

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Rubric

Ability to recognize and define a question or issue, integrate and analyze relevant data and resources, and engage in creating and implementing innovative ideas to achieve the most effective conclusion or resolution.

Critical Thinking Skills and Dispositions

- Interpreting
- Analyzing
- Evaluating
- Inferring
- Explaining
- Self-Regulation
- Approaching Life and Living in General
- Approaches to Specific Issues, Questions, or Answers

	Dimensions; Other Rubrics	Beginning 1	Developing 2	Accomplished 3	Exemplary 4	Score
	<p>[Also see Critical Thinking and Problem Solving” Rubrics from the following organizations and universities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric •AAC&U Problem Solving Value Rubric •Boise State University Problem Solving Rubric •Foundation for Critical Thinking QEP Critical Thinking Rubric •Lane Community College Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Rubric •Lawrence Technological University Critical Thinking Rubric •Northeastern Illinois University 					

<p>Critical Thinking Rubric</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rollins College Critical Thinking Rubric •Rollins College Problem Solving Rubric •Texas A&M University Critical Thinking Rubric •UNC Wilmington Critical Thinking Rubric •University of Northern Iowa Critical Thinking Rubric •Washington State University Critical Thinking Rubric •Washington State University Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric] 					
<p>[Also see “Creative Thinking” rubrics from other organizations and universities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •AAC&U Creative Thinking Value Rubric] 					
<p>[Also see “Inquiry and Analysis” rubrics from other organizations and universities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric •Clemson University Analytical Skills Rubric] 					

<p>Critical Thinking (CT) Skills: Interpreting</p>	<p>Categorizing, Decoding Significance, Clarifying Meaning (comprehending and expressing the meaning or significance of a wide variety of experiences, situations, data, events, judgments, conventions, beliefs, rules, procedures, or criteria)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Never develops categories, distinctions, or frameworks for understanding, describing or characterizing information •Never describes experiences, situations, beliefs, and events so that they become understandable in terms of appropriate categories or frameworks •Never decodes significance of information, intentions, motives, purposes, values, views, rules, procedures, criteria, or inferred relationships between things •Never decodes significance of language, behaviors, drawings, numbers, graphs, tables, charts, signs and symbols used to express items listed in the bulleted point above •Never paraphrases or clarifies using specifications, descriptions, analogies, or symbolic expressions •Never scrutinizes and interprets meanings conveyed through 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rarely develops categories, distinctions, or frameworks for understanding, describing or characterizing information •Rarely describes experiences, situations, beliefs, and events so that they become understandable in terms of appropriate categories or frameworks •Rarely decodes significance of information, intentions, motives, purposes, values, views, rules, procedures, criteria, or inferred relationships between things •Rarely decodes significance of language, behaviors, drawings, numbers, graphs, tables, charts, signs and symbols used to express items listed in the bulleted point above •Rarely paraphrases or clarifies using specifications, descriptions, analogies, or symbolic expressions •Rarely scrutinizes and interprets meanings conveyed through 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Sometimes develops categories, distinctions, or frameworks for understanding, describing or characterizing information •Sometimes describes experiences, situations, beliefs, and events so that they become understandable in terms of appropriate categories or frameworks •Sometimes decodes significance of information, intentions, motives, purposes, values, views, rules, procedures, criteria, or inferred relationships between things •Sometimes decodes significance of language, behaviors, drawings, numbers, graphs, tables, charts, signs and symbols used to express items listed in the bulleted point above •Sometimes paraphrases or clarifies using specifications, descriptions, analogies, or symbolic expressions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Almost always develops categories, distinctions, or frameworks for understanding, describing or characterizing information •Almost always describes experiences, situations, beliefs, and events so that they become understandable in terms of appropriate categories or frameworks •Almost always decodes significance of information, intentions, motives, purposes, values, views, rules, procedures, criteria, or inferred relationships between things •Almost always decodes significance of language, behaviors, drawings, numbers, graphs, tables, charts, signs and symbols used to express items listed in the bulleted point above •Almost always paraphrases or clarifies using specifications, descriptions, analogies, or symbolic expressions •Almost always
--	---	---	---	--	--

words, ideas, concepts, statements, behaviors, drawings, numbers, signs, charts, graphs, symbols, rules, events or ceremonies
•Never paraphrases or clarifies to remove confusion, unintended vagueness, or ambiguity

words, ideas, concepts, statements, behaviors, drawings, numbers, signs, charts, graphs, symbols, rules, events or ceremonies
•Rarely paraphrases or clarifies to remove confusion, unintended vagueness, or ambiguity

expressions
•Sometimes scrutinizes and interprets meanings conveyed through words, ideas, concepts, statements, behaviors, drawings, numbers, signs, charts, graphs, symbols, rules, events or ceremonies
•Sometimes paraphrases or clarifies to remove confusion, unintended vagueness, or ambiguity

scrutinizes and interprets meanings conveyed through words, ideas, concepts, statements, behaviors, drawings, numbers, signs, charts, graphs, symbols, rules, events or ceremonies
•Almost always paraphrases or clarifies to remove confusion, unintended vagueness, or ambiguity

CT Skills:
Analyzing

Examining Ideas, Detecting Arguments, Analyzing Arguments (identifying the intended and actual inferential relationships among statements, questions, concepts, descriptions or other forms of representation intended to express beliefs, judgments, experiences, reasons, information, or opinions)

- Never determines the role statements or explanations play in the context of argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Never defines terms used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Never compares or contrasts ideas, concepts, or statements used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Never identifies issues or problems and determines their component parts
- Never identifies the relationships of component parts to each other and to the whole
- Never determines whether a set of statements or descriptions expresses reasons that support or contest claims, opinions, or points of view
- Never identifies and differentiates reasons for the main conclusion
- Never identifies or differentiates reasons for assumptions supporting the main conclusion
- Never identifies or differentiates the overall structure of the

- Rarely determines the role statements or explanations play in the context of argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Rarely defines terms used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Rarely compares or contrasts ideas, concepts, or statements used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Rarely identifies issues or problems and determines their component parts
- Rarely identifies the relationships of component parts to each other and to the whole
- Rarely determines whether a set of statements or descriptions expresses reasons that support or contest claims, opinions, or points of view
- Rarely identifies and differentiates reasons for the main conclusion
- Rarely identifies or differentiates reasons for assumptions supporting the main conclusion
- Rarely identifies or differentiates the overall structure of the

- Sometimes determines the role statements or explanations play in the context of argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Sometimes defines terms used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Sometimes compares or contrasts ideas, concepts, or statements used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Sometimes identifies issues or problems and determines their component parts
- Sometimes identifies the relationships of component parts to each other and to the whole
- Sometimes determines whether a set of statements or descriptions expresses reasons that support or contest claims, opinions, or points of view
- Sometimes identifies and differentiates reasons for the main conclusion
- Sometimes identifies or differentiates reasons for assumptions supporting the main conclusion
- Sometimes identifies or differentiates the overall structure of the

- Almost always determines the role statements or explanations play in the context of argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Almost always defines terms used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Almost always compares or contrasts ideas, concepts, or statements used in argument, reasoning, or persuasion
- Almost always identifies issues or problems and determines their component parts
- Almost always identifies the relationships of component parts to each other and to the whole
- Almost always determines whether a set of statements or descriptions expresses reasons that support or contest claims, opinions, or points of view
- Almost always identifies and differentiates reasons for the main conclusion
- Almost always identifies or differentiates reasons for assumptions supporting the main conclusion
- Almost always

argument or intended chain or reasoning
•Never identifies or differentiates unexpressed elements of reasoning such as intermediary conclusions, unstated assumptions, or presuppositions
•Never identifies or differentiates items being examined which are not intended to be taken as part of the reasoning

argument or intended chain or reasoning
•Rarely identifies or differentiates unexpressed elements of reasoning such as intermediary conclusions, unstated assumptions, or presuppositions
•Rarely identifies or differentiates items being examined which are not intended to be taken as part of the reasoning

supporting the main conclusion
•Sometimes identifies or differentiates the overall structure of the argument or intended chain or reasoning
•Sometimes identifies or differentiates unexpressed elements of reasoning such as intermediary conclusions, unstated assumptions, or presuppositions
•Sometimes identifies or differentiates items being examined which are not intended to be taken as part of the reasoning

identifies or differentiates the overall structure of the argument or intended chain or reasoning
•Almost always identifies or differentiates unexpressed elements of reasoning such as intermediary conclusions, unstated assumptions, or presuppositions
•Almost always identifies or differentiates items being examined which are not intended to be taken as part of the reasoning

CT Skills:
Evaluating

Assessing Claims, Assessing Arguments (assessing the credibility of statements or other representations which are accounts or descriptions of a person's perception, experience, situation, judgment, belief, or opinion; and assessing the logical strength of the actual or intended inferential relationships among statements, descriptions, questions or other forms of representation)

- Never recognizes factors relevant to assessing credibility of information or opinion sources
- Never assesses the relevance of questions, information, principles, rules, or procedural directions
- Never assesses the level of confidence to place in the credibility or truthfulness of experiences, situations, judgments, beliefs, or opinions
- Never judges whether an argument's assumptions supports accepting conclusions as partially or fully true
- Never raises questions or objections to assess whether there are significant weaknesses in the argument being evaluated
- Never determines whether an argument relies on false or doubtful assumptions
- Never determines how false or doubtful assumptions affect the strength

- Rarely recognizes factors relevant to assessing credibility of information or opinion sources
- Rarely assesses the relevance of questions, information, principles, rules, or procedural directions
- Rarely assesses the level of confidence to place in the credibility or truthfulness of experiences, situations, judgments, beliefs, or opinions
- Rarely judges whether an argument's assumptions supports accepting conclusions as partially or fully true
- Rarely raises questions or objections to assess whether there are significant weaknesses in the argument being evaluated
- Rarely determines whether an argument relies on false or doubtful assumptions
- Rarely determines how false or doubtful assumptions affect the strength

- Sometimes recognizes factors relevant to assessing credibility of information or opinion sources
- Sometimes assesses the relevance of questions, information, principles, rules, or procedural directions
- Sometimes assesses the level of confidence to place in the credibility or truthfulness of experiences, situations, judgments, beliefs, or opinions
- Sometimes judges whether an argument's assumptions supports accepting conclusions as partially or fully true
- Sometimes raises questions or objections to assess whether there are significant weaknesses in the argument being evaluated
- Sometimes determines whether an argument relies on false or doubtful assumptions
- Sometimes determines how false or doubtful assumptions

- Almost always recognizes factors relevant to assessing credibility of information or opinion sources
- Almost always assesses the relevance of questions, information, principles, rules, or procedural directions
- Almost always assesses the level of confidence to place in the credibility or truthfulness of experiences, situations, judgments, beliefs, or opinions
- Almost always judges whether an argument's assumptions supports accepting conclusions as partially or fully true
- Almost always raises questions or objections to assess whether there are significant weaknesses in the argument being evaluated
- Almost always determines whether an argument relies on false or doubtful assumptions
- Almost always determines how false or doubtful assumptions

of the argument
•Never judges between reasonable and incorrect or misleading assumptions
•Never judges the strength of an argument with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Never judges the strength of an argument's intended or unintended consequences with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Never determines the extent to which possible additional information might strengthen or weaken an argument

of the argument
•Rarely judges between reasonable and incorrect or misleading assumptions
•Rarely judges the strength of an argument with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Rarely judges the strength of an argument's intended or unintended consequences with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Rarely determines the extent to which possible additional information might strengthen or weaken an argument

affect the strength of the argument
•Sometimes judges between reasonable and incorrect or misleading assumptions
•Sometimes judges the strength of an argument with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Sometimes judges the strength of an argument's intended or unintended consequences with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Sometimes determines the extent to which possible additional information might strengthen or weaken an argument

affect the strength of the argument
•Almost always judges between reasonable and incorrect or misleading assumptions
•Almost always judges the strength of an argument with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Almost always judges the strength of an argument's intended or unintended consequences with a view toward determining whether it is acceptable or not
•Almost always determines the extent to which possible additional information might strengthen or weaken an argument

CT Skills:
Inferring

<p>Querying Evidence, Conjecturing Alternatives, Drawing Conclusions (identifying and securing elements needed to draw reasonable conclusions; to form conjectures and hypotheses; considering relevant information and inferring the consequences flowing from data, statements, principles, evidence, judgments, beliefs, opinions, concepts, descriptions, questions, or other forms of representation)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Never recognizes assumptions which support a strategy for gathering information used to draw conclusions •Never judges information used to decide the acceptability of a question, issue, theory, hypothesis, or statement •Never determines whether strategies used to investigate are credible •Never formulates multiple alternatives for resolving a problem by creating hypothetical possibilities related to a question, event, or goal •Never projects the range of possible consequences of decisions, positions, policies, theories, or beliefs •Never applies appropriate modes of inference in determining what position, opinion, or point of view one should take on a given matter or issue •Never deduces inferential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rarely recognizes assumptions which support a strategy for gathering information used to draw conclusions •Rarely judges information used to decide the acceptability of a question, issue, theory, hypothesis, or statement •Rarely determines whether strategies used to investigate are credible •Rarely formulates multiple alternatives for resolving a problem by creating hypothetical possibilities related to a question, event, or goal •Rarely projects the range of possible consequences of decisions, positions, policies, theories, or beliefs •Rarely applies appropriate modes of inference in determining what position, opinion, or point of view one should take on a given matter or issue •Rarely deduces inferential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Sometimes recognizes assumptions which support a strategy for gathering information used to draw conclusions •Sometimes judges information used to decide the acceptability of a question, issue, theory, hypothesis, or statement •Sometimes determines whether strategies used to investigate are credible •Sometimes formulates multiple alternatives for resolving a problem by creating hypothetical possibilities related to a question, event, or goal •Sometimes projects the range of possible consequences of decisions, positions, policies, theories, or beliefs •Sometimes applies appropriate modes of inference in determining what position, opinion, or point of view one should take on a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Almost always recognizes assumptions which support a strategy for gathering information used to draw conclusions •Almost always judges information used to decide the acceptability of a question, issue, theory, hypothesis, or statement •Almost always determines whether strategies used to investigate are credible •Almost always formulates multiple alternatives for resolving a problem by creating hypothetical possibilities related to a question, event, or goal •Almost always projects the range of possible consequences of decisions, positions, policies, theories, or beliefs •Almost always applies appropriate modes of inference in determining what position, opinion, or point of view one should take on a given matter or issue
--	---	--	---	---

relationships and consequences or the presumptions which they support
•Never employs analogic, arithmetic, dialectic, or scientific reasons to determine which of several possible conclusions is most strongly warranted or supported by the evidence at hand, or which should be rejected or regarded as less plausible by the information given

relationships and consequences or the presumptions which they support
•Rarely employs analogic, arithmetic, dialectic, or scientific reasons to determine which of several possible conclusions is most strongly warranted or supported by the evidence at hand, or which should be rejected or regarded as less plausible by the information given

given matter or issue
•Sometimes deduces inferential relationships and consequences or the presumptions which they support
•Sometimes employs analogic, arithmetic, dialectic, or scientific reasons to determine which of several possible conclusions is most strongly warranted or supported by the evidence at hand, or which should be rejected or regarded as less plausible by the information given

•Almost always deduces inferential relationships and consequences or the presumptions which they support
•Almost always employs analogic, arithmetic, dialectic, or scientific reasons to determine which of several possible conclusions is most strongly warranted or supported by the evidence at hand, or which should be rejected or regarded as less plausible by the information given

CT Skills:
Explaining

<p>Stating Results, Justifying Procedures, Presenting Arguments (stating the results of one's reasoning; justifying that reasoning in terms of the evidential, conceptual, methodological, criteriological and contextual considerations upon which one's results were based; and presenting one's reasoning in the form of cogent arguments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Never produces accurate statements, descriptions, or representations of the results of one's reasoning •Never analyzes, evaluates, infers from, or monitors the results of one's reasoning •Never presents evidence, concepts, methods, criteria, and contexts used in forming one's interpretations, analyses, evaluations, or inferences •Never records, evaluates, describes, or justifies processes to remedy perceived deficiencies •Never gives reasons for accepting some claim •Never meets objections about the appropriateness of inferential, analytical, or evaluative judgments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rarely produces accurate statements, descriptions, or representations of the results of one's reasoning •Rarely analyzes, evaluates, infers from, or monitors the results of one's reasoning •Rarely presents evidence, concepts, methods, criteria, and contexts used in forming one's interpretations, analyses, evaluations, or inferences •Rarely records, evaluates, describes, or justifies processes to remedy perceived deficiencies •Rarely gives reasons for accepting some claim •Rarely meets objections about the appropriateness of inferential, analytical, or evaluative judgments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Sometimes produces accurate statements, descriptions, or representations of the results of one's reasoning •Sometimes analyzes, evaluates, infers from, or monitors the results of one's reasoning •Sometimes presents evidence, concepts, methods, criteria, and contexts used in forming one's interpretations, analyses, evaluations, or inferences •Sometimes records, evaluates, describes, or justifies processes to remedy perceived deficiencies •Sometimes gives reasons for accepting some claim •Sometimes meets objections about the appropriateness of inferential, analytical, or evaluative judgments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Almost always produces accurate statements, descriptions, or representations of the results of one's reasoning •Almost always analyzes, evaluates, infers from, or monitors the results of one's reasoning •Almost always presents evidence, concepts, methods, criteria, and contexts used in forming one's interpretations, analyses, evaluations, or inferences •Almost always records, evaluates, describes, or justifies processes to remedy perceived deficiencies •Almost always gives reasons for accepting some claim •Almost always meets objections about the appropriateness of inferential, analytical, or evaluative judgments
---	--	--	--	--

