

Learning Assessment Plan: Critical Thinking, 2010

SAC: Political Science

Contact: Rosa Bettencourt rbettenc@pcc.edu

Political Science is creating a questionnaire to do a pre and post poll of how it is meeting PCC's outcomes.

All those teaching PS 201 will include in our next exam the following question:

How do the biases and format constraints of information sources (print, broadcast, internet, etc) impact political outcomes (e.g. voting choice, party affiliation, public opinion, etc)?

Each of us then will randomly pick 5 exams, copy them without any names and then we will get together to evaluate them based on the rubric we agreed upon at the SAC meeting, which is the Holistic rubric:

The Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric **A Tool for Developing and Evaluating Critical Thinking**

Peter A. Facione, Ph.D and Noreen C. Facione, Ph.D.

Strong 4. Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.
Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions.
Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.
Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.

Acceptable 3. Does most or many of the following:

Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view.
Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions.
Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.
Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.

Unacceptable 2. Does most or many of the following:

Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments.
Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions.
Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.
Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.

Weak 1. Consistently does all or almost all of the following:

Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.
Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.
Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.
Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.
Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.
Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.

Permission is hereby granted to students, faculty, staff, or administrators at public or nonprofit educational institutions for unlimited duplication of the critical thinking scoring rubric, rating form, or instructions herein for local teaching, assessment, research, or other educational and non-commercial uses, provided that no part of the scoring rubric is altered and that "Facione and Facione" are cited as authors. (PAF49:R4.2:062694).
www.insightassessment.com USA Phone: (650) 697- 5628