

Critical & Integrative Thinking: Short Form

Washington State University 2009

Work No. _____ Rater Initials _____ Average Score _____

For each of the seven criteria below

- a) **identify specific phrases on the accompanying longer form** which describe the work, and
- b) **circle a numeric score** on the short form for each criteria. Notes:
 - A score of 4 represents competency for a student graduating from WSU
 - Assess by ***what is appropriate to the specific context/task***. Not all criteria / descriptors apply to every communication mode or assignment.
- c) **average all the scores** and entering that number above, with your initials and paper no.

1. Issue Identification and Focus

0 - Absent	1 - Minimal	2 - Emerging	3 -Developing	4 -Competent	5 - Effective	6 - Mastering
------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

This dimension focuses on identifying, focusing on and thoroughly exploring the issue and significant underlying or implicit issues, aspects, or relationships integral to effective analysis.

2. Context and Assumptions

0 - Absent	1 - Minimal	2 - Emerging	3 -Developing	4 -Competent	5 - Effective	6 - Mastering
------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

This dimension focuses on the context, scope and assumptions connected to the issue, considering other integral contexts, background information, and the challenges regarding complexity and bias. Work demonstrates understanding of social, political, and ethical implications.

3. Sources and Evidence

0 - Absent	1 - Minimal	2 - Emerging	3 -Developing	4 -Competent	5 - Effective	6 - Mastering
------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

This dimension focuses on search, selection, and source evaluation skills—including accuracy, relevance, and completeness. High scores effectively analyze and integrate multiple appropriate pieces of evidence, acknowledge biases, and distinguish correlations from causal relationships.

4. Diverse Perspectives

0 - Absent	1 - Minimal	2 - Emerging	3 -Developing	4 -Competent	5 - Effective	6 - Mastering
------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

This dimension focuses on identifying and integrating diverse relevant perspectives, including contrary views and evidence.

5. Own Perspective

0 - Absent	1 - Minimal	2 - Emerging	3 -Developing	4 -Competent	5 - Effective	6 - Mastering
------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

This dimension focuses on ownership of an issue, indicated by the justification and advancement of an original view or hypothesis, recognition of own bias, and skill at integrating multiple perspectives or interpretations.

6. Conclusion

0 - Absent	1 - Minimal	2 - Emerging	3 -Developing	4 -Competent	5 - Effective	6 - Mastering
------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

This dimension focuses on integrating previous dimensions and identifying conclusions or consequences / pulling the work together, as a professional, ethical, and socially-responsible citizen. May provide future action, outcome, significance, issue summary or essence, overarching question.

7. Communication

0 - Absent	1 - Minimal	2 - Emerging	3 -Developing	4 -Competent	5 - Effective	6 - Mastering
------------	-------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------

This overarching meta-dimension focuses on intentional and purposeful strategies to communicate an identified purpose and message while managing relationships and affect with intended audiences, with particular resources and constraints. May include delivery/mode, media, activities, interactions, rhetorical moves, tone, style, language, and conventions.

Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking: Long Form

Washington State University 2009

Instructions: For each of the seven criteria below:

- a) **circle specific phrases** which describe the work, and writing comments
- b) **circle a numeric score** for each criteria (or indicate a half point increment)

Notes

- A score of 4 represents competency for a student graduating from WSU.
- Assess by **what is appropriate to the context / task**; as needed / as appropriate are implicit in all descriptors. Similarly, not all criteria apply to every assignment or mode.

1. Identifies and focuses (and appropriately reformulates) the issue, problem, question.

Absent	Minimal	Emerging	Developing	Competent	Effective	Mastering
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
ABSENT	Attempts with limited success to identify and summarize the issue; or does so superficially, incompletely, or inaccurately. Scope may be overly narrow or overbroad.		Identifies and focuses on the issue(s), though minor aspects may be inaccurate, confused, inappropriately weighted, or extraneous. Partially identifies related subsidiary issue(s). Some details or nuances are missing or glossed over.		Identifies, focuses and thoroughly explores the issue and significant underlying issues, aspects, or relationships. Captures the multi-faceted and dynamic nature, scope and elements of complex issue.	
Comments:						

