

C R I T I C A L T H I N K I N G R U B R I C

| <i>Critical Thinking Opportunity at Phases of a Project</i> | Below Standard | Approaching Standard | At Standard | Above Standard |
|---|---|--|---|----------------|
| <i>Launching the Project:</i> Analyze Driving Question and Begin Inquiry | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sees only superficial aspects of, or one point of view on, the Driving Question | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> identifies some central aspects of the Driving Question, but may not see complexities or consider various points of view asks some follow-up questions about the topic or the wants and needs of the audience or users of a product, but does not dig deep | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows understanding of central aspects of the Driving Question by identifying in detail what needs to be known to answer it and considering various possible points of view on it asks follow-up questions that focus or broaden inquiry, as appropriate (CC 6-12.W.7) asks follow-up questions to gain understanding of the wants and needs of audience or product users | |
| <i>Building Knowledge, Understanding, and Skills:</i> Gather and Evaluate Information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is unable to integrate information to address the Driving Question; gathers too little, too much, or irrelevant information, or from too few sources accepts information at face value (does not evaluate its quality) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> attempts to integrate information to address the Driving Question, but it may be too little, too much, or gathered from too few sources; some of it may not be relevant understands that the quality of information should be considered, but does not do so thoroughly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> integrates relevant and sufficient information to address the Driving Question, gathered from multiple and varied sources (CC 6,11-12.RI.7) thoroughly assesses the quality of information (considers usefulness, accuracy and credibility; distinguishes fact vs. opinion; recognizes bias) (CC 6-12.W.8) | |
| <i>Developing and Revising Ideas and Products:</i> Use Evidence and Criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> accepts arguments for possible answers to the Driving Question without questioning whether reasoning is valid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> recognizes the need for valid reasoning and strong evidence, but does not evaluate it carefully when developing answers to the Driving Question | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluates arguments for possible answers to the Driving Question by assessing whether reasoning is valid and evidence is relevant and sufficient (CC 6-12.SL.3, RI.8) | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • uses evidence without considering how strong it is • relies on “gut feeling” to evaluate and revise ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions (does not use criteria) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluates and revises ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions based on incomplete or invalid criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • justifies choice of criteria used to evaluate ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions • revises inadequate drafts, designs or solutions and explains why they will better meet evaluation criteria (CC 6-12.W.5) | |
| <p><i>Presenting Products and Answers to Driving Question:</i> Justify Choices, Consider Alternatives & Implications</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chooses one presentation medium without considering advantages and disadvantages of using other mediums to present a particular topic or idea • cannot give valid reasons or supporting evidence to defend choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products • does not consider alternative answers to the Driving Question, designs for products, or points of view • is not able to explain important new understanding gained in the project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • considers the advantages and disadvantages of using different mediums to present a particular topic or idea, but not thoroughly • explains choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products, but some reasons are not valid or lack supporting evidence • understands that there may be alternative answers to the Driving Question or designs for products, but does not consider them carefully • can explain some things learned in the project, but is not entirely clear about new understanding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of using different mediums to present a particular topic or idea (CC 8.RI.7) • justifies choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products, by giving valid reasons with supporting evidence (CC 6-12.SL.4) • recognizes the limitations of an answer to the Driving Question or a product design (how it might not be complete, certain, or perfect) and considers alternative perspectives (CC 11-12.SL.4) • can clearly explain new understanding gained in the project and how it might transfer to other situations or contexts | |