

Research Paper Assignment Packet

The research paper is one of the main components of your Fellowship. You will work on it throughout the program and will have several opportunities to receive feedback from your mentors and peers. All papers are eligible to win prizes and/or be published in the annual [Fellows Review](#).

Below is the information that you will need to reference including the proposal, outline, first draft, and final draft information along with notes on citations, formatting, and style. You can also find information about paper prizes and the grading rubric.

Table of Contents:

Due Dates.....	2
Paper Topic.....	2
Paper Proposal.....	3
Proposal Sample.....	4
Outline.....	6
Final Paper Formatting.....	9
Citations and Styles.....	10
Research Paper Prizes.....	16
Grading Rubric.....	18

Due Dates

September 29, 2023 – Paper Proposal

December 1, 2023 – Paper Outline

January 19, 2024 – First Draft

March 1, 2024 – Final Draft

All written assignments MUST be submitted as a Word document

Paper Topic

Fellows' papers are based upon research, historical analysis, or comparison of an aspect of the U.S. Presidency and/or Congress. We encourage papers that consider the many historical lessons that can be gleaned from the Presidency and Congress. Historical analysis should be linked to current issues facing the Presidency or Congress or to broader themes that have recurred throughout the history of these institutions. Paper topics should fit into one of four categories:

- Foreign Policy & National Security
- Domestic Policy
- Economics & Finance
- Campaigns, Communications, and Elections

If you are writing about a subject that has received significant scholarly attention, you should strive to find a unique angle. However, if you are writing about a more obscure subject, please be sure that you make a strong argument for its importance or emphasize a strong connection to more central issues for the U.S. Presidency and Congress.

Paper Proposal

Due September 29, 2023

A short abstract:

This should be a 4-6 sentence summary of your central question and your project design. Abstracts will change over the year as you conduct your research, but should always be one paragraph in length, single-spaced, justified alignment, and italicized.

Address the significance of your research:

Why is your research question interesting and important for Presidential or Congressional studies? If this is an area about which much has been written, what will be unique about your approach? If this is an area that no one has addressed before, why should it be studied? Why would the President or a Member of Congress want this research to be done? Why would your policy recommendations be relevant to leaders in the executive or legislative branches?

Discuss your design and the feasibility of your research:

How will you go about exploring your research question? Discuss any plans for interviews with relevant officials or the use of special documents or archives. Is your research question appropriate for a fifteen-page paper? How will this research fit into your overall schedule? How does this work relate to other thesis work or work in other classes?

Proposal format:

- Use Times New Roman 12-point font throughout.
- Place your research topic or paper title at the top of the page, followed by your name and school.
- The abstract should follow. Make sure the abstract is one paragraph in length, single-spaced, justified alignment, and italicized.
- The remainder of the proposal should be double-spaced and left-aligned with 1-inch margins.
- The proposal should be no more than 2 pages.
- Spell-checking and careful editing are required.

Proposal Sample

The Policy Impact of Congressional and Presidential Bioethics Commissions

Student Name, Student School

Since 1974, there have been eight major presidential or congressional bioethics commissions, all of which have exhibited a large degree of variance in their scope, longevity, level of support, and final impact. This research project will attempt to examine possible explanations for the commissions' variance in final impact and will seek to identify factors that permit bioethics commissions to have the greatest effect on public policy. I will first create a general overview of the relative success of the eight commissions followed by an examination of 2-3 case studies. I will then use the research to offer suggestions for reforming the structure of bioethics commissions so as to increase their potential impact.

Overview

The first major bioethical commission in the United States was the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 1974-1978. The eight bioethics commissions since then have had highly disparate impacts: the report *Defining Death* in 1981, for instance, was directly responsible for the model Uniform Determination of Death Act, which was enacted by most U.S. states, while other commissions seem to have produced nothing other than reports, and one commission failed to produce even a single report.

