

## DEAL MODEL CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

[Modified source: Paul, R& Elder, L. 2001. The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking. The Foundation for Critical Thinking. Santa Rosa, CA. mm'.criticalthinking.org]

	<b>1 - Completely lacking</b>	<b>2 - Under-developed</b>	<b>3 - Good</b>	<b>4 - Excellent</b>
<b><i>Integration</i></b>	Provides no clear connection between experience and learning	Provides minimal and/or unclear connection between experience and learning	Provides reasonably clear, adequate connection between experience and learning	Provides thorough and very clear connection(s) between experience and learning
<b><i>Relevance</i></b>	Misclassifies learning and/or inappropriately shifts between categories of learning; fails to keep discussion specific to the learning	Discusses learning that is relevant to the category of learning goal, but much of the discussion is not related to the learning	Discusses learning that is relevant to the category of learning goal and keeps the discussion reasonably well focused on the learning	Discusses learning that is relevant to the category of learning goal and keeps the discussion well-focused on the learning
<b><i>Accuracy</i></b>	Consistently makes inaccurate statements and/or fails to provide supporting evidence for claims:  <u>Academic Category:</u> Incorrectly identifies, describes, and/or applies academic concepts(s)	Makes several inaccurate statements and/or supports few statements with evidence  <u>Academic Category:</u> Is not accurate in identifying, describing, and/or applying academic concepts	Usually, but not always, makes statements that are accurate and well-supported with evidence  <u>Academic Category:</u> Accurately identifies, describes, and applies appropriate academic concept(s)	Consistently makes statements that are accurate and well-supported with evidence  <u>Academic Category:</u> Accurately identifies, describes, and applies appropriate academic concept(s)
<b><i>Clarity</i></b>	Consistently fails to provide examples, to illustrate points to define terms, and/or to express ideas in other ways	Only occasionally provides examples, illustrates points, defines terms, and/or expresses idea in other ways	Usually, but not always, provides examples, illustrates points, defines terms, and/or expresses ideas in other ways	Consistently provides examples, illustrates points, defines terms, and/or expresses ideas in other ways
<b><i>Precision</i></b>	Consistently fails to provide specific information, descriptions, or data	Only occasionally provides specific information, descriptions, or data	Usually, but not always, provides specific information, descriptions, or data	Consistently provides specific information, descriptions, or data
<b><i>Writing</i></b>	Consistently makes typographical, spelling, and/or grammatical errors	Makes several typographical, spelling, and/or grammatical errors	Makes few typographical, spelling, and/or grammatical errors	Makes very few or no typographical, spelling, and/or grammatical errors
<b><i>Breadth</i></b>	Ignores or superficially considers alternative points of view and/or interpretations	Gives minimal consideration to alternative points of view and/or interpretations and makes very limited use of them in shaping the learning being articulated	Gives some consideration to alternative points of view and/or interpretations and makes some use of them in shaping the learning being articulated	Gives meaningful consideration to alternative points of view and/or interpretations and makes very good use of them in shaping the learning being articulated

Ash, Clayton & Moses. (2009). Learning through Critical Reflection: A Tutorial for Service-Learning Students (Instructors Version). Raleigh, NC