

**Learning Objective Task Description:  
Students demonstrate effective [thinking/cognitive processing]**

<b>Outcome Objective</b>	<b>Exceeding</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Approaching</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Identify</b></p> <p>facts, vocabulary, definitions, terms, concepts, people</p>	<p>Correctly identifies or recalls most or all (e.g. 80% or more) of the requested factual information</p>	<p>Correctly identifies or recalls much (e.g. 70%) of the requested factual information</p>	<p>Correctly identifies or recalls some (e.g. 69% or less) of the requested factual information</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Recognize</b></p> <p>concepts or tools relevant for application to a task</p>	<p>Selects most or all (e.g. 80% or more) relevant concepts for solving a problem; shows thorough awareness of what principles, methods, and concepts are relevant to a problem situation</p>	<p>Selects many (e.g. 70%) relevant concepts for solving a problem; grasps the main points for making the connections to the problem, but misses some</p>	<p>Selects few (e.g. 69% or less) of the relevant concepts for solving a problem; misses a number of useful connections of concepts and/or misses the main “key” that could unlock the problem</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Ask</b></p> <p>questions or frame hypotheses relevant to the task</p>	<p>Converts an ill-defined problem situation into a question (or questions) that can be addressed within the discipline; does this with a high degree of efficiency, accuracy, and thoroughness</p>	<p>Converts an ill-defined problem situation into a question (or questions) that can be addressed within the discipline; does this with mixed or moderate degrees of efficiency, accuracy, and thoroughness</p>	<p>Misses the major discipline-linked question(s) that could be derived from an ill-defined problem situation; focuses on irrelevant aspects; misses major aspects of the problem; and/or poses the wrong question</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Collect</b></p> <p>information relevant to address the task – e.g. data; literature sources</p>	<p>Uses appropriate sources (literature or sample); cites/describes sources correctly; is careful, thorough, specific, accurate, and precise in recording and presenting information</p>	<p>Uses some appropriate sources; cites sources; is careful enough in recording and presenting information to have a reasonably accurate overall perspective on the problem</p>	<p>Misses the most important sources; uses inappropriate sources; does not cite, or incorrectly cites sources; is sloppy, imprecise, incomplete in ways that may lead to a significantly distorted perspective on the problem</p>

<p><b>Analyze 1</b>  <u>Apply</u> concepts to address the task</p>	<p>Applies relevant concepts thoroughly and correctly to solve a problem</p>	<p>Applies some but not all of the relevant concepts to solve a problem; achieves only part of the correct answer after applying the concepts</p>	<p>Concepts are misapplied; incorrect use of concepts leads to incorrect answer</p>
<p><b>Analyze 2</b>  <u>Deconstruct</u> an argument by indicating claims and/or evidence; <u>synthesize</u> evidence from multiple sources</p>	<p>Correctly describes the logic and/or evidence used to convey an argument; distinguishes between facts and inferences; accurately compares and contrasts positions; effectively builds a cogent synthesis</p>	<p>Generally follows the reasoning of the argument but misses some elements of the argument; correctly describes some important aspects of the evidence and logic but not all; builds a reasonable synthesis but misses important points</p>	<p>Argument is misunderstood; synthesis is ill-conceived or not present</p>
<p><b>Analyze 3</b>  <u>Evaluate</u> support for claims; <u>justify</u> conclusions</p>	<p>Critically evaluates and justifies conclusions by examining strengths and weaknesses of an argument</p>	<p>Demonstrates some ability to critically evaluate and justify conclusions by examining strengths and weaknesses of an argument; misses some important strengths or weaknesses</p>	<p>Does not take an evaluative position or takes a position on weak evidence; does not defend position when called for or conclusions are not supported by evidence</p>