The variation in commission success and functionality over time results in a similar variation in the ability of the federal government to respond to emerging bioethics issues. If the president and Congress are to act appropriately in determining bioethical guidelines for policy, research, and technology, they must have recourse to reliable experts on reasonably influential commissions. Yet few researchers in the past 20 years have sought to explain the success differentials among these commissions. My research for the Presidential Fellows Program will seek to do precisely that, especially with respect to the period since 1996 (when the last research

in this area appears to have been performed), offering some explanations for the variation in success and suggesting some methods to optimize the work of future commissions.

I will primarily make use of the resources offered by the Bioethics Library at Georgetown University to perform this research, incorporating information from the Congressional Record and other archived resources when appropriate. I intend to begin with an overview of each of the past commissions, answering basic empirical questions such as: (1) how many reports did the commission author? (2) how many laws, statutes, or executive orders were passed that can be traced to the work of the commission? (3) have presidential commissions been responsible for more policy change than congressional commissions, or vice versa? and so forth. Following that, I intend to examine two or three case studies from the period 1996-2017, including at least one case in which a policy action was successfully implemented on the recommendations of a bioethics commission and one case in which no policy action was taken despite clear and significant warnings from a commission. This stage may include examination of congressional debate and may make use of resources such as the Congressional Record.

My main area of study is political theory, and I am also writing a thesis this year on the relationship of Rawlsian liberalism to technological development. This research for the CSPC is not directly related to that topic, but it may provide interesting test cases which can be incorporated into the thesis; the thesis may similarly provide a theoretical lens with which to view the research I do as a Presidential Fellow. I think the scope is manageable in a fifteen-page paper, especially if the scope of study is restricted to the period 1996-2017 and the number of case studies is limited to two.

Outline

Due December 1, 2023

The paper outline should be a more fleshed-out version of your proposal where you list out the points you will be making in your paper and the evidence you will use to support it. Below is a sample outline:

Name - CSPC

Rough Outline of Presidential Fellows Research Paper: How Veterans Vote in Congress

Introduction:

- A. Discuss the goal of this paper, what the data set includes, and what data this paper is going to look at
 - This paper assesses the voting behavior former military members exhibit in Congress to understand possible explanations for any variance among veterans' voting. This paper will examine the bipartisanship and moderation of congress members during the 105th, 106th, 116th, and 117th Congresses given party affiliation, veteran status, conflict era, length of service, rank, and district competitiveness. Bipartisanship will be measured with the Lugar data set for the 116th and 117th Congresses but does not exist and therefore will not be applied to the 105th and 106th Congresses. DW-NOMINATE, a different measure of moderation will be applied to all four Congresses.
 - Discuss the connection between moderation and bipartisanship to validate DW-NOMINATE as a fair bipartisanship score.
- B. Background on polarization and Congressional voting in Congress
 - 1) Both Republicans and Democrats have grown significantly apart ideologically over the past 50 years. Following the dissolution of the textbook Congress era that took place following World War II until the mid-1960s, the two political parties have shifted further apart in ideology. This has been evident through rhetoric, actions, media, and most importantly, voting behavior.
- C. Veterans in Congress
 - 1) Why veterans would vote differently
 - “We contend that prior socialization to the obligations of the Oath of Office in military service represents a similar example of highly applicable expertise that may result in significant differences in voting behavior between veterans and nonveterans” (Ulrich et al. 5).
 - 2) Veteran representation in Congress – Largely the second school of thought
 - Compared to the 1960 and 1970s, there are nearly 50% fewer veterans in Congress today (see Mullen and Ackerman). The potential implications of this are endless. If the data proves that veterans are more moderate/bipartisan in their behaviors, more veterans would mean less overall polarization. There is also the potential that increasing the number of veterans in today's Congress could yield different results; voting behaviors of veteran congress members may fluctuate based on how many other members have a similar military background.

