

## Psyc 3470 Critical Thinking Assignment Grading Rubric

<b>Component</b>	<b>Missing</b> 0 points	<b>Needs Improvement</b> 1 point	<b>Emerging</b> 2 points	<b>Meets Expectations</b> 3 points	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b> 4 points
<b>Summary of Issue (Introduction)</b>		Summary is short and/or missing key elements.	Summary captures most elements but misses some and/or is poorly organized.	Summary captures key elements and is concise and well-organized.	Summary piques the reader's interest in the topic with a creative approach while maintaining a detailed yet concise and well-organized presentation.
<b>Context and Assumptions</b>		No acknowledgement of personal or societal biases or assumptions, and/or ethical considerations, and/or connection to other contexts.	Biases, assumptions, ethical considerations, and/or connection to other contexts is present in part but is limited and not fully developed.	Biases. Assumptions, ethical considerations, and connection to other contexts are present and are fully developed. A description of the intended audience of the article is presented, along with existing biases and assumptions. Ethical considerations are outlined.	All the information of the "Meets Expectations" level is present, but the author provides unique insight into these topics.
<b>Application of Dyadic Relations Theories and Principles</b>		Theories/principles are mentioned briefly and/or applied incorrectly or misinterpreted.	Theories/principles are provided but the connection to the article is not always clear and/or the discussion is limited and not fully developed.	Theories/principle are provided, the connection the article is clear, and the discussion is detailed and fully developed.	Theories/principles and their connection to the article are clear and fully developed, and the author provides novel insight.
<b>Analysis</b>		Analysis is simplistic or inappropriate. Information is repeated from the article or other sources without original insight. Ideas are obvious and/or represent only one perspective, uncomfortable topics are mostly ignored, and/or the author does not make a distinction between objective facts and subjective opinions.	Analysis is appropriate but limited in scope and lacks novel insight. Ideas may be overstated or discounted without justification. Alternative perspectives are presented but in a limited manner, and there is an attempt at least in part to make a distinction between objective facts and subjective opinions.	Analysis is appropriate and detailed but may be predictable at times. Alternative perspectives are presented and examined. Justification is provided when discounting evidence provided by other sources (e.g., the article that is the object of the reflection). and there is a clear distinction between objective facts and subjective opinions.	Analysis is detailed and includes novel insight. Alternative perspectives are presented and fully developed, and the author provides a clear distinction between objective fact and subjective opinion. Arguments are supported by research and are explored in detail.

<b>Conclusions</b>		Conclusions are simplistic and/or implications are not provided. Conclusions are a repetition of someone else's conclusion (e.g., author of the article or an external source).	Conclusions are correctly acknowledged but predictable. Implications are provided, but in a limited manner. Connections between conclusions and their implications is not clear.	Conclusions and implications are correctly acknowledged and are applied, at least in part, beyond the current issue/people. Weak connections between conclusions and implications are made.	Conclusions and implications are correctly acknowledged and applied beyond the current issue/people. Novel insight into the issue under discussion is evident, and strong connections are made between the conclusions and implications.
<b>Writing Mechanics</b>		Grammar, syntax, and/or other mechanical writing errors occur throughout the paper and distract from the content. Language may be confusing and interfere with reading the content, and there is little evidence of proofreading. The paper may be poorly organized. Inconsistent style or formatting, or missing formatting. Sources are absent or incorrect, and paper may not meet the required word count.	There are some problems with grammar, syntax, and/or other mechanical errors, and/or language may be confusing at times, occasionally interfering with flow, and reading ease. Ideas are organized and the connection between ideas is adequate. Style and APA formatting are consistent most of the time. Sources are cited correctly in-text and in the references, and the paper meets the required word count.	Minimal problems with grammar, syntax, and mechanical errors, but they do not interfere with reading the content. Language is clear and effective. Paper is well organized, and the ideas are well connected. Style and APA formatting are consistent. Sources are cited correctly in-text and in the references, and the paper meets the required word count.	No grammar, syntax, or mechanical errors. Language is clear, effective, and persuasive. Clear organization of ideas and well-articulated connections between ideas is at a masterful level. Style and APA formatting are consistent. Sources are cited correctly in-text and in the references, and the paper meets the required word count.