



Association
of American
Colleges and
Universities

FALL 2008 VALUE CRITICAL THINKING METARUBRIC DRAFT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

This rubric is the first step in a rubric development process that will produce additional drafts, each responsive to the feedback received. Feedback deadline is February 15, 2009. The next draft of this rubric will be available in May 2009. For more information or to give feedback, please email Wende Morgaine at wendemm@gmail.com. Thank you!

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a **zero** to any performance that doesn't meet level one performance.

	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues	Problem/issue relevant to situation in context clearly stated	Problem/issue relevant to situation stated and partially described	Problem/issue relevant to situation stated	Problem/issue relevant to a different situation identified
Investigation of evidence	Position is established with evidence. Source selection reflects some exploration across disciplines and integrates multiple media modes; Veracity of sources is challenged and mostly balanced. Source summaries and attribution deepen the position not just decorate it.	Position is supported by evidence, though selective (cherry picked), inconsistently aligned, narrow in scope and limited to one or two modes. Examination of source quality shows some balance; attribution (citations) documents and adds authority to position.	Position strengthened by supporting evidence, though sources are limited or convenient (assigned sources & personal stories only) and in a single mode (text, audio, graphs, or video, etc); Source use repeats information and absent contrary evidence. Attribution merely lists references, decorates.	Position is unsubstantiated, random. Limited evidence of exploration (curiosity) or awareness of <i>need</i> for information, search, selection, source evaluation & source attribution (citations).
Influence of context and assumptions	Position qualified by considerations of experiences, circumstances, conditions and environment that influence perspectives and the implications of those perspectives.	Position presented with recognition of contextual sources of bias, assumptions and possible implications of bias.	Position presented tentatively, with emerging awareness of own and others' biases, ethical and political, historical sources and implications of bias.	Position presented in absolutes with little recognition of own personal and cultural bias and little recognition of ethical, political, historical or other considerations.
Own perspective, hypothesis, or position	A reasonable, clear, position or hypothesis, stated or implied, demonstrates some complexity of thought. It also acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes, or extends some other perspectives appropriately.	A reasonable, clear position or hypothesis is stated or implied. Important objections and/or alternate perspectives are considered with some thought.	Position or hypothesis is clear, whether stated or implied, with at least one other perspective acknowledged.	Work contains a discernible position or hypothesis that reflects the student's perspective.
Conclusions, implications and consequences	Conclusions are based on a synthesis of evidence from various sources. Inferences about causal consequences are supported by evidence that has been evaluated from disparate viewpoints. Analysis of implications indicates some awareness of ambiguity.	Conclusions and evidence are relatively obvious, with synthesis drawn from selected (cherry picked) evidence. Assertions of cause are supported mostly by opinion and are also selective. Considerations of consequences are timid or obvious and easy.	Conclusions are weakly supported by evidence, with only emerging synthesis. Assertions of cause are doubtful. Considerations of consequences are narrow or exaggerated and dichotomous.	Conclusions are not supported by the evidence or repeat the evidence without synthesis or elaboration; tendency to confuse correlation and cause. Considerations of consequences are sketchy, drawn in absolutes, or absent.