Peer Evaluation (DARE)

HUP 104 Ethics and Moral Issues

Name of Committee:_____ **Name of Evaluator**:_____

Criteria	**Respond in complete sentences in a short paragraph for each section.**
Ethical Issue - is the issue clearly stated, and the problem explained thoroughly?	
Survey Analysis - is the purpose of survey clear, and survey question explained in the context of the demographic? Does it connect to the purpose of the presentation?	
Two Sides - does the presenter identify the *best* reasons on both sides?	
Counterclaim and Refutation – does the presenter provide the best counterclaim? Is the refutation reasonable?	
Research Results - relevant?	
Visual Data: Graphs, Charts, Statistics, etc. - is it helpful?	
Ethical Theory - explained correctly and effectively?	
Ethical theory application - accurate and step-by-step? Does the conclusion follow from the application?	
Conclusion - does the presenter reach a logical conclusion drawing on the application of the theory and examination of both sides?	
Identify the strongest part of the presentation. Why is it persuasive?	

Peer Evaluation (DARE)

HUP 104 Ethics and Moral Issues

Identify the weakest part of the presentation. What is at least one aspect that needs clarification?	
How reasonable is the conclusion? Do you agree? Why or why not?	
Provide at least one counterclaim to the presenter's conclusion.	
Ask at least one question for further research.	
Any additional comments for the presenter?	

	Meets Standards	Does NOT Meet Standards
REFLECT *Recall, ponder and communicate*	References specific parts of the project/ discussion	Responds to the project/discussion in vague terms by addressing assignment instructions/rubric only; Offers no insight into what was recalled
	EXAMPLE: *"I relate/concur/disagree with X because..." OR "I like what you did with*	

Peer Evaluation (DARE)

HUP 104 Ethics and Moral Issues

Guide questions:

- What is the main argument?
- What evidence/support does the author give?
- What is the primary purpose of the work?
- Does the work achieve its purpose? Fully or only partially?
- Was the purpose worthwhile to begin with? Or was it too limited, trivial, broad, theoretical, etc.?
- Is any of the evidence weak or insufficient? In what way?
- Can I supply further explanation to clarify or support any of the main points, ideas, and arguments?
- Are there sections you don't understand? Why?
- Was there any area where the author offered too much or too little information?
- Is the analysis of the research an important factor? Is every piece of evidence followed by analysis?
- Where can the analysis better explain the evidence? Where can analysis be further developed?
- Is it clear how examples support the argument and connect to the research question?
- Does the writer make any leaps in judgment that are questionable or illogical?
- Did the writer incorporate a counterargument? Was it refuted successfully?
- Is anything about the language or style noteworthy?
- Lastly, summarize your criticism, and argue why your response is a helpful way to improve the author's argument and understanding how to better resolve the issue.