- Given the potential reversal trend from the decline in veteran participation in Congress, these ideas could become a reality to be analyzed through future research.
- D. What has previously been written about this subject
- 1) Amoroso et al. is a similar paper without some of the variables this paper will be using in its regression.
- I. School of thought 1 theory and hypothesis**
- 1) Polarization has been increasing in the country at rapid rates with the Republican Party polarizing more drastically than the Democratic Party (Poole and Rosenthal).
 - Discuss the textbook Congress and what forced the shift away (see Kenneth A. Shepsle). Strong committees ruled Congress from 1947 – 1965. This was followed by strong parties that have remained powerful and encouraged separation between the parties.
 - Give data on increased polarization statistics – specifically highlight the 105th/106th and 116th/117th Congresses because those are the relevant years for this paper.
 - What are the current effects of polarization? Data on the effectiveness of today’s Congress would be relevant in this section.
 - 2) Hypothesis: Veterans have been polarizing at a slower rate than the rest of Congress/non-veterans.
- II. School of thought 3 theory and hypothesis**
- 1) Why veterans would vote differently in Congress
 - Military members take an additional oath to the Constitution during their service.
 - The Oath military members take does not demand loyalty to a particular person or political party, only to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Experience serving the country in a nonpartisan manner could influence veteran congress members to continue serving the country with an unusually low loyalty to a singular party. Being less inclined to function solely within a party would lead to bipartisan behavior by those veteran military members.
 - Veterans in Congress have also been socialized into the military professional ethos that revolves around nonpartisanship. This culture encourages upholding democratic principles instead of individual political preferences.
 - Nonveteran congress members do not have the same exposure and have not received the same professional ethos training as military members. The Oath, combined with socialization to a military professional ethos could lead to different voting behaviors for veteran congress members.
 - 2) Hypothesis: Veterans in Congress are more bipartisan in their voting behavior than non-veterans.

Data/methods

- I anticipate using a blend of a preexisting data set on Congress voting behaviors that include state, service, conflict era, district competitiveness, service academy attendance,

length of service, officer or enlisted, and state served. I will add the Lugar data sets to the years applicable (data set limitations) and DW-NOMINATE scores to all veterans in the data set.

- The Lugar data set measures bipartisanship through congress members' actions beyond simply roll call votes. Instead, the Lugar index uses bill sponsorship and co-sponsorship data to objectively measure a member's partisanship and tendencies.
- While the Lugar data set is most revealing of bipartisanship, scores for the 105th and 106th Congresses do not exist. To measure bipartisanship (in a way) for those years, DW-NOMINATE scores will be applied to all four congresses. While DW-NOMINATE does not directly estimate the bipartisanship level of congress members, it does measure their moderation levels. This measure is sufficient for determining bipartisanship because moderation can be directly connected to bipartisanship. If a member is voting for opposition party bills on a semi-regular basis, they are scored as moderates under the DW-NOMINATE measure. Similarly, if a member never votes for a bill proposed by the opposing party, they receive a lower score signifying they are less moderate. If this paper is defining bipartisanship as willingly taking actions in support of another party's issue, a moderate DW-NOMINATE score signifies bipartisanship.
- I will use logic to determine the results in Stata.

Results

- Results will be based on the answers to the hypotheses given the data results.

Conclusions/ future research

A) Conclusions about the results

- Was there a difference in results between the 105/106 and 116/117 Congresses? What could this mean?

B) Future research

- 1) Future research questions will be derived based on the data results
- 2) Potential future research questions
 - Is it financially beneficial to back veteran congress members in non-competitive districts by opposing parties?
 - Would this data look different given Lugar scores for the 105th and 106th Congresses?
 - Is there an actionable connection between moderation and bipartisanship?
 - What would the effect of more veteran representation in Congress look like?
 - If veterans are not more bipartisan, why not? Potentially elections could be affecting this – what do the results for district competitiveness say?

Final Research Paper Formatting

The first draft of your research paper is due **January 19, 2024**. The final draft of your paper is due **March 1, 2024**. The following information is for the formatting of both your first draft and final paper. Feel free to reference last year's papers in the *Fellows Review* for questions about formatting and citations. You can find it on the [CSPC website](#).

