

PISc 310
Paper Evaluation Form

Evaluator's name _____

Author's name _____

As a peer evaluator, your job is to evaluate the author's **arguments**. You are not a copy editor. You are the argument editor. You do not need to spend time correcting spelling and other technical mistakes. You do need to spend time giving constructive criticism on the author's arguments. Constructive criticism means that you not only point out the weaknesses in the author's arguments, you give suggestions on how to strengthen those arguments. As stated on the syllabus, 10% of your final paper grade is determined by how well you evaluate your peers.

Make any notes that you wish on the author's paper. Also, answer all of the questions below. Make a copy of the author's paper after you have evaluated it (i.e., with all of your notes on it), and a copy of this form after completed. Turn in originals to author, and turn in the copies to the instructor on **7 April 2011** (at the beginning of class).

How could the author better characterize the event, practice, or institution? Is the descriptive background sufficient to understand it? Is there too much information? Too little?

How could the author better apply the three theories? What aspects of the theories should be included and applied that have not? How could the author better show what features of the event, practice, or institution are not explained/predicted by the theory? Does the author discuss how the theories apply (or not) on a general and specific level? How could the author better show how the premises/assumptions lead to the explanation and prediction (research tradition discussion)?

How could the author better support those arguments from current events sources and the readings on the specific theories and readings on theories generally? Where specifically is more support needed (discuss here or show on paper)?

How could the author better support her/his argument for which theory she/he finds to be best?

How could the author better apply the theories to predict the future situation (as well as to explain the past and current situation)?

How could the author better discuss the implications for democracy from the theories?

How well does the author do in the technical aspects of the paper (proper citations; spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors; etc.)?

How well is the paper written (clear sense of direction, transitions, flow, etc.)?

Other comments: