

THINK	Capstone (4)	Accomplished (3)	Developing (2)	Deficient (1)
Explanation of Issues	Explains and justifies the importance of the issues with clear and relevant evidence.	Describes but does not justify the importance of the issue and/or omits key evidence.	Identifies the issue but leaves some aspects undefined and only mentions importance of the issue.	Does not identify or justify the importance of the issue.
Evidence	Analyzes relevant information and, if required by the assignment, synthesizes the viewpoints of experts from the appropriate discipline(s).	Identifies relevant information and, if required by the assignment, includes the viewpoints of experts from the appropriate discipline(s).	Includes some relevant information but excludes key or important elements, and, if required by the assignment, includes or merely inserts the viewpoints of experts as required within the discipline.	Includes minimal to no relevant information, and, if required by the assignment, does not include or merely inserts the viewpoints of experts as required within the discipline.
Influence of Context and Assumptions	Analyzes assumptions using systematic and methodical approaches, and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Analyzes assumptions and the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies relevant assumptions and contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies minimal to no assumptions and contexts when presenting a position.
Student's Position (perspective)	Amalgamates a position or perspective that takes into account the complexities of the issue.	Establishes a specific position or perspective that takes into account some complexities of the issue.	Develops a specific position or perspective but doesn't acknowledge the complexities of the issue.	States a position or perspective but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and Related Outcomes	Constructs logical conclusions based on consequences and implications drawn from an informed evaluation of evidence and perspectives.	Constructs logical conclusions based on a partial understanding of evidence, consequences, and/or implications.	Includes a conclusion based on a partial understanding of evidence, consequences, and/or implications.	Includes a conclusion based on an incomplete understanding of evidence, consequences, and/or implications, or simply restates the introduction or thesis.

THINK

History

During the 2014-2015 AY, Florida SouthWestern State College initiated a revised assessment of the General Education Program. Throughout the process, the AAC&U Value Rubrics and one in-house rubric were utilized to score voluntarily submitted artifacts. The scorers, mainly members of the Learning Assessment Committee (LAC) General Education Sub-Committee, were asked to provide qualitative feedback on the functionality of the rubrics. They were asked to comment on the rubric dimensions, achievement levels, and appropriateness of the rubrics in relation to the submitted artifacts. The FSW “Think” rubric was developed by a 9-member task force from the LAC of faculty and staff representing all five schools of the College as well as the Office of Academic Assessment as well as the Office of the Provost during special sessions held on May 7, 31, June 7, and June 8, 2017. Task members, led by the Assessment & Effectiveness Director, Dr. Joseph van Gaalen included: Martha Ambrose (English), Jane Charles (Libraries), Rebecca Harris (English), Margaret Kruger (Health Sciences), Jennifer Patterson (Business), Caroline Seefchak (Education), Amy Trogan (English & LAC Chair), Joseph van Gaalen (Dir. of Academic Assessment), and Eileen DeLuca (Assoc. VPAA).

Framework

The school representatives used the Association of American Colleges and Universities Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric as a foundation for development ultimately adopting only the dimensions and achievement levels (4-3-2-1) with a 0 if no achievement is met. The rubric defines the fundamental criteria for each learning outcome and outline performance required to demonstrate levels of attainment through the use of Bloom’s Taxonomic verbiage. Rubric achievement levels, in descending order: Capstone (4), Accomplished (3), Developing (2), and Deficient (1).

Purpose

The intent of the rubric developers was to frame language such that the rubric is as inclusive as possible to any and all critical thinking assignments. Careful consideration was paid to providing descriptors detailed enough to score an artifact but yet remain in general terms as much as possible to allow for application to a wide assortment of critical thinking assignment types. In order to increase clarity, action verbs were utilized in each achievement level description. The developers also attempted to place emphasis on dimensions being mutually exclusive, such that users of this rubric can elect to omit any dimension not required of a given assignment. To ensure that non-traditional assignments are scored properly, artifacts representing a variety of modes and media should be utilized during the “Think” Rubric Calibration Sessions prior to the scoring process.

Dimensions

Evaluation of Issues: Explains and justifies the importance of the issues; **Evidence:** Analyzes relevant information and, if required by the assignment, synthesizes the viewpoints of experts from the appropriate discipline(s); **Influence of Context & Assumptions:** Analyzes assumptions using systematic and methodical approaches, evaluating the relevance of contexts when presenting a position; **Student’s Position (perspective):** Amalgamates a position or perspective accounting for complexities of an issue; and **Conclusions & Related Outcomes:** Constructs logical conclusions based on consequences and implications drawn from an informed evaluation of evidence and perspectives.