Length & Page Setup

- Pages: Length 10-15 pages—focus on quality over quantity; one-inch margins all around
- Page Numbers: Bottom of Page, centered.

Text & Spacing

- Font: Times New Roman, black (except hyperlinks or graphics)
 - Title: Bold, 14 point, all capitals, centered, (followed by two 14 point lines)
 - Author Name: 12 point, all caps, centered
 - School Name: Italicized, 12 point, centered (followed by two 12 point lines)
 - Abstract: Italicized, 12 point, justified (followed by two 12 point lines), no “abstract:” heading
 - Subtitles/Headings: Bold, 12 point, all capitals, centered (preceded by two 12 point lines, followed by one 12 point line)
 - Body & Works Cited Citations: 12 point, left justified (each followed by one 12 point line)
 - Footnotes: 10 point, left justified
 - Page Numbers: 12 point, footer, centered
- Line Spacing
 - Abstract: Single
 - Body: 1.5
 - Block Quote (any quotation over three lines): Single
 - Bibliography: Single
- Indentation
 - Abstract: 1-inch indentation from left and right margins
 - Body Paragraphs: Half-inch indentation on first line
 - Block Quote: Half-inch indentation from left and right margins
 - Works Cited Citations: Half-inch hanging indentation

Citations and Styles

- All citations must be consistent with the *Chicago Manual of Style, 17th ed.*, available online at: <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html>.
 - The following page offers a great overview guide of how to utilize CMOS <https://whrhs.libguides.com/ChicagoStyle>
- Zotero is a great application that helps to organize and format citations. You can download the application and collect citations from web-based articles and books and import the citation to your library of sources. You can also manually input citations from physical sources into your citation library. You can link Zotero to Word which will automatically populate your paper with the correct citation of the source you use. Zotero will also create your bibliography at the end of your paper.
 - https://www.zotero.org/support/quick_start_guide

Sources

- Similar to any academic paper you might write in school, the sources that you use need to be high quality and cited properly.
- Newspaper articles should be found on reputable sites such as the *New York Times* or the *Wall Street Journal*.
- Articles found from a think tank **are not** news articles, but articles published on a website. E.g.:
 - ¹“Geotech: Implementation at Home, Partnerships Abroad,” Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress, December 2022, <https://www.thepresidency.org/geotech-report-2022>.
- Government documents are always welcome to be used to support your paper, however, you must be sure to cite them properly. This includes congressional research service reports, bills, public laws, and hearings. E.g.:
 - ¹ *Homeland Security Act of 2002: Hearings on H.R. 5005, Day 3, Before the Select Comm. on Homeland Security, 107th Cong. 203 (2002)* (statement of David Walker, Comptroller General of the United States).

Points of Note for Citations

- Basic footnote examples:
 - *Book*:
 - First name last name, *Title of Book* (Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication), page number.

- ¹Victoria de Grazia, *How Fascism Ruled Women: Italy, 1922 – 1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 132-133.
- *Journal*:
- First name last name, “Title of Journal,” *Journal title volume, number* (Month Year): page number.
 - ²Stephen Ansolabehere and Philip Edward Jones, “Constituents’ Responses to Congressional Roll-Call Voting,” *American Journal of Political Science* 54, no. 3 (July 2010): 585.
- If you use a source from the internet, you must include the date it was accessed and the website. Again, you can find all the proper citation formats on the [CMOS website](#).
- After using the full citation in the initial footnote for the source, use an abbreviated citation for additional references.
 - ³de Grazia, *How Fascism Ruled Women*, 75.
 - ⁴ Ansolabehere and Jones, “Constituents’ Responses,” 590.
- Every time you cite a source, you need to have a new citation with a new footnote number. You cannot reference the number of the citation from the first time you cited the source.
- Citation superscripts should go at the end of a sentence, not in the middle:
 - The **text**¹ suggested that story is stained with blood spilled in the name of civilization. **WRONG**
 - The text suggested that history is stained with blood spilled in the name of civilization.¹ **CORRECT**
- Citations always go outside of the quotation mark when quotation marks are present. For example:
 - History is stained with blood spilled in the name of “civilization.”¹ **CORRECT**
- No more than **one** superscript citation per sentence. If the sentence references multiple sources, condense them into one footnote and separate the sources with a semicolon.
 - In-text Superscript
 - History is stained with blood spilled in the name of “civilization.”¹² **WRONG**
 - History is stained with blood spilled in the name of “civilization.”¹ **CORRECT**
 - Corresponding Footnote

