

Essentials: Critical Thinking and Analytic Reasoning – GECRT-AH, GECRT–SS, and GECRT-SC

Student Learning Outcomes for GECRT

1. Identify a topic, problem, or issue to be addressed
2. Locate relevant information representing various points of view
3. Evaluate alternate points of view
4. Synthesize diverse points of view
5. Draw a conclusion that is a logical inference from the evidence

Assessment Rubric

| CRITERIA | 4: Exceeds Expectations | 3: Meets Expectations | 2: Approaches Expectations | 1: Minimally Approaches Expectations |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| SLO 1: Identify a topic, problem, or issue to be addressed | Student artifact comprehensively articulates a topic, problem, or issue for critical analysis, explaining all relevant information necessary for full understanding. Key terms, background information, and boundaries for the study are well-defined . | Student artifact sufficiently articulates a topic, problem, or issue for analysis, explaining relevant information for understanding. Minor terms, background information, or boundaries may need clarification . | Student artifact articulates a topic, problem, or issue for discussion, with some explanation relevant for understanding. Some terms may be undefined , ambiguities unexplored , boundaries undetermined , and/or backgrounds unknown . | Student artifact selects a topic, problem, or issue for discussion but without necessary explanation for adequate understanding. Artifact lacks coherence and requires clarification, development of terms, and background information for understanding. |
| SLO 2: Locate relevant evidence representing various points of view | Student artifact comprehensively selects relevant evidence that addresses the topic, problem, or issue from various viewpoints. | Student artifact sufficiently selects relevant evidence that addresses the topic, problem, or issue from various viewpoints. | Student artifact selects some evidence, but the relevance of the evidence is unclear , or it doesn't represent various viewpoints. | Student artifact selects little or no evidence. Evidence may not be relevant or from various viewpoints. |

| CRITERIA | 4: Exceeds Expectations | 3: Meets Expectations | 2: Approaches Expectations | 1: Minimally Approaches Expectations |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| SLO 3: Evaluate alternate points of view | Artifact comprehensively evaluates diverse alternative points of view related to a specific topic, problem, or issue. Perspectives are compared and/or contrasted to support a fully developed argument or analysis. | Artifact sufficiently evaluates alternative points of view related to a specific topic, problem, or issue. Perspectives are compared and/or contrasted to support a developed argument or analysis. | Artifact evaluates some alternative points of view related to a specific topic, problem, or issue. Perspectives are compared and/or contrasted but lack cohesion or do not contribute toward a developed argument or analysis. | Artifact evaluates little to no alternative points of view related to a specific topic, problem, or issue. Perspectives are inadequately compared and/or contrasted, lack cohesion, or insufficiently support an argument or analysis. |
| SLO 4: Synthesize diverse points of view | Artifact comprehensively and effectively synthesizes diverse points of view or evidence. | Artifact sufficiently and effectively synthesizes diverse points of view or evidence. | Artifact provides some synthesis of diverse points of view but does not sufficiently or effectively engage with evidence or diverse viewpoints. | Artifact provides little to no synthesis of diverse points of view and inadequately engages with evidence and viewpoints. |
| SLO 5: Draw a conclusion that is a logical inference from the evidence | Conclusion offers a comprehensive and new understanding and/or perspectives on the topic, problem, or issue. | Conclusion offers a sufficient and new understanding and/or perspectives on the topic, problem, or issue. | Conclusion offers some insight and understanding and/or perspectives on the topic, problem, or issue. | Conclusion offers no insight or little to no understanding and/or perspectives on the topic, problem, or issue. |

Notes:

The rubric will be used to evaluate samples of the signature assignments submitted as part of the coursework for these courses. **(Revised Draft – Feb. 2023)**

- Evaluators should assign a zero to any work sample that does not meet Level 1 performance.
- Evaluators should assign an NA to all work samples for a course for which the signature assignment does not elicit a specific outcome (even though students may demonstrate that outcome).
- This rubric is based on the AAC&U's Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric.
- The UMKC Essentials Critical Thinking Rubric has been developed to assess student achievement of the Student Learning Outcomes identified for the three UMKC Essentials program's critical thinking courses in the Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Natural Sciences.