|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fall 2021**  **CRITICAL THINKING ISLO AND RUBRIC**  **Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness** |  |

**STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS IN PROBLEM SOLVING ACROSS THE DISCIPLINES AND IN DAILY LIFE.**

Critical thinking includes the ability to:

• support claims with relevant and credible evidence.

• develop awareness of and ability to respond to bias.

• apply accurate and logical analysis to achieve desired outcome.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SKYLINE COLLEGE CRITICAL THINKING ISLO RUBRIC** | | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Exceeding** | **Meeting** | **Progressing** | **Emerging** |
| **Claims Supported: Accurately interprets evidence specific to the discipline (e.g., quotes, graphs, stats, etc.)** | Accurately and/or thoroughly interprets a range of evidence specific to the discipline with a high level of discernment | Interprets a range of evidence specific to the discipline with varying complexity | Demonstrates some understanding of how to interpret evidence specific to the discipline | Demonstrates little to no understanding of how to interpret evidence specific to the discipline |
| **Claims Supported: Considers rival theories or opposing views** | Considers rival theories utilizing appropriate and relevant evidence with a thorough discernment of their strengths and weaknesses | Considers opposing theories or views with some discernment of their strengths and weaknesses | Demonstrates some consideration of any alternate views | Demonstrates little to no consideration of any alternate views |
| **Ability to Respond to Bias: Considers the credibility of evidence used** | Demonstrates thorough analysis of all relevant viewpoints and their respective credibility, distinguishes between facts and opinions, and thoroughly questions expert/ status quo viewpoints or approaches | Distinguishes between credible and non-credible sources and distinguishes between facts and opinions, with some analysis of expert/ status quo viewpoints or approaches | Demonstrates some discernment between credible and non-credible sources | Demonstrates little to no discernment between credible and non-credible sources |
| **Logical Analysis: Exhibits methodological awareness** | Acknowledges the role of methodology in approaches taken to form arguments and/or reach conclusions, weighs different methodological approaches, and evaluates alternative approaches not taken | Acknowledges the role of methodology in approaches taken to form arguments and/or reach conclusions, making a case for the approach taken | Acknowledges the role of methodology in approaches taken to form arguments and/or reach conclusions | Gives little to no consideration to the role of methodology in approaches taken to form arguments and/or reach conclusions |
| **Logical Analysis: Reaches conclusions that are well- supported by the premises or evidence** | Demonstrates a clear and strong logical connection between evidence/ premises and conclusions reached | Demonstrates a logical connection between evidence/ premises and conclusions reached; however, displays some minor shortcomings in connecting evidence/ premises to conclusions | Demonstrates some logical connection between evidence/ premises and conclusions reached; however, displays major shortcomings in connecting evidence/ premises to conclusions | Demonstrates little to no logical connection between evidence/ premises and conclusions reached |
| **Logical Analysis: Appropriately chooses and correctly applies formulas or techniques unique to the discipline (such as in algebra, logic, probability theory, chemistry, physics, statistics, etc.)** | Appropriately chooses and correctly applies formulas or techniques while recognizing and avoiding using flawed reasoning | Applies appropriate formulas or techniques but contains some minor shortcomings or flawed reasoning in application (e.g., invalid assumptions, circular logic, omissions or other gaps in understanding) | Applies appropriate formulas or techniques but with major shortcomings or flawed reasoning in application (e.g., invalid assumptions, circular logic, omissions or other gaps in understanding) | Demonstrates little to no ability to select and appropriately apply relevant formulas or techniques |
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