- ¹ Stephen Ansolabehere and Philip Edward Jones, “Constituents’ Responses to Congressional Roll-Call Voting,” *American Journal of Political Science* 54, no. 3 (July 2010): 591.
 - ² Jeff Manza and Fay Lomax Cook, "A Democratic Polity?" *American Sociological Review* 59, no. 1 (February 1994): 16. **WRONG**

 - ¹ Stephen Ansolabehere and Philip Edward Jones, “Constituents’ Responses to Congressional Roll-Call Voting,” *American Journal of Political Science* 42, no. 2 (April 1998): 402; Jeff Manza and Fay Lomax Cook, "A Democratic Polity?" *American Sociological Review* 59, no. 1 (February 1994): 16. **CORRECT**
- At the end of your paper, you need to create a bibliography that includes all the sources you referenced in your paper. It will look similar to your footnotes, with some minor adjustments.
 - *Book:*
 - Last name, first name. *Title of Book*. Place of publication: Publisher, year of publication.
 - De Grazia, Victoria. *How Fascism Ruled Women: Italy, 1922 – 1945*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
 - *Journal:*
 - Last name, first name. “Journal Title.” *Journal Name*, number (Month Year): Total number of pages of article.
 - Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Philip Edwards Jones. “Constituents’ Responses to Congressional Roll-Call Voting.” *American Journal of Political Science* 54, no. 3 (July 2010): 583-597.
 - The bibliography page must be organized alphabetically by the last name of the author, regardless of the type of source. The bibliography should be single-spaced, and each source should be indented after the second line. See the example below, you can also reference [this graphic](#) in the CMOS.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Philip Edwards Jones. “Constituents’ Responses to Congressional Roll-Call Voting.” *American Journal of Political Science* 54, no. 3 (July 2010): 583-597.

De Grazia, Victoria. *How Fascism Ruled Women: Italy, 1922 – 1945*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

- **PAPERS WITHOUT CITATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.** If you have any questions, feel free to contact Sydney Johnson.

- Each Fellow *must* complete a research paper checklist and attach it to their final paper before submission. You can find the checklist on the [“Assignment”](#) page of the website.

Graphics and/or Tables

- Please be prepared to provide any graphics in high-resolution JPEG or PNG images, and any tables or data in original Excel files.
- Table formatting: Font: Arial or Helvetica, 10 point; Column or Row Titles in bold

Capitalization & Abbreviations

- **President/Prime Minister (Titles)**
 - Capitalize when it precedes a president’s name or prime minister’s name, otherwise lowercase.
 - President Lincoln gave the order; Past presidents of the United States include Washington, Jefferson, and Adams; the current prime minister of the United Kingdom is David Cameron; Prime Minister David Cameron made a visit to the United States.
- **Presidency**
 - Capitalize when preceded by the name of a president, otherwise lowercase.
 - The Fillmore Presidency is not often discussed; the presidency of Andrew Jackson is an interesting conversation starter.
- **Administration**
 - Always lowercase.
 - The Fillmore administration is not often discussed; the administration of Andrew Jackson is an interesting conversation starter.
- **Congress**
 - U.S. Congress and Congress (referring to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives) are capitalized. Lowercase “congressional” unless it is part of a proper name.
 - Congressional Budget Office vs. congressional leaders.
- **Constitution**
 - Capitalize references to the U.S. Constitution, with or without the “U.S.” Place "constitutional" in lowercase unless it is part of a proper name.

