

**Definition: The ability to explore issues critically and draw logical conclusions through comprehensive examination of evidence.**

TOPIC	UNSATISFACTORY (0)	INTRODUCTORY (1)	DEVELOPING (2)	PROFICIENT (3)
<b>Explanation of issues</b>	Statement of issue/problem is absent.	Statement or description of issue/problem is unclear or irrelevant.	Statement or description of issue/problem leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Statement or description of issue/problem is clearly and comprehensively described, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.
<b>Evidence</b>	Source information/evidence is absent.	Source information/evidence is not interpreted or evaluated. Expert viewpoints are taken as fact, without question.	Source information/evidence is interpreted and/or evaluated to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Source information/evidence is interpreted/evaluated to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.
<b>Conclusions and related outcomes</b>	Conclusion is absent.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.	Conclusion is logically tied to the evidence related to the issue/problem; some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.

*This rubric was created using the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics>*

*Final 03.2020*