

**Decision-Making and Critical Thinking Common Rubric**

**Critical Thinking and Decision Making Goal:** Our students will be able to think critically when evaluating decisions.

**Critical Thinking and Decision Making Learning Objective:** Students will evaluate alternatives and understand the ramifications of those alternatives within a given business context.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work that does not meet the benchmark (cell one) level of performance.*

	<b>Capstone 4</b>	<b>Milestones</b>		<b>Benchmark 1</b>
		<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Articulate the Problem</b>	Issue/problem is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding. Relevant stakeholders are recognized.	Issue/problem is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions. Relevant stakeholders are recognized.	Issue/problem is stated but description does not recognize the complexity of the problem and/or identify all relevant stakeholders.	Issue/problem is not stated or is stated without clarification or description.
<b>Evidence</b>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. No irrelevant information is included in the analysis.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a detailed analysis or synthesis. Very little irrelevant information is included.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation but not enough to develop a detailed analysis or synthesis. Some irrelevant information is included.	Information is taken from sources without any interpretation or analysis. There is little to no discernment between relevant and irrelevant information.
<b>Propose Solutions</b>	Utilizes relevant theoretical or conceptual frameworks to propose one or more solutions that indicate a deep comprehension of the problem. Solutions are sensitive to contextual factors and are completely consistent with the evidence provided.	Utilizes relevant theoretical or conceptual frameworks to propose one or more solutions that indicate comprehension of the problem and follow from the evidence provided. Solutions are sensitive to contextual factors but one important concept or framework has not been considered.	Utilizes a theoretical or conceptual framework to propose a solution that is “off the shelf” rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem and considers little of the evidence provided.	Proposes a solution that contradicts the evidence provided or is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the issue/problem. Does not utilize theoretical or conceptual frameworks to propose solution(s).

<b>Evaluate Potential Solution</b>	Evaluation of solutions is deep (for example, contains thorough and insightful explanation) and includes, deeply and thoroughly, all of the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility, and weighs impacts.	Evaluation of solutions is adequate (for example, contains thorough explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility, and weighs impacts.	Evaluation of solutions is brief (for example, explanation lacks depth) and includes one of the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility, or weighs impact.	Evaluation of solutions is superficial (for example, contains cursory, surface level explanation) and fails to consider the feasibility and impact of potential solutions.
<b>Conclusions and Related Outcomes</b>	Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, or consequences that consider context and all evidence is considered. Objectively reflects upon their own assertions.	Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, or consequences that consider context and all evidence is considered.	Identifies and discusses conclusions that consider the context, and uses some, but not all, of the evidence considered.	Fails to draw conclusions based on the evaluation, or draws conclusions that contradict the evidence or context.

*Revised spring 2019*