**Critical Thinking Rubric**

(Low 1 2 3 4 5 High; or Did NOT 1 2 3 4 5 Did)

Scores of 3 to 5 are considered acceptable.

**Framework**

1-Did not define the problem or frame in the issue

3-Defined the problem but did not clearly identify relevant issues

5-Defined the problem clearly and identified relevant issues

**Evaluation**

1-Did not identify courses of action

3-Identified courses of actions though not always in a clear manner

5-Clearly identified courses of action

**Integration or recommendation**

1-Did not support conclusions with a logical arrangement of facts

3-Supported conclusions but with flaws or errors in arrangement of facts

5-All conclusions were supported as a logical progression of facts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FRAMEWORK – ability to define the problem or frame the issue | 1  Did not define the problem or frame in the issue | 2 | 3  Defined problem but did not clearly identify relevant issues | 4 | 5  Clearly defined the problem and identified relevant issues |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EVALUATION – ability to identify courses of action | 1  Did not identify courses of action | 2 | 3  Identified courses of action but not always in a clear manner | 4 | 5  Clearly identified courses of action |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| INTEGRATION – ability to identify and support a conclusion | 1  Did not support conclusions with logical arrangement of facts | 2 | 3  Supported conclusions but with flaws or errors in arrangement of facts | 4 | 5  All conclusions were supported as a logical progression of facts |

**Ethics Rubric**

(Low 1 2 3 4 5 High; or Did NOT 1 2 3 4 5 Did)

Scores of 3 to 5 are considered acceptable.

**Framework**

1. Harm test: does this option do less harm than any alternative
2. Publicity test: would I want my choice published in the newspaper
3. Defensibility test: could I defend my choice of this option before a Congressional committee, my peers, my parents?
4. Reversibility test: Would I still think the choice of this option good if I were one of those adversely affected by it?
5. Virtue test: What would I become if I chose this option often?
6. Professional test: What would a profession’s ethics committee say about this option?
7. Colleague test: What would my colleagues say when I describe my problem and suggest this option as a solution?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FRAMEWORK – ability to define the problem or frame the issue | 1  Did not define the problem or ethical dilemma | 2 | 3  Did not clearly define the ethical dilemma | 4 | 5  Defined the ethical dilemma clearly |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EVALUATION – ability to identify a decision criterion | 1  Did not identify a decision criterion | 2 | 3  Did not clearly identify a decision criterion | 4 | 5  Clearly identified a decision criterion |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| INTEGRATION – ability to identify and support a conclusion | 1  Did not make a decision/defend the decision | 2 | 3  Provided a decision but with flaws or errors in justification | 4 | 5  Provided a well-reasoned decision and justification |