes some information from opposing views • Identifies and <i>accurately</i> explains and uses the key concepts, but <i>not with the depth and precision</i> of a “4” • Follows where evidence and reason lead to obtain <i>justifiable, logical conclusions</i>; makes <i>valid inferences</i>, but <i>not with the same depth</i> and as a “4”
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is <i>not completely clear</i> about the purpose of the assignment • Gathers <i>some credible [Accurate] information</i>, but not enough; some information may be <i>irrelevant</i>; <i>omits significant information</i>, including some strong counter-arguments • Identifies <i>some</i> (not all) key concepts, but use of concepts is <i>superficial and inaccurate</i> at times • Does follow <i>some evidence</i> to conclusions, but inferences are more often than not <i>unclear, illogical, inconsistent, and/or superficial</i>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Does not clearly understand</i> the purpose of the assignment • Relies on <i>insufficient, irrelevant, or unreliable information</i>; fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, <i>relevant</i> counter-arguments • <i>Misunderstands</i> key concepts or <i>ignores relevant</i> key concepts altogether • Uses <i>superficial, simplistic, or irrelevant</i> reasons and <i>unjustifiable conclusions</i>; makes <i>illogical, inconsistent inferences</i>

*Adapted from the Critical Thinking Grid from the Foundation for Critical Thinking, www.criticalthinking.org