# ES2660 Panel Discussion Rubric for Peer Review

**Your name**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Panellist’s name:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Comments** |
| **CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (Critical Thinking skills, mainly)**   * References to source information, examples * Knowledge of counter argument and ability to rebut |  |
| **CONFIDENCE**   * Developing and defending position   **OPEN MINDEDNESS**   * Engagement with opposing viewpoints – own team / Q and A |  |
| **CT SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS**   * *Building on contributions/Challenging*   *• Clarifying information or understanding*  *• Defining key terms*  *• Establishing assumptions*  *• Evaluating contributions*  *• Forming hypothesis*  *• Judging conclusions*  *• Setting parameters of discussion/giving outline or overview*  *• Synthesising information* |  |
| **NONVERBAL CUES**   * *Maintaining eye contact* * *Looking interested* * *Speaking directly rather than reading from notes* |  |
| **DISCUSSION BEHAVIOUR**   * *Holding on ground ● Debating with* * *Jumping in ● Inviting (others) in* * *Giving way ● Agreeing with* |  |
| **LANGUAGE USE**   * Asking questions * Agreeing/disagreeing * Building/challenging |  |

Follow one panellist on the panels when you are a member of the audience. You and your team members should observe different panellists in each discussion. **How well does the panellist juggle the academic conversation balls?** Tick off each item, evaluating the quality of each category by giving a comment.

**Overall**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **How well did the discussion define the key terms?** 2. **How well did the panellist engage with others?** 3. **How much content knowledge about the topic was displayed on a scale of 1 to 5? (*1 - ‘Little / General’; 5 - ‘A substantial range’)*** 4. **How deeply was the topic explored?** |  |