



Center for Teaching, Learning, & Technology

[Contact Us](#) | [Help Desk](#)



[Printable Version](#)



WSU's Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric

Emerging	Developing			Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6

1 Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the **problem/question/work assignment**

This dimension focuses on task or issue identification, including subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of an issue and the relationships integral to effective analysis. [Expand](#)

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

This dimension focuses on scope and context, and considers the audience of the analysis. Context includes recognition of the relative nature of context and assumptions, the reflective challenges in addressing this complexity and bias, including the way ethics are shaped by context and shape assumptions. [Expand](#)

3 Develops, and communicates **OWN perspective, hypothesis or position**.

This dimension focuses on ownership of an issue, indicated by the justification and advancement of an original view or hypothesis, recognition of own bias, and skill at qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations. [Expand](#)

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

This dimension focuses on evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills—including accuracy, relevance and completeness. High scores provide evidence of bias recognition, causality, and effective organization. [Expand](#)

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

This dimension focuses on the treatment of diverse perspectives, effective interpretation and integration of contrary views and evidence through the reflective and nuanced judgment and justification. [Expand](#)

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

This dimension focuses on integrating previous dimensions and extending them as they explicitly and implicitly resolve in consequences. Well developed conclusions do more than summarize. They establish new directions for consideration in light of context and the breadth and depth of the evidence. [Expand](#)

7 **Communicates** effectively.

This dimension focuses on the presentation. If written, it is organized effectively, cited correctly; the language use is clear and effective, errors are minimal, and the style and format are appropriate for the audience. [Expand](#)

NEW CRITICAL & INTEGRATIVE THINKING RUBRIC, FALL 2006

In the past two years, educators across the institution have begun developing a Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric, to highlight the importance of integrating ideas and perspectives across traditional boundaries of viewpoint, practice, and discipline. Within the General Studies program, faculty from General Education, History, English, General Studies, Comparative Ethnic Studies, and Career Services, as well as assessment specialists from the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, worked together to adapt the WSU Critical Thinking Rubric.

CHANGES TO THE RUBRIC

The new Critical and Integrative Thinking Rubric makes some significant changes to the previous version of the WSU critical thinking rubric:

Each dimension identifies and describes criteria for three stages: emerging, developing, and mastering (rather than for two stages in the Critical Thinking Rubric). This change helps make visible different stages and skills in each dimension, revealing a continuum rather than a divide, providing a more educative and nuanced approach than a dualistic system can offer.

Communication skills have been added as a new dimension (dimension 7) even though they are not traditionally considered a construct of critical thinking. While using the Critical Thinking Rubric to assess student work, WSU faculty and others found that skills used in communication impacted their perception of the work and the extent to which critical thinking was effectively expressed. This new dimension captures those criteria.

Criteria related to examining assumptions, context, and ethical considerations are combined (dimension 2), instead of being assessed as separate criteria in the previous version. Criteria related to information literacy—search, selection, and source evaluation skills—expand the assessment of data and evidence (dimension 4). Continual refinement as programs and faculty use the new rubric more, it will continue to be refined and adapted to fit their needs and context, in an on-going cycle of improvement.

Below are printable PDF files of the Original WSU Critical Thinking Rubric along with sample adaptations from Entomology, Math, and Metaphysics.

For more background about the [WSU Critical Thinking Project](#), visit the [Project History](#) page.

[Original WSU Critical Thinking Rubric](#)
[Entomology Rubric](#)

Math Rubric
Metaphysics Rubric
CIT Rubric 2009 with Ratio Scale

Contact us: citf@wsu.edu 509-335-1355 | fax 335-1362 | Accessibility | Copyright
PO Box 644550, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, 99164-4550 USA

WSU's Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric, 2006

DIMENSION 1

Identifies, summarizes (and appropriately reformulates) the **problem/question/work assignment**

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize accurately.		Summarizes issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused; nuances and key details are missing or glossed over.		Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the issue. Identifies integral relationships essential to analyzing the issue.	