CT Skills: Self-Regulation

Self-Examining, Self-Correcting (self-consciously monitoring one's cognitive activities, the elements used in those activities, and the results

educated, particularly by applying skills in analysis and evaluation to one's own inferential judgments with a view toward questioning, confirming, validating, or correcting either one's reasoning or one's results)

•Never reflects on one's own reasoning verifying both results and application and execution of cognitive skills involved
•Never makes an objective and thoughtful self-assessment of one's opinions and reasons for holding them
•Never judges the extent to which one's thinking is influenced by deficiencies in one's knowledge, or by stereotypes, prejudices, emotions, or other factors which constrain objectivity or rationality
•Never reflects on one's motivations, values, attitudes, and interests to determine if one has endeavored to be unbiased, fair-minded, thorough, objective, respectful of the truth, reasonable, and rational in one's analyses, interpretations, evaluations, inferences, or expressions
•Never designs reasonable procedures to remedy or correct, if possible, mistakes and their causes

•Rarely reflects on one's own reasoning verifying both results and application and execution of cognitive skills involved
•Rarely makes an objective and thoughtful self-assessment of one's opinions and reasons for holding them
•Rarely judges the extent to which one's thinking is influenced by deficiencies in one's knowledge, or by stereotypes, prejudices, emotions, or other factors which constrain objectivity or rationality
•Rarely reflects on one's motivations, values, attitudes, and interests to determine if one has endeavored to be unbiased, fair-minded, thorough, objective, respectful of the truth, reasonable, and rational in one's analyses, interpretations, evaluations, inferences, or expressions
•Rarely designs reasonable procedures to remedy or correct, if possible, mistakes

•Never reflects on one's own reasoning verifying both results and application and execution of cognitive skills involved
•Never makes an objective and thoughtful self-assessment of one's opinions and reasons for holding them
•Never judges the extent to which one's thinking is influenced by deficiencies in one's knowledge, or by stereotypes, prejudices, emotions, or other factors which constrain objectivity or rationality
•Never reflects on one's motivations, values, attitudes, and interests to determine if one has endeavored to be unbiased, fair-minded, thorough, objective, respectful of the truth, reasonable, and rational in one's analyses, interpretations, evaluations, inferences, or expressions
•Never designs reasonable procedures to remedy or correct, if possible, mistakes

•Never reflects on one's own reasoning verifying both results and application and execution of cognitive skills involved
•Never makes an objective and thoughtful self-assessment of one's opinions and reasons for holding them
•Never judges the extent to which one's thinking is influenced by deficiencies in one's knowledge, or by stereotypes, prejudices, emotions, or other factors which constrain objectivity or rationality
•Never reflects on one's motivations, values, attitudes, and interests to determine if one has endeavored to be unbiased, fair-minded, thorough, objective, respectful of the truth, reasonable, and rational in one's analyses, interpretations, evaluations, inferences, or expressions
•Never designs reasonable procedures to remedy or correct, if possible, mistakes and their causes

revealed through
self-examination

and their causes
revealed through
self-examination

possible,
mistakes and
their causes
revealed through
self-examination

revealed through
self-examination

Critical Thinking (CT)
 Dispositions:
 Approaching Life
 and Living in
 General

- Is never concerned with becoming and remaining well-informed with regard to a wide range of issues
- Is never alert to opportunities to use critical thinking
- Never trusts in the processes of reasoned inquiry
- Never has self-confidence in one's own ability to reason
- Never possesses open-mindedness regarding divergent world views
- Never has flexibility in considering alternatives and opinions
- Is never understanding of the opinions of others
- Is never fair-minded in appraising reasoning
- Never has honesty in facing one's own biases, prejudices, stereotypes, and egocentric and sociocentric tendencies
- Never exercises prudence in suspending, making, or altering judgments
- Never has willingness to reconsider and revise views where honest

- Is rarely concerned with becoming and remaining well-informed with regard to a wide range of issues
- Is rarely alert to opportunities to use critical thinking
- Rarely trusts in the processes of reasoned inquiry
- Rarely has self-confidence in one's own ability to reason
- Rarely possesses open-mindedness regarding divergent world views
- Rarely has flexibility in considering alternatives and opinions
- Is rarely understanding of the opinions of others
- Is rarely fair-minded in appraising reasoning
- Rarely has honesty in facing one's own biases, prejudices, stereotypes, and egocentric and sociocentric tendencies
- Rarely exercises prudence in suspending, making, or altering judgments
- Rarely has willingness to reconsider and revise views where honest

- Is sometimes concerned with becoming and remaining well-informed with regard to a wide range of issues
- Is sometimes alert to opportunities to use critical thinking
- Sometimes trusts in the processes of reasoned inquiry
- Sometimes has self-confidence in one's own ability to reason
- Sometimes possesses open-mindedness regarding divergent world views
- Sometimes has flexibility in considering alternatives and opinions
- Is sometimes understanding of the opinions of others
- Is sometimes fair-minded in appraising reasoning
- Sometimes has honesty in facing one's own biases, prejudices, stereotypes, and egocentric and sociocentric tendencies
- Sometimes exercises prudence in suspending, making, or altering judgments

- Is almost always concerned with becoming and remaining well-informed with regard to a wide range of issues
- Is almost always never alert to opportunities to use critical thinking
- Almost always trusts in the processes of reasoned inquiry
- Almost always has self-confidence in one's own ability to reason
- Almost always possesses open-mindedness regarding divergent world views
- Almost always has flexibility in considering alternatives and opinions
- Is almost always understanding of the opinions of others
- Is almost always fair-minded in appraising reasoning
- Almost always has honesty in facing one's own biases, prejudices, stereotypes, and egocentric and sociocentric tendencies
- Almost always exercises prudence in suspending, making, or altering judgments

		reflection suggests that change is warranted	reflection suggests that change is warranted	•Sometimes has willingness to reconsider and revise views where honest reflection suggests that change is warranted	•Almost always has willingness to reconsider and revise views where honest reflection suggests that change is warranted
CT Dispositions: Approaches to Specific Issues, Questions, or Problems		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Never has clarity in stating the question or concern •Never possesses orderliness in working with complexity •Never has diligence in seeking relevant information •Never exercises reasonableness in selecting and applying criteria •Never exercises care in focusing attention on the concern at hand •Never has persistence when difficulties are encountered •Never has precision to the degree permitted by the subject and circumstance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rarely has clarity in stating the question or concern •Rarely possesses orderliness in working with complexity •Rarely has diligence in seeking relevant information •Rarely exercises reasonableness in selecting and applying criteria •Rarely exercises care in focusing attention on the concern at hand •Rarely has persistence when difficulties are encountered •Rarely has precision to the degree permitted by the subject and circumstance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Sometimes has clarity in stating the question or concern •Sometimes possesses orderliness in working with complexity •Sometimes has diligence in seeking relevant information •Sometimes exercises reasonableness in selecting and applying criteria •Sometimes exercises care in focusing attention on the concern at hand •Sometimes has persistence when difficulties are encountered •Sometimes has precision to the degree permitted by the subject and circumstance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Almost always has clarity in stating the question or concern •Almost always possesses orderliness in working with complexity •Almost always has diligence in seeking relevant information •Almost always exercises reasonableness in selecting and applying criteria •Almost always exercises care in focusing attention on the concern at hand •Almost always has persistence when difficulties are encountered •Almost always has precision to the degree permitted by the subject and circumstance

Critical thinking portions of this rubric derived from *Critical Thinking: A Statement of Expert Consensus for Purposes of Educational Assessment and Instruction* by Peter Facione, 1989
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242279575_Critical_Thinking_A_Statement_of_Expert_Consensus_for_Purposes_of_Educational_Assessment_and_Instruction