

Tri-University Critical Thinking Rubric—University of Arizona

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations or Exemplary	Meets Expectations or Proficient	Does Not Meet Expectations or Developing or Emerging
<p>Argumentation (Sound/evident-based reasoning, use of evidence to support ideas, analysis of biases and assumptions, problem-solving)</p>	<p>Specific claims or positions are clearly justified with a comprehensive range of supporting evidence, a longitudinal reasoning, or accepted disciplinary ideas; considers complexities of an issue and other’s point of view and biases.</p>	<p>Specific claims or positions are justified by appealing to relevant supporting evidence; evidence is partially aligned with accepted disciplinary ideas and considers other’s point of view and assumptions.</p>	<p>Claims or positions have little or no justification; Any supporting evidence is minimally consistent with disciplinary ideas and assumptions, and biases are not evidenced; Any structure of reasoning from evidence to conclusion is unclear.</p>
<p>Evaluation of Sources (Analyze, judge, interpret, assumptions/bias, prudence, comprehensive exploration of ideas/concepts)</p>	<p>Extensively or thoroughly demonstrates that the evidence used to develop a comprehensive analysis, synthesis or argument comes from relevant, reliable, and viable sources.</p>	<p>Adequately demonstrates that the evidence used to develop a comprehensive analysis, synthesis or argument comes from relevant, reliable, and viable sources.</p>	<p>Evidence is used definitively without any interpretation/evaluation of assumptions or bias.</p>
<p>Reflective Thinking (Analysis/Interpretation) (Analysis of one’s own assumptions/biases, self-regulated judgment, agency/self-confidence, adaptation)</p>	<p>Thoroughly analyzes and interprets relevant information or evidence with acknowledgement of one’s own influence on values and life experiences; further critically evaluates these biases and their effect on the final evaluation of evidence.</p>	<p>Appropriately analyzes and interprets relevant information or evidence with acknowledgement of one’s own influence on values and life experiences; acknowledges their own biases in the final evaluation of evidence.</p>	<p>Conclusions are drawn quickly, and the relevant evidence is not appropriately analyzed; Effect of one’s own bias and reasoning is not demonstrated.</p>
<p>Meaning-Making (Conclusions and Related Outcomes) (Process/practice of synthesizing, analyzing, evaluating, creating, justifying, integrating, demonstrating, applying)</p>	<p>Effectively connects, integrates and/or synthesizes thoroughly analyzed evidence from a variety of theories, sources, and perspectives in support of an argument, conclusion or view that can be novel or unique.</p>	<p>Connects/integrates evidence that results in conclusions that synthesizes multiple theories, sources and/or perspectives to create a new viewpoint.</p>	<p>Conclusions or viewpoints are weakly or not supported by evidence; does not include analysis from multiple sources or perspectives.</p>
<p>University-Specific criteria Open-Mindedness (Perspective-taking, curiosity, question formulation, nimble, adaptation)</p>	<p>Actively seeks and incorporates multiple perspectives and adaptations to arrive at a position; demonstrates in depth contemplation and value of diverse views and experiences.</p>	<p>Different viewpoint/perspectives are evident; demonstrates some contemplation and value of diverse views and experiences.</p>	<p>Only one perspective/viewpoint is present and taken at face value; no evidence of inquiry or curiosity.</p>