Rosa Flores interviews Danielle the Hurricane Harvey Survivor. The paper needs to be 1500-2000 words (~6-8 pages), and included at least 5 sources. These sources should be cited both in text and in a Works Cited at the end. You may choose either MLA or APA. Choose an ethical issue in that field to focus on. As was the case with the presentation, focus, detail, and development are the key to success in this paper. Rather than trying for a broad overview of many issues, try to focus on one and really dig into it. Identify specific moral actors involved in the issue. One of the strengths of the Potter Square as a tool is that it helps you understand why specific people in specific positions make the choices that they do. Identifying what scope of action a moral actor has regarding a situation, and therefore what level of practical responsibility they have over the outcome of the situation, helps keep your analysis fair and persuasive. Identify credible sources and clear, relevant examples. As in the presentation, identifying good sources and examples is a key part of this paper. You want to choose a small number of high quality examples that will help give specific concrete examples of the moral challenges you are discussing. But these examples must remain in balance with your own argument--too many examples will drown our you voice and turn your paper into a bullet pointed list. Similarly, finding good, authoritative sources can be great for providing key terms and definitions for your argument, but these expert voices should always be in support of your argument. Don't let them take over your paper, so that your argument becomes "here is what Prof X would say about this case." Create a strong organization that moves the reader through your information in a clear and logical way. All the material we covered preparing to outline your presentation applies equally here. What kinds of knowledge, examples, and assumptions are your readers likely to possess regarding your topic? What will they know )or think they know)? Are there important gaps you need to fill in, or myths you need to bust, in order to explain the way these situations really work? What key terms and ideas will you need to define for your reader upfront? What is the best, clearest, most logical order to present your analysis of this ethical situation? How can you clearly introduce each new point, and create strong transitions between them so your reader can always easily follow the sequence of your thinking? How can you introduce your sources to the readers in a way that maximizes the authority those sources lend to your argument? How can you frame quotes, examples, and other information so that your reader gets what you want them to get out of them (the "Source Sandwich" of intro/framing/evidence/analysis) What kind of conclusion paragraph will send your reader out with the clearest understanding of your main points? Have you used a clear and consistent citation method, so that your reader can easily follow up with any of the sources that you used? You can use either MLA or APA, as long as you do it consistently and correctly