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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Mastering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not attempt</td>
<td>Summarizes issue, though some</td>
<td>Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to or fails to</td>
<td>aspects are incorrect or confused.</td>
<td>embedded, or implicit aspects of the issue. Identifies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify and</td>
<td>Nuances and key details are missing</td>
<td>integral relationships essential to analyzing the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summarize</td>
<td>or glossed over.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

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

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

Comments:

Contexts may include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural/social</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Technological</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Personal Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group, national,</td>
<td>Conceptual, basic science,</td>
<td>Schooling, formal</td>
<td>Trade, business concerns</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Informal character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic behavior/</td>
<td>scientific method</td>
<td>training</td>
<td>costs</td>
<td>science,</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied science,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or governmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Develops, presents, and communicates **OWN** perspective, hypothesis or position.

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Mastering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emerging</strong></td>
<td><strong>Developing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mastering</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emerging</strong></td>
<td><strong>Developing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mastering</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devises issue using <strong>OTHER</strong> (disciplinary) perspectives and positions.</td>
<td>Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis.</td>
<td>Addresses others’ perspectives and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information to qualify analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopts a single idea or limited ideas with little question. If more than one idea is presented, alternatives are not integrated.</td>
<td>Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way.</td>
<td>Fully integrated perspectives from variety of sources; any analogies are used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas.</td>
<td>Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that overstate the conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily.</td>
<td>Integrates own and others’ ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification. Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them.</td>
<td>Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate.</td>
<td>Analysis of other positions is accurate, nuanced, and respectful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

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

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

**Comments:**
7. Communicates effectively.

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

Comments:

Overall Rating

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

Comments: