

C R I T I C A L T H I N K I N G R U B R I C f o r P B L

(for grades 6-12; CCSS ELA aligned)

<i>Critical Thinking Opportunity at Phases of a Project</i>	Below Standard	Approaching Standard	At Standard	Above Standard ✓
<p><i>Launching the Project:</i> Analyze Driving Question and Begin Inquiry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ sees only superficial aspects of, or one point of view on, the Driving Question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ identifies some central aspects of the Driving Question, but may not see complexities or consider various points of view ▶ asks some follow-up questions about the topic or the wants and needs of the audience or users of a product, but does not dig deep 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ shows understanding of central aspects of the Driving Question by identifying in detail what needs to be known to answer it and considering various possible points of view on it ▶ asks follow-up questions that focus or broaden inquiry, as appropriate (CC 6-12.W.7) ▶ asks follow-up questions to gain understanding of the wants and needs of audience or product users 	
<p><i>Building Knowledge, Understanding, and Skills:</i> Gather and Evaluate Information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ is unable to integrate information to address the Driving Question; gathers too little, too much, or irrelevant information, or from too few sources ▶ accepts information at face value (does not evaluate its quality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ attempts to integrate information to address the Driving Question, but it may be too little, too much, or gathered from too few sources; some of it may not be relevant ▶ understands that the quality of information should be considered, but does not do so thoroughly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ integrates relevant and sufficient information to address the Driving Question, gathered from multiple and varied sources (CC 6,11-12.RI.7) ▶ thoroughly assesses the quality of information (considers usefulness, accuracy and credibility; distinguishes fact vs. opinion; recognizes bias) (CC 6-12.W.8) 	
<p><i>Developing and Revising Ideas and Products:</i> Use Evidence and Criteria</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ accepts arguments for possible answers to the Driving Question without questioning whether reasoning is valid ▶ uses evidence without considering how strong it is ▶ relies on “gut feeling” to evaluate and revise ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions (does not use criteria) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ recognizes the need for valid reasoning and strong evidence, but does not evaluate it carefully when developing answers to the Driving Question ▶ evaluates and revises ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions based on incomplete or invalid criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ evaluates arguments for possible answers to the Driving Question by assessing whether reasoning is valid and evidence is relevant and sufficient (CC 6-12.SL.3, RI.8) ▶ justifies choice of criteria used to evaluate ideas, product prototypes or problem solutions ▶ revises inadequate drafts, designs or solutions and explains why they will better meet evaluation criteria (CC 6-12.W.5) 	
<p><i>Presenting Products and Answers to Driving Question:</i> Justify Choices, Consider Alternatives & Implications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ chooses one presentation medium without considering advantages and disadvantages of using other mediums to present a particular topic or idea ▶ cannot give valid reasons or supporting evidence to defend choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products ▶ does not consider alternative answers to the Driving Question, designs for products, or points of view ▶ is not able to explain important new understanding gained in the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ considers the advantages and disadvantages of using different mediums to present a particular topic or idea, but not thoroughly ▶ explains choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products, but some reasons are not valid or lack supporting evidence ▶ understands that there may be alternative answers to the Driving Question or designs for products, but does not consider them carefully ▶ can explain some things learned in the project, but is not entirely clear about new understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of using different mediums to present a particular topic or idea (CC 8.RI.7) ▶ justifies choices made when answering the Driving Question or creating products, by giving valid reasons with supporting evidence (CC 6-12.SL.4) ▶ recognizes the limitations of an answer to the Driving Question or a product design (how it might not be complete, certain, or perfect) and considers alternative perspectives (CC 11-12.SL.4) ▶ can clearly explain new understanding gained in the project and how it might transfer to other situations or contexts 	