WSU's Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric, 2006

DIMENSION 2

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

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Approach to the issue is in egocentric or socio-centric terms. Does not include connections to other contexts--cultural, political, and historical.		Presents and explores relevant contexts and assumptions regarding the issue, though in a limited way.		Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis. Considers other integral contexts.	
Analysis is grounded in absolutes with little evidence of knowledge of own bias.		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 and 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 that underlie the issue.	
Cultural/Social Group, national, ethnic behavior/attitude Educational Schooling, formal training Technological Applied Science, engineering Political Organizational or governmental		Scientific Conceptual, basic science, scientific method Economic trade, business concerns costs Ethical Values Personal Experience Personal observation, informal character		Contexts to consider	

WSU's Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric, 2006

DIMENSION 3

Develops, presents, and communicates OWN **perspective, hypothesis or position**.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Position or hypothesis is clearly inherited or adopted with little original consideration		Position includes some original thinking, and/or acknowledging, refuting, synthesizing or extending other assertions, though some aspects may have been adopted with limited thought.		Position demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original hypothesis/ questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition.	
Addresses a single source or view of the argument, and fails to clarify the established or presented position relative to one's own. Fails to establish other critical distinctions.		Presents own position or hypothesis, though inconsistently.		Appropriately identifies own position on the issue, 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.		In general, position or hypothesis is clear, though gaps may exist.		Position or hypothesis includes sophisticated, integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout.	

WSU's Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric, 2006

DIMENSION 4

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

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
No evidence of search, selection or source evaluation skills.		Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.		Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills; notable identification of uniquely salient resources.	
Repeats information without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification.		Use of evidence is qualified and selective, though perhaps unintentional.		Examines the evidence and source of evidence; questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, completeness.	
Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments.		Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize bias in evidence, though attribution is spotty, inappropriate, or exaggerated.		Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias and does so with balance.	
Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and ideas in confused or confusing sequence.		Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may be flawed.		Correlations are clearly distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Sequence of presentation reflects clear relationship or organization of ideas, subordinating appropriately for importance and impact.	
Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, not on topic or are inappropriate.		Appropriate data/evidence or sources provided to meet the information need, though little evidence of more than routine exploration.		Information need is clearly defined, related, and well integrated to meet and exceed assignment, course or personal interests.	

WSU's Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric, 2006

DIMENSION 5

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

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Deals only with a single perspective and fails to discuss other possible perspectives, especially those held by others.		Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis.		Addresses perspectives noted previously, and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information to qualify analysis.	
If more than one idea is advanced, alternatives are disjointed or bolted together.		Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives.		Fully integrated ideas and perspectives from variety of sources. Analogies may be used effectively.	
Adopts a single idea or limited ideas with little question.		Ideas are investigated, if in a limited way, and integrated, if unevenly.		Integrates own and other's ideas through a complex process of judgment and justification	
Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids difficult, challenging, and discomforting ideas.		Engages challenging ideas tentatively or perhaps in ways that overstate conflict. May dismiss alternative views too hastily.		Can clearly present and justify own view or hypothesis while respecting other views.	
Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them.		Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate.		Analysis of other positions is accurate and nuanced, empathetic even when countered.	

WSU's Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric, 2006

DIMENSION 6

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

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences or conclusion is simplistic summary.		Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences that extend beyond the borders of single discipline or single issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues.		Identifies, discusses and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences considering context, assumptions, data, and evidence. Qualifies own assertions with balance.	
Conclusions presented as absolute and may attribute conclusion to external authority.		Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Implications may follow with vague reference to conclusions.		Conclusions qualified as the best available evidence within the given context; clear ties to and consideration of consequences. Implications are clearly developed, including consideration of uncertainty and ambiguity.	

WSU's Critical & Integrative Thinking Rubric, 2006

DIMENSION 7

Communicates effectively .

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
In many places, language obscures meaning.		In general, language does not interfere with communication.		Language clearly and effectively communicates 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.		Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience.	
Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent or distracting.		Basic organization 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. 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.	