Declaration of Independence, Bill of Rights, First Amendment, and other legislation and treaties are capitalized.

- **Nationalities/Race**
 - Capitalize the proper names of nationalities, races, and tribes.
 - French, Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, Native American, Mattaponi, Zulu.

- **Political Parties/Philosophies**
 - Capitalize the name of a political party and the word “party.” Use lowercase for a general political philosophy.
 - The Republican Party; German Social Democratic Party; the United States was founded on democratic principles; American Republicans are generally conservative and share some ideologies with the Conservative Party in the U.K.

- **Directions/Regions**
 - Lowercase directions (north, south, northeast, etc.) when they indicate direction. Capitalize when they indicate geographical regions. Phrases such as the Mid-Atlantic, Silicon Valley, Dixie, Sun Belt, and Midwest are capitalized.
 - Head north on Highway 51; he decided to move to the South.

Abbreviating Countries & Organizations

- The United States should always be referred to as “the United States.” The abbreviation “U.S.” should only be used as an adjective.
 - U.S. Congress vs. China’s influence in the United States.

- For other nations, after using the full name, it is acceptable to use an abbreviation with periods between the letters.
 - United Arab Emirates, U.A.E., Democratic Republic of the Congo, D.R. Congo.

- International organizations that are not politically distinct realms and that are commonly referred to by their initials do not have periods between the letters.
 - UN, EU, UNICEF, UNESCO, NATO, OECD.

- After initially using the full name, U.S. Federal Agencies do not have periods in the abbreviation.
 - FBI, CIA, DOJ, USAID.

Dates and Numbers

- When referencing a decade, please use just an “s” following the full year.
 - 1960’s, 60’s, the 1960s
- Numbers under 100 should be spelled out unless they are a reference to statistical data or are followed by a percent sign.
- Centuries should be written numerically with “century” in lowercase.
 - twenty-first century.
- Papers should consistently use either the percent sign (%) or the word percent, not both.
- Paper should consistently use either the dollar sign (\$) or the word dollars, not both.
- Dates should be given as Month Day, Year. There should be a comma after the year if the sentence continues after that.
 - **Wrong:** “March 21st, 2011”
 - **Correct:** “March 21, 2011”
 - **Wrong:** “On March 21, 2011 he went to the store.”
 - **Correct:** “On March 21, 2011, he went to the store.”

Miscellaneous Style Notes

- The “Oxford Comma” should be used:
 - **Wrong:** “The President, Congress and the Supreme Court”
 - **Correct:** “The President, Congress, and the Supreme Court”
- Quotation marks should be curly (“) not straight ("), internal quotations should be the same.
- There should not be quotation marks on a block quote.
- There should be one space between sentences.
- There should be no spaces on either side of an em-dash “—” or “--”
 - “‘Publius’—a pseudonym used by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison—was the author of the *Federalist Papers*.”

Research Paper Prizes

Five awards are given out annually for outstanding research papers. The award-winning papers are automatically featured in the *Fellows Review* alongside other additional exceptional Fellows papers.

The David M. Abshire Award for Most Outstanding Paper by an International Fellow- \$1000 Prize

The David M. Abshire Award is given annually to the best paper written by an International Fellow. The award honors the late Dr. Abshire, who served as President and CEO, and later Vice Chairman and Counselor of CSPC. A graduate of West Point in 1951, Dr. Abshire served in the Korean War as a division intelligence officer. He also served as Ambassador to NATO from 1983-1987, and as a top advisor to President Reagan. As President and CEO of CSPC, he was integral in introducing the International Fellows Program. Dr. Abshire passed away in 2014.

