



# Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking for ePortfolios Washington State University, Fall 2006

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

- a) circling specific phrases which describe the work, and writing comments
- b) circling a numeric score for each criteria

1. Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the **challenge(s) or question(s) represented in the portfolio.**

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Does not attempt to or fails to clearly identify and summarize the challenge(s) or question(s) addressed in the portfolio.		Summarizes the challenge(s)/question(s), though some aspects may be unclear. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over.		Clearly identifies the challenge(s)/question(s), and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the challenge. Identifies integral relationships essential to analyzing the challenge(s)/ question(s).	
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Approach to the challenge(s)/ question(s) is in egocentric or socio-centric terms. Does not relate challenge to other contexts (cultural, political, historical, etc.).		Presents and explores relevant contexts and assumptions regarding the challenge(s)/question(s), although in a limited way.		Analyzes the challenge(s)/question(s) 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 challenge.	
<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.

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
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 challenge, 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.	
Little or no risk-taking, lacks exploration.		May remain within "safe" or predictable parameters.		May explore ideas that stretch conventional parameters; includes innovative thinking, questioning or risk-taking.	
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Evidence selected is random and unconnected to the purpose of the portfolio, or fails to convincingly demonstrate that learning has taken place in the way that the author claims.		Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating material, but it may fail to fully capture the learning experiences. Limited variation in the kinds of evidence or multiple variations of evidence, but with little integration.		The evidence presented is compelling, varied, well integrated and connected to the purpose of the portfolio. The evidence chosen communicates different stages of learning clearly (e.g., an engineering log book; a video capturing the creation of an art piece from beginning to end; revisions of a paper or composition; different stylistic versions of a song, etc.)	
Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification. Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments.		Use of evidence is qualified and selective.		Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.	
Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and ideas out of sequence.		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.	
Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic.		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.	
		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 challenge using **OTHER** (disciplinary) **perspectives and positions**.

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
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 discomfoting ideas. Ignores or incorporates feedback with no justification</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 or incorporate alternative views or feedback with limited justification.</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 and feedback 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**.

<i>Emerging</i>		<i>Developing</i>		<i>Mastering</i>	
1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>Fails to identify conclusions, implications and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary.</p>		<p>Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond the original challenge(s)/question(s) addressed in the portfolio. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.</p>		<p>Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance.</p>	

Conclusions presented as absolute, and may attribute conclusion to external authority.	Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may include vague reference to conclusions.	Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications are clearly developed and consider ambiguities.
--	---	---

**Comments:**

7. Effectively communicates the author’s learning growth in regards to the challenge(s)/question(s) addressed in the portfolio.

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

**Comments:**