2. Identifies and considers the influence of context* and assumptions, including biases.

Absent	Minimal	Emerging	Developing	Competent	Effective	Mastering
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
ABSENT	Begins to consider context, or does so with partial success. Overall, little development of context. Approach to the issue may be egocentric or socio-centric. Most analysis is grounded in absolutes. Shows some basic awareness of own assumptions and/or assumptions that underlie the issue; may remain superficial.		Presents and explores relevant contexts regarding the issue. Considers and develops at least one aspect of context; some other aspects are marginally developed. Analysis includes some outside verification, but primarily relies on established sources. Acknowledges personal biases; may have some difficulty accepting other vantage points as legitimate. Provides some recognition of context and consideration of own assumptions and/or assumptions that underlie the issue, and of the implications of those assumptions.		Analyzes the issue with a clear sense of scope and multiple contexts. Considers other integral contexts and background information. Contextualizes multiple biases and values, giving each full weight and consideration, but may elect to choose one vantage while acknowledging complexity of issue. Identifies influence of context and questions assumptions, addressing ethical dimensions underlying the issue. Demon-strates understanding of social, political, and ethical implications.	
Comments:						
Context may include:						
Cultural / Historical: Group, national, ethnic, cross-cultural or other			Ethical: Values, impact on society, citizenry and democracy; equity, quality of life		Political /Economic: Organizational or governmental, trade, labor, business, power relations	
Educational / Experience: School, training, personal experience Disciplinary / Multi-Disciplinary: theories, critiques, developments			Sustainable / Global: ability to meet longterm future needs; change and flexibility; resource allocation; global implications		Scientific / Technical : Conceptual, science, scientific method; applied science, engineering, medicine	

Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking: Long Form
Washington State University 2009

3. Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence/sources.

Absent 0	Minimal 1	Emerging 2	Developing 3	Competent 4	Effective 5	Mastering 6
ABSENT	<p>Search and selection are narrow, or loosely connected to information need.</p> <p>Most data/evidence or sources are simplistic, or inappropriate / not related to topic. Does not diverge from traditional sources.</p> <p>Repeats information provided without question; or may dismiss evidence without adequate justification.</p> <p>May consider knowledge as absolute, unassailable, confirmed by one or another authority.</p> <p>Makes limited distinctions among fact, opinion, and value judgments.</p> <p>Conflates cause and correlation; relationship between evidence and analysis may be unclear.</p>		<p>Search and selection suggest sources were evaluated to meet the information need.</p> <p>Appropriate evidence or sources provided, although exploration appears to have been routine; may include an innovative or nontraditional source or interpretation.</p> <p>Use of evidence, qualified selective, and appropriate.</p> <p>Considers knowledge as relative collection of opinions and perspectives, and makes little attempt to compare.</p> <p>Discerns fact from opinion and may recognize some bias in evidence, although may be limited.</p> <p>Distinguishes causality from correlation, though presentation may have minor flaws. Relationship between evidence and analysis is generally clear.</p>		<p>Evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills demonstrates notable identification of unique and salient resources.</p> <p>Information need is clearly defined and integrated to meet and exceed assignment. May explore and synthesize unconventional sources or interpretations.</p> <p>Examines evidence and its source; questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness.</p> <p>Views knowledge as the best available evidence within the given context, even in the face of uncertainty and ambiguity.</p> <p>Demonstrates understanding of how facts shape but may not confirm opinion. Recognizes bias, including selection bias.</p> <p>Correlations are distinct from causal relationships between and among ideas. Relationship between evidence and analysis is clear; subordination reflects, subordinated for importance and impact.</p>	
Comments:						

Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking: Long Form

Washington State University 2009

4. Integrates diverse relevant perspectives.

Absent	Minimal		Emerging		Developing		Competent		Effective		Mastering	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	
ABSENT	Adopts a single perspective, with limited discussion of other perspectives. If more than one viewpoint is presented, alternatives are not integrated.		Begins to relate alternative views to qualify analysis. Multiple viewpoints are mentioned but not thoroughly discussed, explained or qualified.		Addresses other perspectives and additional diverse perspectives to qualify analysis. Multiple viewpoints are thoroughly discussed, explained and qualified.		Treats other positions superficially or misrepresents them. May not consider that other viewpoints and expertise are necessary.		Rough integration of multiple viewpoints and comparison of ideas or perspectives. Ideas are investigated and integrated, but in a limited way.		Fully integrated perspectives from variety of sources; any analogies are used effectively.	
	Engages ideas that are obvious or agreeable. Avoids challenging or discomforting ideas.		Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that inflate conflict. May dismiss alternative views hastily.		Seeks out, weighs and effectively integrates diverse, uncomfortable or contrary views.		Minimal analysis. May treat other positions superficially or misrepresent them. Little integration of perspectives and little attention to others' views.		Analysis of other positions is thoughtful and mostly accurate. Acknowledges value of multiple perspectives.		Analysis of other positions is accurate, nuanced, and respectful.	
	Mostly uses one way of knowing.		Acknowledges and integrates different ways of knowing.		Integrates different disciplinary and epistemological ways of knowing.							
Comments:												

5. Develops, presents, and communicates own perspective, hypothesis or position.

Absent	Minimal		Emerging		Developing		Competent		Effective		Mastering	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	
ABSENT	Position or hypothesis is unclear, simplistic, or includes little original thinking.		Perspective or hypothesis includes some original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects adopted or limited.		Perspective or hypothesis demonstrates ownership for constructing knowledge or framing original questions, integrating objective analysis and intuition.		Own position or hypothesis is minimally identified and/or justified. May not clarify the established position relative to own.		Presents and justifies own position or hypothesis, although gaps may exist. May not address other views, or does so superficially. Relationship to established positions is clear.		Clearly presents and justifies own position or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations. May draw support from experience and information not available from assigned sources. Position or hypothesis demonstrates sophisticated, integrative thought.	
	Little or no risk-taking, lacks exploration.		May remain within "safe" or predictable parameters.		May explore ideas that stretch conventional parameters; includes innovative thinking, questioning or risk-taking.		Little evidence of reflection or self-assessment.		Some evidence of reflection and/or self-assessment		Evidence of significant reflection and self-assessment	
Comments:												

Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking: Long Form

Washington State University 2009

6. Identifies and assesses conclusions and consequences.

Absent	Minimal		Emerging		Developing		Competent		Effective		Mastering	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6						
ABSENT	<p>Conclusion may be a simplistic summary; limited identification of conclusions, implications and consequences. Conclusion and implications may not align with previous dimensions.</p> <p>Minimal consideration of future action, significance, overarching question, or context.</p> <p>May present conclusions as absolute; may attribute conclusion to external authority.</p> <p>Limited or no concrete connections between conclusions, recommendations, and consequences.</p>		<p>Presents conclusions, recommendations, and potential consequences, though limited; generally align with previous dimensions.</p> <p>May give some indication of future action, outcome, significance, issue summary or essence, or overarching question, though limited. May present implications that impact other people or issues, or extend beyond a single discipline or issue.</p> <p>Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences.</p> <p>Relates consequences to conclusions, though may be vague or overstated.</p>		<p>Identifies, discusses, and extends conclusions and/or consequences, integrating previous dimensions, as a professional, ethical, and socially-responsible citizen. May identify "lessons learned."</p> <p>May provide future action, outcome, significance, issue summary or essence, or overarching question. Considers context, assumptions, evidence, and/or feasibility. Qualifies own assertions with balance.</p> <p>Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context.</p> <p>Develops consequences fully and connects them clearly to conclusions, considering ambiguities and raising questions.</p>							
Comments:												

7. Communicates effectively in one or more modes. (May include articles, posters, lectures, oral presentations, interviews, websites, consultations, discussions, demonstrations, performances, powerpoint, artwork, film, etc.)

Absent	Minimal		Emerging		Developing		Competent		Effective		Mastering	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6						
Conveys no purpose	<p>Communication choices may:</p> <p>Convey little or unintended message, Produce unanticipated or detrimental affect (visceral impact, tone and credibility), Disregards or poorly manages rapport with audience (or participants)</p> <p>Does not adequately meet the needs of the situation; lacks preparation and/or flexibility. May:</p> <p>Not adequately identify why the issue is relevant to this audience; Overlook audience / participant interests, needs, or background.</p>		<p>Attempts, with some success, to:</p> <p>Convey a purpose and message, Create the desired affect (visceral impact, tone and credibility), Manage rapport with immediate audience / participants.</p> <p>Meets the general needs of the situation, with limits to preparation and/or flexibility. May:</p> <p>Identify why the issue is generally relevant. Anticipate some audience/participant interests, needs, or background.</p>		<p>Uses communication choices to effectively:</p> <p>Convey identified purpose and message, and Create the desired affect (visceral impact, tone and credibility), and Manage rapport with (multiple) intended audience(s) or participants.</p> <p>Meets the needs of the particular situation, both immediate and larger context; is well-prepared and flexible. May:</p> <p>Identify why the issue is relevant to this audience in context.</p> <p>Anticipate and build on audience/participant interests, needs, background, and expertise.</p>							

Guide to Rating Critical & Integrative Thinking: Long Form

Washington State University 2009

	<p>Some choices of delivery, media, activities, rhetorical moves, tone, and style do not fit this audience or purpose; basic choices may seem haphazard or ineffective. Tied to prepared material; little adjustment in context.</p> <p>Cultural competencies attempts fall short. May seem unaware.</p> <p>Poor use of venue, time, or technology.</p> <p>Lacks clear organization of information, ideas, or activities; or is inconsistent.</p> <p>Uses language which obscures some ideas; some use of conventions, standards, and formatting seems unsuitable; shifts are confusing. Errors distract.</p>	<p>Choose basic elements of delivery, media, activities, rhetorical moves, tone, and style to engage this audience; most elements, though not all, positively contribute. May partially adjust in context, though flexibility is limited.</p> <p>Apply cultural competencies, with varying success.</p> <p>Makes adequate use of venue, time, and available technology, with minor exceptions.</p> <p>Adequately organizes information, ideas, and activities.</p> <p>Uses language which communicates ideas; appropriately employs conventions, standards, and formatting. Occasional errors do not generally distract.</p>	<p>Choose and adeptly adjust delivery, media, activities, rhetorical moves, tone, and style to effectively engage this audience; all elements used for impact and contribution.</p> <p>Apply cultural competencies effectively.</p> <p>Strategically uses venue, time, and available technology, managing constraints .</p> <p>Organizes information, ideas, and activities with smooth transitions.</p> <p>Uses language which clearly communicates ideas; makes effective use of conventions, standards, and formatting; shifts are purposeful. Few if any errors.</p>
<p>Comments:</p>			