

# Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking

## Washington State University, Fall 2006

From <http://wsuctproject.wsu.edu/ctr.htm>

For each of the seven criteria below, assess the work by:

- a) circling specific phrases that describe the work, and writing comments
- b) circling a numeric score

Note: A score of 4 represents competency for a student graduating from WSU.

**1. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the **problem, question, or issue.****

<i><b>Emerging</b></i>		<i><b>Developing</b></i>		<i><b>Mastering</b></i>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize accurately.		Summarizes issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over.		Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the issue. Identifies integral relationships essential to analyzing the issue.	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**2. Identifies and considers the influence of **context \*** and **assumptions.****

<i><b>Emerging</b></i>		<i><b>Developing</b></i>		<i><b>Mastering</b></i>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Approach to the issue is in egocentric or socio-centric terms. Does not relate issue to other contexts (cultural, political, historical, etc.).		Presents and explores relevant contexts and assumptions regarding the issue, although in a limited way.		Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of audience. Considers other integral contexts.	
Analysis is grounded in absolutes, with little acknowledgment of own biases.		Analysis includes some outside verification, but primarily relies on established authorities.		Analysis acknowledges complexity and bias of vantage and values, although may elect to hold to bias in context.	
Does not recognize context or surface assumptions and underlying ethical implications, or does so superficially.		Provides some recognition of context and consideration of assumptions and their implications.		Identifies influence of context and questions assumptions, addressing ethical dimensions underlying the issue.	
<b>Comments:</b>					

Contexts may include:

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

**3. Develops, presents, and communicates OWN perspective, hypothesis or position.**

<b>Emerging</b>		<b>Developing</b>		<b>Mastering</b>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration.		Position includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects may have been adopted.		Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition.	
Addresses a single source or view of the argument, failing to clarify the established position relative to one's own.		Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistently.		Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, drawing support from experience, and information not available from assigned sources.	
Fails to present and justify own opinion or forward hypothesis.		Presents and justifies own position without addressing other views, or does so superficially.		Clearly presents and justifies own view or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations.	
Position or hypothesis is unclear or simplistic.		Position or hypothesis is generally clear, although gaps may exist.		Position or hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated, integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout.	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**4. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence.**

<b>Emerging</b>		<b>Developing</b>		<b>Mastering</b>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
No evidence of search, selection or source evaluation skills.		Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.		Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources.	
Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification.		Use of evidence is qualified and selective.		Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.	
Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments.		Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize bias in evidence, although attribution is inappropriate.		Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias.	
Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and ideas out of sequence.		Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may be flawed.		Correlations are distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Sequence of presentation reflects clear organization of ideas, subordinating for importance and impact.	
Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic.		Appropriate data/evidence or sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine.		Information need is clearly defined and integrated to meet and exceed assignment, course or personal interests.	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**5. Integrates issue using OTHER (disciplinary) perspectives and positions.**

<b>Emerging</b>		<b>Developing</b>		<b>Mastering</b>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss others' perspectives.</p> <p>Adopts a single idea or limited ideas with little question. If more than one idea is presented, alternatives are not integrated.</p> <p>Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas.</p> <p>Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them.</p> <p>Little integration of perspectives and little or no evidence of attending to others' views. No evidence of reflection or self-assessment.</p>		<p>Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis.</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 overstate the conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily.</p> <p>Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate.</p> <p>Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing. Some evidence of reflection and/or self-assessment.</p>		<p>Addresses others' perspectives and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information to qualify analysis.</p> <p>Fully integrated perspectives from variety of sources; any analogies are used effectively.</p> <p>Integrates own and others' ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification. Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others.</p> <p>Analysis of other positions is accurate, nuanced, and respectful.</p> <p>Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological ways of knowing. Connects to career and civic responsibilities. Evidence of reflection and self-assessment.</p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>					

**6. Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications, and consequences.**

<b>Emerging</b>		<b>Developing</b>		<b>Mastering</b>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary.</p> <p>Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority.</p>		<p>Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.</p> <p>Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions.</p>		<p>Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance.</p> <p>Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed, and consider ambiguities.</p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>					

## 7. Communicates effectively.

<b>Emerging</b>		<b>Developing</b>		<b>Mastering</b>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>In many places, language obscures meaning.</p> <p>Grammar, syntax, or other errors are distracting or repeated. Little evidence of proofreading. Style is inconsistent or inappropriate.</p> <p>Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent or distracting.</p> <p>Few sources are cited or used correctly.</p>		<p>In general, language does not interfere with communication.</p> <p>Errors are not distracting or frequent, although there may be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice.</p> <p>Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Format is appropriate although at times inconsistent.</p> <p>Most sources are cited and used correctly.</p>		<p>Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. May at times be nuanced and eloquent.</p> <p>Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience.</p> <p>Organization is clear; transitions between ideas enhance presentation. Consistent use of appropriate format. Few problems with other components of presentation.</p> <p>All sources are cited and used correctly, demonstrating understanding of economic, legal and social issues involved with the use of information.</p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>					

## Overall Rating

	Criteria	Score
1.	Identify problem, question, or issue	
2.	Consider context and assumptions	
3.	Develop own position or hypothesis	
4.	Present and analyze supporting data	
5.	Integrate other perspectives	
6.	Identify conclusions and implications	
7.	Communicate effectively	
<p>Comments:</p>		