



Association
of American
Colleges and
Universities

Critical Thinking Metarubric First Draft

This rubric is the very first step in a rubric development process that will produce at least three drafts, each responsive to the feedback of those using it to evaluate eportfolios. Please note any concerns or suggestions you have as you use this rubric and report them on the evaluation form.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Influence of context and assumptions	Position presented in absolutes; presumes and projects from ego or socio centric terms; little evidence of own bias Position reveals little awareness of ethical, cultural, political, historical or other contextual assumptions	Position presented tentatively, aware of alternate perspectives & possible fallibility Position reports superficial acknowledgement of contexts	Position presented with adequate summary of an alternative perspective Position reports awareness of assumptions that shape context	Position qualified by internalization of alternative perspectives Position reflects an awareness & considers implications of assumptions that shape context	Position attentive to the way context shapes alternative perspectives Position explores complexity, bias, values; questions assumptions	Position represents clear sense of factors shaping perspective relative to others Position explores complexity, bias, values; questions own and others assumptions and how they create own and others' values
Own Perspective, Hypothesis, or Position	Work contains a discernible position or hypothesis that reflects the student's perspective.	Position or hypothesis is clearly evident, whether stated or implied, with at least one other perspective acknowledged.	A reasonable, clear position or hypothesis is articulated or implied. Important objections are considered with some thought.	Clear and reasonable perspective, position or hypothesis demonstrates some original thinking and qualification. It also acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes, or extends some other views appropriately.	Position or hypothesis is appropriate in scope and clearly articulated. It demonstrates original and integrative thinking and makes a significant effort to engage with alternate perspectives or positions meaningfully.	Position or hypothesis is precise, original, and sophisticated, demonstrating serious engagement with the topic. Contrary views are convincingly handled or integrated, suggesting a fair-minded and highly rational approach to complex issues or problems.
Explanation of Issues	Problem/issue relevant to a different situation identified	Problem/issue relevant to situation stated	Problem/issue relevant to situation stated and partially described	Problem/issue relevant to situation in context clearly stated	Problem/issue identified and subsidiary, embedded or implicit aspects of the problem/issue are partially identified	Problem/issue identified and subsidiary, embedded or implicit aspects of the problem/issue are identified and clearly stated
Implications, Conclusions, and Consequences	Does not identify implications, conclusions, or consequences of the argument or viewpoint, and/or infers implications, conclusions, etc. that are not supported by the evidence.	Suggests some implications, conclusions, or consequences of the argument or viewpoint, but without clear reference to context, assumptions, or evidence; infers implications, conclusions, etc. that are unsupported or weakly supported by the evidence.	Identifies some but not all implications, conclusions, and consequences of the argument or viewpoint, but with only cursory references to context, assumptions, and data; correctly infers some but not all implications, conclusions, etc. from the evidence cited.	Identifies most but not all implications, conclusions, or consequences of the argument or viewpoint, considering most relevant assumptions, contexts, and data; correctly infers most but not all implications, conclusions, etc. from the evidence cited.	Clearly identifies and briefly discusses implications, conclusions, or consequences of the argument or viewpoint, considering, with minor omissions, relevant assumptions, contexts, and data; correctly infers, with only minor lapses, implications, conclusions, etc. from the evidence cited.	Clearly identifies and thoroughly discusses implications, conclusions, or consequences of the argument or viewpoint, considering, all relevant assumptions, contexts, and data; correctly infers implications, conclusions, etc. from the evidence cited.
Investigation of Evidence	Little evidence of information need identification, search, selection, source evaluation & source attribution (citations). Opinion mostly unsubstantiated and little distinguishes fact from opinion and value judgment.	Information need somewhat ill defined; source selection appears random or perhaps convenient, in a single mode (text or video); appears to repeat information without question or dismiss evidence without justification. Source attribution adequate in form but only lists references. Seeks to verify information, but capitulates to single authority.	Information need meets task purpose and suggests engagement with issues. Source selection takes few risks; but key attributes of evidence, regardless of mode, are qualified & balanced. Sources selected mostly align with the information need; quotes and summaries of sources align with topic(s).	Information need exceeds and expands task purposed; clearly engaged with issues. Source selection integrates multiple media modes and disciplines; evidence acutely qualified and balanced, regardless of mode. Sources meet information needs; use of quotes and summaries of sources align with and forward analysis.	Persuasive identification of interesting & salient information; search explores primary and interesting sources from multiple disciplines and media modes. Strong evidence of visual, textual, scientific and symbolic source evaluation skills & clear integration of evidence. Sources are scrutinized for accuracy, bias (including selection bias), and relevance and marshaled to elaborate and forward the analysis.	Pertinent, creative & persuasive identification of information; evidence of search clearly discerns primary from tertiary sources in multiple media modes; cogent source evaluation skills across multiple literacies; notable identification & creative integration of resources. Evidence and sources of evidence are examined for bias, relevance and deepen analysis.