

Interpretation (articulation of conclusions, interpretation, recommendation based on information, concepts, POV, assumptions and Implications)	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Critical Thinking and Written Analyses Rubric – Scale Description

Criteria	Levels		
	1 Did Not Meet Expectations	2 Met Expectations	3 Exceeded Expectations
Clarity	Writing is not clear. It is difficult to understand points being made. The writing lacks transitions, and few examples and/or illustrations are provided to support explanation or recommendations.	Writing is generally well organized and understood. Transitions are used to facilitate clarity. Some examples and/illustrations are used to support explanation or recommendations.	Writing is succinct, precise, effectively organized and without ambiguity. Transitions, explanation and elaboration are extensive to elucidate points. Detailed illustrations and/or examples are used to support explanation or recommendations.
Relevance	Critical issues/questions are omitted or ignored in the writing.	Most of the critical issues/questions are addressed in the writing.	All critical issues/questions are addressed completely in the writing
Depth of Discussion	Ignores bias; Omits arguments Misrepresents issues; Excludes data; Includes but does not detect inconsistencies of information; Ideas contain unnecessary gaps, repetition or extraneous details; Sees no arguments and overlooks differences	Detects bias; Recognizes arguments; Categorizes content; Paraphrases data; Sufficient detail to support conclusions and/or recommendations	Analysis includes insightful questions; Refutes bias; Discusses issues thoroughly Critiques content; Values information Examines inconsistencies; Offers extensive detail to support conclusions and recommendations; Suggests solutions or implementation
Breadth of Discussion	Omits arguments or perspectives; Misses major content areas/concepts; Presents few options	Covers the breadth of the topic without being superfluous	Considers multiple perspectives; Thoroughly delves into the issues/questions; Thoroughly discusses facts relevant to the issues
Integration of all Elements of Reasoning	Fails to draw conclusions or conclusions rely on author's authority rather than strength of presentation; Draws faulty conclusions; Shows intellectual dishonesty	Formulates clear conclusions with adequate support	Assimilates and critically reviews information, uses reasonable judgment, and provides balanced, well justified conclusions

Internal Consistency	There is little integration across the sections of the paper. Several inconsistencies or contradictions exist. Few of the issues, recommendation and explanations make sense and are well integrated.	Sections of the paper are generally well linked/connected. Only minor contradictions exist. Most of the issues, recommendations and explanations make sense and are well integrated.	All sections of the paper are linked. There are no contradictions in the writing. All issues, recommendations and explanations make sense and are well integrated
-----------------------------	---	--	---

Values: Level 1: 10%, Level 2: 50% and Level 3: 100%