Teagle Scoring Guide for Critical Thinking
May 2007

This guide sets out several habits of mind that students must develop in order to succeed at critical thinking in their academic work. Academic work includes but is not limited to such activities as argumentation; interpretation; developing proofs, theorems, and case statements; model building; analysis; and creative projects. Faculty in various disciplines are invited to *adapt* this scoring guide to fit the contexts of their disciplines, the courses they teach, and the assignments that they present in those courses. Each habit of mind identified below is accompanied by descriptors for a range of performance exhibited in actual student work.

1. **Problem:** Recognizes from readings, experience, data, or observation a problem, question, or issue to address.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Does not identify a problem, question, or issue or identifies an inappropriate problem, question, or issue. May be confused or represent the problem, question, or issue inaccurately. Does not establish problem's significance/relevance.		Identifies a problem, question, or issue and presents it clearly, if simply. May recognize some of the nuances, but does so inconsistently. Acknowledgment of problem's significance/relevance is too simple.		Identifies the main problem, question, or issue, as well as embedded or implicit ones; and identifies them clearly, addressing their relationships to each other. Recognizes the nuances of the problem, question, or issue, including the relevance/ significance.	

2. **Central/Main Idea**: identifies and presents an approach and position to address the problem/issue raised.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
The project displays no central approach or controlling idea, or that idea remains unimportant to the work.		Presents an approach/controlling idea that addresses the issue or problem, though sometimes in an unsophisticated or simplified way.		Presents an approach/controlling idea that addresses the issue or problem raised, in a complex, sophisticated way.	

3. **Perspective(s):** Identifies and considers salient perspective(s), position(s), and context(s).

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Deals superficially with a single perspective. Even when applicable, fails to acknowledge other possible salient perspectives. Lacks a sense of fairness and open-mindedness. May not be aware of having a perspective or may not present an appropriate perspective.		Maintains a single perspective. When applicable, acknowledges other possible salient perspectives. Is mostly fair and open-minded. When appropriate to subject, student demonstrates some awareness of his or her own perspective and its influence on the approach to the task.		Skillfully conveys a single perspective and, when applicable, addresses and accommodates all other salient perspectives well. Is consistently fair and open-minded. When appropriate to subject, student shows a deep and detailed awareness of his or her own perspective and its influence on the approach to the task.	

4. **Supporting Data/Evidence:** Includes supporting data/evidence and assesses its quality.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Provides very little data/evidence to support its position, or the data/evidence selected is low quality or irrelevant. Does not seriously assess support, to distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments.		Provides data/evidence to support its position; some data/evidence is low quality or irrelevant. Attempts, though sometimes mistakenly, to assess support, to distinguish among fact, opinion, and value judgments.		Provides ample evidence to support its position; almost all data is high quality and clearly relevant. Clearly assesses support, distinguishing among fact, opinion, and value judgments.	

5. Depth of thought: Deeply engages in the work.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Demonstrates little engagement with the work. The treatment remains shallow, over-simplified, and limited in focus and usefulness. Exhibits little or no ability to deal with ambiguity.		Engages the work, in places pushing the treatment to greater depth and complexity, approaching it with a spirit of exploration, or expanding the focus as needed to do the work justice. Level of complexity throughout is adequate but in need of greater development. Acknowledges ambiguity.		Engages the work fully, pushing to achieve full depth and complexity, fully exploring and where necessary expanding the boundaries of the work. Treatment is complex, sophisticated, imaginative, and nuanced. Acknowledges and effectively manages ambiguity.	

6. **Reasoning**: employs logic to construct a cogent argument/statement.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Work has obvious flaws in logic/analysis**.**		Work is generally sound, but has some flaws in logic/analysis.		Work is very sound, with no flaws or only minor flaws in logic/analysis.	

7. Development: Strategically organizes and styles the work.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Employs seemingly random and/or inappropriate organization, and, where applicable, genre, and/or medium.		Makes some sensible choices of organization. Where applicable, selects an appropriate genre and/or medium.		Makes appropriate choices of organization and, where applicable, genre and/or medium. While coherent, also engages with and tests rules or boundaries of the work.	

8. Conclusions/Consequences: identifies and assesses strengths and weaknesses of choices, conclusions, implications, and consequences.

Emerging		Developing		Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue or the key relationships between the other elements of the problem, such as assumptions, contexts, data, evidence, organization, genre, medium. Seems unaware of limits of evidence and conclusions.		Identifies some conclusions, implications, and consequences and/or fails to spell out conclusions, implications, and consequences as clearly as possible. Some awareness of the limits of evidence and conclusions.		Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences considering assumptions, context, data, evidence, organization, genre, medium. Objectively reflects upon their own assertions, including limits of evidence and conclusions.	

9. Holistic Rating. What rating would you give this work as a whole?

(Absent) **Emerging** (Recognizable)	(Inconsistently **Developing** (Competent but	(Sometimes **Mastering** (Frequently
	Competent)	unsophisticated) sophisticated)	sophisticated)
1	2	3	4	5	6