## DEAL Model Critical Thinking Standards Table excerpts (Ash & Clayton, 2009; various)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Associated questions to ask to check your thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Clarity**                | *Expands on ideas, express ideas in another way, provides examples or illustrations where appropriate.* | - Did I give an example?  
- Is it clear what I mean by this?  
- Could I elaborate further? |
| **Accuracy**               | *All statements are factually correct and/or supported with evidence.*        | - How do I know this?  
- Is this true?  
- How could I check on this or verify it? |
| **Precision**              | *Statements contain specific information*                                    | - Can I be more specific?  
- Have I provided sufficient detail? |
| **Relevance**              | *All statements are relevant to the question at hand; all statements connect to the central point.* | - How does this relate to the issue being discussed?  
- How does this help us/me deal with the issue being discussed? |
| **Depth**                  | *Explains the reasons behind conclusions and anticipates and answers the questions that the reasoning raises and/or acknowledges the complexity of the issue.* | - Why is this so?  
- What are some of the complexities here?  
- What would it take for this to happen?  
- Would this be easy to do? |
| **Breadth**                | *Considers alternative points of view or how someone else might have interpreted the situation.* | - Would this look the same from the perspective of…?  
- Is there another way to interpret what this means? |
| **Logic**                  | *The line of reasoning makes sense and follows from the facts and/or what has been said.* | - Does what I said at the beginning fit with what I concluded at the end?  
- Do my conclusions match the evidence that I have presented?* |
| **Significance**           | *The conclusions or goals represent a (the) major issue raised by the reflection on experience.* | - Is this the most important issue to focus on?  
- Is this most significant problem to consider? |
| **Fairness**               | *Other points of view are represented with integrity (without bias or distortion)* | - Have I represented this viewpoint in such a way that the person who holds it would agree with my characterization? |

### Use the table to provide feedback:

A: “Everybody knows that smoking is bad, so parents shouldn’t smoke when they have children; those parents who do smoke obviously just don’t care about their kids.”

B: “My study away experience not only taught me a lot about the subject I was studying but myself as well. It changed how I saw the world, how I experienced campus and gave me qualities in myself I hadn’t yet found. The experiences were once in a lifetime, and I use what I’ve learned from them to navigate my life now.”
**DEAL Model Critical Thinking Standards Rubric (excerpt) (Ash & Clayton, 2009; various)**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong></td>
<td>Consistently makes inaccurate statements and/or fails to provide supporting evidence for claims</td>
<td>Makes several inaccurate statements and/or supports few statements with evidence</td>
<td>Usually but not always makes statements that are accurate and well-supported with evidence</td>
<td>Consistently makes statements that are accurate and well-supported with evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity</strong></td>
<td>Consistently fails to provide examples, to illustrate points, to define terms, and/or to express ideas in other ways</td>
<td>Only occasionally provides examples, illustrates points, defines terms, and/or expresses ideas in other ways</td>
<td>Usually but not always provides examples, illustrates points, defines terms, and/or expresses ideas in other ways</td>
<td>Consistently provides examples, illustrates points, defines terms, and/or expresses ideas in other ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth</strong></td>
<td>Fails to address salient questions that arise from statements being made; consistently over-simplifies when making connections; fails to consider any of the complexities of the issue</td>
<td>Addresses few of the salient questions that arise from statements being made; often over-simplifies when making connections; considers little of the complexity of the issue</td>
<td>Addresses some but not all of the salient questions that arise from statements being made; rarely over-simplifies when making connections; considers some but not all of the full complexity of the issue</td>
<td>Thoroughly addresses salient questions that arise from statements being made; avoids over-simplifying when making connections; considers the full complexity of the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breadth</strong></td>
<td>Ignores or superficially considers alternative points of view and/or interpretations</td>
<td>Gives minimal consideration to alternative points of view and/or interpretations and makes very limited use of them in shaping the learning</td>
<td>Gives some consideration to alternative points of view and/or interpretations and makes some use of them in shaping the learning</td>
<td>Gives meaningful consideration to alternative points of view and/or interpretations and makes very good use of them in shaping the learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness</strong></td>
<td>Consistently represents others’ perspectives in a biased or distorted way</td>
<td>Occasionally represents others’ perspectives in a biased or distorted way</td>
<td>Often but not always represents others’ perspectives with integrity</td>
<td>Consistently represents others’ perspectives with integrity (without bias or distortion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>