



# Critical Thinking

## Definition:

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. - AACU

According to the Foundation for Critical Thinking, "Critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection,

reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action." At Palomar College, we also believe critical thinking involves the development of open- mindedness, and the identification of assumptions and implications and awareness of one's own biases.

## RUBRICS for the 5 Dimensions of the Critical Thinking

### Outcome

Select one or more of these rubrics to assess the dimensions of critical thinking. **Add the rubric to the assignment, test, or discussion that best captures students' ability to demonstrate the specific dimension. Please use each rubric no more than once per course.**

Dimension	Meets outcome (5)	Outcome nearly met (3)	Outcome not met (1)	No Submission (0)
Conceptualization of issues	Issue/Problem/ Interpretation to be considered is stated or demonstrated clearly, delivering relevant information when necessary for full understanding.	Statement of the issue/problem/ interpretation was attempted, but understanding appears impeded based on omissions and/or imprecision.	Issue/Problem/ Interpretation was not attempted or was clearly misunderstood	

Dimension	Meets outcome (5)	Outcome nearly met (3)	Outcome not met (1)	No Submission (0)
Conclusions	Conclusions clearly follow in a logical manner from premised and supporting ideas with no omissions and logical flaws. The relationship between premises and conclusions is clearly demonstrated.	Conclusions are derived in a somewhat logical fashion from premised and supporting ideas, but with significant omissions and/or logical flaws. The relationship between premises and conclusions is not well-demonstrated.	Conclusions and/or premises are missing and/or unclear.	

Dimension	Meets outcome (5)	Outcome nearly met (3)	Outcome not met (1)	No Submission (0)
Evidence	Selects relevant sources that strengthen the credibility and/or authority of the points/conclusion because the sources are of such high quality according to the standards of the assignment/discipline.	Selects relevant sources that do not strengthen the credibility and/or authority of points/conclusion because the sources are of poor quality according to the standards of the assignment/discipline.	Selects sources that are not relevant to the issue and/or are of such poor quality according to the standards of the assignment/discipline that they weaken the credibility and/or authority of the points/conclusions.	

Dimension	Meets outcome (5)	Outcome nearly met (3)	Outcome not met (1)	No Submission (0)
Questioning viewpoints	Personal viewpoints take into account the complexities of an issue and those of sources and authorities and are questioned thoroughly and acknowledged within student's position.	Personal viewpoints are simplistic and obvious and those of sources and authorities are taken mostly as fact, with little questioning.	Personal viewpoints are missing and/or unclear and those of sources and authorities are taken as fact, without question.	

Dimension	Meets outcome (5)	Outcome nearly met (3)	Outcome not met (1)	No Submission (0)
Influence of context and assumptions	Identifies own and others' assumptions and relevant context(s) when presenting a position.	Begins to identify relevant context(s) when presenting a position. Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions).	Influence of context and relevant assumptions are missing and/or unclear.	

Definitions and rubric dimensions adapted from the [Critical Thinking Group](#) and the [Association of American Colleges & University VALUE rubrics](#)