LLU INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOME: PROFESSIONAL CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

Based on the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric[1]

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Loma Linda University (LLU) is a largely graduate and professional health sciences institution. Dr. Lynda Daniel-Underwood developed a clinical version of the AAC&U Critical Thinking Rubric for the School of Medicine. The LLU Learning Outcome Committee took Dr. Daniel-Underwood's version of the rubric she developed for the MD program and broadened it to be applicable for practice in a variety of settings to include programs with clinicals, practica, and field experiences.

Definition
Critical thinking is higher level reasoning using professional judgment with appropriate and reliable sources to make evidence-based decisions.

Framing Language
This Professional Critical Thinking Rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those competencies in various and changing situations encountered in diverse environments. This rubric is designed for use with many different types of environments, and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in situations that require students to complete analyses of complex professional experiences and issues.

Notes on Uses of the Rubric
- **Zero Score**: Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or resolution of a problem that does not meet level one performance.
- **Contextualizing the Rubric**: Programs may further modify this rubric to fit their unique disciplines' needs.

Glossary
The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Sources**: Reliable books, statements, people, etc., supplying appropriate information[2].
- **Problem**: A practical situation within the discipline/profession that needs resolution.
- **Professional ILO[3]**: Professional programs and skills-intensive disciplines may adapt and assess LLU's ILOs and rubrics to meet their unique learning and assessment needs.
- **Reliable**: Peer-acceptable, trusted standards and sources[4].

---

[1] AAC&U Critical Thinking Rubric was initially revised by Dr. Lynda Danial-Underwood, LLU School of Medicine, for the clinical setting and was further revised by LLU Learning Outcomes Committee; AAC&U - http://www.aacu.org/value/metarubrics.cfm - value@aacu.org; LLU Office of Educational Effectiveness - http://www.llu.edu/central/assessment/index.page - assessment@llu.edu.

[2] Based on Dictionary.com: http://www.dictionary.com/browse/source?s=t

[3] LLU's Professional Institutional Learning Outcomes:

[4] Based on Dictionary.com: http://www.dictionary.com/browse/reliable?s=t

LLU INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOME: PROFESSIONAL CRITICAL THINKING RUBRIC

Based on the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric[5]

Definition

Critical thinking is higher level reasoning using professional judgment with appropriate and reliable sources to make evidence-based decisions.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or resolution of a problem that does not meet level one performance.

	4	3	2	1
Identify the presented problem(s)	Identifies problem(s) accurately, independently, and with expertise.	Identifies problem(s) accurately and independently.	Identifies problem(s) without accuracy or broad focus but seeks input.	Inaccurately identifies the problem nor seeks input when appropriate.
Gain new information	Gathers sufficient and appropriate information from reliable sources.	Gathers appropriate information from reliable sources.	Gathers insufficient information from standard and unreliable sources.	Gathers unreliable information from various sources.
Define key components within context of the presented problem(s)	Defines, formulates and prioritizes individualized multiple solutions to the presented problem(s) based on prior knowledge and the evidence.	Defines and formulates a solution to the presented problem(s) based on prior knowledge and the evidence.	Defines and formulates an ineffective solution to the presented problem(s).	Defines and formulates an inappropriate solution to the presented problem(s).
Integrate knowledge and expertise for decision-making	Articulates the complexities of the presented problem(s) and uses prior knowledge and skills to fully assess the complexities of the proposed solution.	Articulates the complexities of the presented problem(s) and uses prior knowledge and skills to assess the appropriateness of the proposed solution.	Articulates some of the complexities of the presented problem(s) to partially assess the proposed solution.	Articulates a simplistic approach to the presented complex problem(s).
Solve problem safely and implement effectively	Effectively resolves the presented problem(s) safely using approved standard protocols and suggests new solutions based on sound evidence.	Safely resolves the presented problem(s) and effectively uses approved standard protocols, devising individualized solutions when appropriate.	Ineffectively resolves the presented problem(s) or incompletely uses standard protocols.	Unsafely addresses the presented problem(s).

[5] AAC&U Critical Thinking Rubric revised by Dr. Lynda Danial-Underwood, LLU School of Medicine, and the LLU Learning Outcomes Committee; AAC&U - http://www.aacu.org/value/metarubrics.cfm - value@aacu.org; LLU Office of Educational Effectiveness - http://www.llu.edu/central/assessment/index.page - assessment@llu.edu.