The Robert A. Kilmarx Award for Best Military, Intelligence, or National Security Strategic Analysis - \$1000 Prize

The Robert A. Kilmarx Award is given annually to the Presidential Fellow who writes the best paper on military, intelligence, or national security strategic analysis. The award honors the career and service of Dr. Robert Kilmarx. Dr. Kilmarx served in World War II as a counterintelligence agent in the Signal Corps and Infantry, participating in the Normandy Invasion and the Battle of the Bulge, and serving as a staff manager with the U.S. component of the Inter-Allied Council in Berlin. He earned a BA and MA from the University of Virginia and a Ph.D. from Georgetown University. After his military service, Dr. Kilmarx spent his career as a military intelligence advisor, international economist, and consultant for government, private businesses, and financial institutions. He was also the editor of eight books. He was a research director for the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Senior Vice President of BKW Associates, adjunct lecturer at George Washington University. Dr. Kilmarx passed away in 2013.

The Donald B. Marron Award for Best Historical Analysis - \$1000 Prize

Papers in consideration for the Marron Award must represent superior scholarship and examine historical subject matter related to the Presidency or Congress. In the thesis, the author must set forth a unique interpretation of the historical events to be covered. The relevance of the historical analysis to current policy debates, larger themes of American history, or political theory should be emphasized.

The James R. Moffett Award for Most Original Paper on the Modern Presidency or Congress - \$1000 Prize

Papers in consideration for the Moffett Award must represent a superior standard of scholarship and an ability to analyze events pertaining to the modern Presidency or Congress in an original manner. Originality can be achieved in the subject matter, structure, or analysis of the research.

The Richard H. Solomon Award for the Most Original Paper on Foreign Policy or Diplomacy - \$1,000 Prize

Ambassador Richard H. Solomon was top American diplomat who played a key role in “Ping-Pong Diplomacy” and the opening of U.S. relations with Communist China, as well as democratization, nuclear arms talks, and strategic long-term planning. His career spanned public service, stints with the RAND Corporation, his leadership of the U.S. Institute of Peace, and his service as a CSPC Trustee. With his passing in 2017, his memory is honored with the inaugural Richard H. Solomon Award for this fellows’ class.

Grading Rubric for Fellowship Papers

The research papers are evaluated by external judges based on the criteria below. Given the caliber of students targeted for CSPC Fellows, factors such as proper spelling, punctuation, and grammar have been removed from the grading rubric. We consider these to be “givens.” Therefore, any errors in these areas will hurt your paper’s grade, but adherence to basic rules in these areas cannot help a paper. The same applies to proper citations and a well-organized reference page. Papers that receive high marks will be published in the *Fellows Review*.

To receive full marks, the following criteria must be observed.

Applicability: 8 points possible

- Tackles a sophisticated issue relevant to the Presidency or Congress—for example, the history of the institution or personalities, a contemporary policy issue (international, domestic, social, etc.), or an examination of decision-making.
- Observes and identifies causality and the potential consequences/implications subject has on the Chief Executive or Congress.
- The paper’s thesis addresses public policy at the national level; if the paper is historical in nature, then there is clear modern relevance to the issues explored.

Analysis and Feasibility: 8 points possible

- Interesting argument, demonstrates highly sophisticated and well-expressed thought process.
- Central thesis is clearly communicated and developed, but scope appropriately limited for paper.
- Paper recognizes the complexity of its thesis; may acknowledge its contradictions, qualifications, or limits and follow out their logical implications.
- Presents information with a new approach and does not simply reiterate accepted theories

Organization, Coherence, and Mechanics: 8 points possible

- Employs a logical structure appropriate to paper’s subject, purpose, audience, thesis and disciplinary field.
- Sophisticated transitional sentences guide the reader through the chain of reasoning or progression of ideas.
- Within the 15-page limit, writer coherently and succinctly explores his/her chosen subject.
 - Page limit does not include works cited or appendices (Papers that do not adhere to the page limit may be disqualified)
- Sentences are varied, yet clearly structured and carefully focused, not long and rambling.

Research: 8 points possible

- Uses evidence appropriately and effectively, providing sufficient evidence and explanation to convince.
- Understands and critically evaluates sources, both primary and secondary.
- Comments on the possible biases, the strong points, and the potential inaccuracies of sources
- Draws on a sufficient number and variety of sources to support argument.