

# Guide to Rating Critical and Integrative Thinking

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.****

| <i><b>Emerging</b></i>   |   | <i><b>Developing</b></i>  |   | <i><b>Mastering</b></i>  |   |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 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. |   |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |   |   |   |  |   |

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

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

Contexts may include:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Cultural/social</b><br/>Group, national, ethnic behavior/attitude</p> <p><b>Educational</b><br/>Schooling, formal training</p> <p><b>Technological</b><br/>Applied science, engineering</p> <p><b>Political</b><br/>Organizational or governmental</p> | <p><b>Scientific</b><br/>Conceptual, basic science, scientific method</p> <p><b>Economic</b><br/>Trade, business concerns costs</p> <p><b>Ethical</b><br/>Values</p> <p><b>Personal Experience</b><br/>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 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.  |   | Position or hypothesis is generally clear, although gaps may exist.  |   | Position or hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated, integrative thought and is developed clearly throughout.                               |   |
| <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 |
| 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 provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification. |   | Use of evidence is qualified and selective.   |   | Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.   |   |
| Does not distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments.                                      |   | 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.  |   |
| Conflates cause and correlation; presents evidence and ideas out of sequence.                       |   | 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. |   |
| Data/evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic.                    |   | 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 issue using OTHER (disciplinary) perspectives and positions.**

| <b>Emerging</b>   |   | <b>Developing</b>  |   | <b>Mastering</b>  |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1   | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5   | 6 |
| Deals with a single perspective and fails to discuss others' perspectives.  |   | Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis.  |   | Addresses others' perspectives and additional diverse perspectives drawn from outside information to qualify analysis.  |   |
| Adopts a single idea or limited ideas with little question. If more than one idea is presented, alternatives are not integrated.          |   | Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way. |   | Fully integrated perspectives from variety of sources; any analogies are used effectively.  |   |
| Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas.   |   | Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that overstate the conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily.                           |   | Integrates own and others' ideas in a complex process of judgment and justification. Clearly justifies own view while respecting views of others.                 |   |
| Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them.   |   | Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate.   |   | Analysis of other positions is accurate, nuanced, and respectful.   |   |
| Little integration of perspectives and little or no evidence of attending to others' views. No evidence of reflection or self-assessment. |   | Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing. Some evidence of reflection and/or self-assessment.                                     |   | Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological ways of knowing. Connects to career and civic responsibilities. Evidence of reflection and self-assessment. |   |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |   |  |   |   |   |

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

| <b>Emerging</b>   |   | <b>Developing</b>   |   | <b>Mastering</b>   |   |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1   | 2 | 3   | 4 | 5  | 6 |
| Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences, or conclusion is a simplistic summary. |   | Conclusions consider or provide evidence of consequences extending beyond a single discipline or issue. Presents implications that may impact other people or issues. |   | Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions, implications, and consequences. Considers 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 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. |   |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |   |   |   |  |   |

## 7. Communicates effectively.

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

## Overall Rating

|                  | Criteria                              | Score |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| 1.               | Identify problem, question, or issue  |       |
| 2.               | Consider context and assumptions      |       |
| 3.               | Develop own position or hypothesis    |       |
| 4.               | Present and analyze supporting data   |       |
| 5.               | Integrate other perspectives          |       |
| 6.               | Identify conclusions and implications |       |
| 7.               | Communicate effectively               |       |
| <p>Comments:</p> |                                       |       |