



Inter-American Defense College

Learning Resource Center and Library

Strategic Writing Manual

Critical thinking, persuasive arguments, and communication skills for decision-making in defense and security.

2026

Contents

Part I **Strategic Writing**

1 · Decision-driven Writing	01
2 · Developing a Strategic Argument	02
3 · Operational Sequence of Strategic Thinking	08
4 · Disciplined Review	11
5 · IADC Academic Methodology and Document Types	13
Principles of Strategic Writing	13

Part II **IADC Strategic Deliverables**

Scope	15
Reflective Essay	17
Reflective Post	22
Policy Memo	26
Decision Brief	30
Critical Review	36
Opinion Paper	40

Part III **Formatting and Citation Style Guidelines**

The Standard for Your Submissions	45
General Presentation Format	46
Introduction to Citation Ethics · The Chicago Manual of Style	48
Practical Examples of Citations	50
Ethical Optimization with Artificial Intelligence	51
Formatting Endnotes	52
Formatting References / Bibliographic Citations	53

Part IV **Academic Integrity**

Academic Integrity and the Ethical Use of Technology	55
1 Framework of Core Values	56
2 Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy	57
3 Academic Dishonesty: Serious Offenses	58
4 Procedure for Handling Violations	58

Part V **Grading Criteria**

Structure of the Rubrics	60
Master Table of Institutional Rubrics	61
Endnotes · Bibliography	64



Strategic Writing

01 Decision-driven Writing

02 Structuring an Argument

03 Operational Sequence

04 Disciplined Review

05 IADC Methodology

1

Decision-driven Writing

At the Inter-American Defense College (IADC), writing is considered a tool for strategic advisors. Consequently, IADC documents take various forms but have a common purpose: enhancing informed decision-making.

This manual reflects approaches inspired by applied public policy analysis. Eugene Bardach argues that the value of a document lies in its ability to frame problems and guide courses of action.¹ In defense and security contexts, where decisions are made with time constraints and incomplete information, analytical clarity is a professional responsibility.

DECISION-DRIVEN DOCUMENTS SHOULD

- Accurately define the problem.
- Present viable options.
- Specify criteria for comparison.
- Develop well-reasoned recommendations.
- Acknowledge risks and limitations.

In the defense and security sectors, there is a preference for the main idea to be presented at the beginning of the document. This executive writing principle, known as “begin with the end in mind,” requires that the reader have immediate access to the main proposal or recommendation before being required to delve into a full analysis.²

At the IADC, students practice this approach that allows decision makers to quickly see the recommendation and its rationale, obviating the need to wade through extensive background information before getting to the main point.

2 Framing a Strategic Argument

The quality of a document, in terms of its clarity and effectiveness in conveying its main message, depends primarily on the structure of the reasoning behind it.

Stephen Toulmin's model for developing arguments provides a clear tool for organizing applied arguments:³

TOULMIN'S MODEL

- Claim: what is being asserted.
- Evidence: data, precedent, doctrine, or verifiable experience.
- Warrant: the principle that links the evidence to the claim.
- Qualifiers or limitations: the actual scope of the argument.
- Potential rebuttal: acknowledging reasonable objections.

Real-world case: AI-orchestrated cyberespionage campaign

(Anthropic, 2025)⁴

Case context

In November 2025, the company Anthropic published a report, *Disrupting the First Reported AI-Orchestrated Cyber Espionage Campaign*, documenting a cyberespionage campaign in which an artificial intelligence agent was used to execute, in a partially autonomous manner, multiple phases of the attack (reconnaissance, exploitation, lateral movement, and data extraction).

Significantly, the case highlights the emerging use of artificial intelligence tools in cyber espionage operations with a high degree of operational automation.

CLAIM

States must strengthen national capabilities and regional cooperation to address threats from automated cyber attacks driven by artificial intelligence.

The claim constitutes the conclusion that the author proposes for acceptance. It does not describe a technical fact; rather, it sets forth a strategic direction.

EVIDENCE

- The report documents a campaign in which an AI agent executed multiple phases of an attack
- Automation made it possible to integrate various operational phases within a single architecture.
- The proliferation of generative AI tools lowered technical barriers for actors with limited capabilities

The evidence consists of verifiable data. It does not yet contain the recommendation.

WARRANT

If a technological tool makes it possible to automate and scale up espionage operations, then traditional defensive systems—which rely primarily on human monitoring or reactive detection—tend to prove insufficient against threats that are more fast moving and adaptive.

The warrant spells out the general principle that enables the transition from empirical data to strategic recommendations. Without this principle, the argument would be incomplete.

QUALIFIERS OR LIMITATIONS

Capacity building must strike a balance between security and technological innovation. Its effectiveness will depend on the actual level of inter-institutional and regional cooperation.

Recognizing these limits avoids absolute statements and defines the scope of the argument.

POTENTIAL REBUTTAL

It can be argued that the responsibility for preventing the misuse of AI lies primarily with the companies that develop it.

REBUTTAL RESPONSE

While the private sector has significant technical responsibilities, the protection of critical infrastructure and national defense go beyond corporate self-regulation and require government coordination.

Model element	Case Application	Theory–Case Linkage (clear explanation of the logical link)
Claim (Claim)	States must strengthen national capacities and regional cooperation to address threats from automated cyber attacks driven by artificial intelligence.	In Toulmin’s model, the claim is the conclusion that is proposed for acceptance. It does not describe a technical fact; rather, it proposes a strategic course of action. In this case, the claim transforms a technological incident into a public policy guideline.
Evidence (Grounds)	1) The Anthropic report documents a campaign in which an AI agent executed multiple phases of the attack. 2) Automation enabled the coordination of reconnaissance, exploitation, and data extraction. 3) The proliferation of AI tools lowers technical barriers for malicious actors.	In Toulmin’s framework, evidence consists of verifiable data that supports the argument. Here, the data comes from a documented technical report. The evidence shows that there is an operational shift in the threat: increased automation and speed. The evidence does not yet contain a recommendation; it merely describes facts.
Logical Warrant (Warrant)	If an espionage campaign can be carried out with greater automation and speed thanks to AI, then defenses based primarily on manual and reactive processes will be overwhelmed by this type of threat.	The guarantee is the general rule that connects the data to the conclusion. The rule here is: when a threat increases in speed, scale, or autonomy, defenses designed for a slower environment tend to become insufficient. This rule allows us to move from the technical fact (more automation) to the strategic assertion (the need to strengthen capabilities). Without this explicit rule, the argument would be merely an intuitive reaction to the case.
Qualifiers or Limitations (Qualifier)	Capacity building must balance security and innovation. Its effectiveness will depend on the actual level of inter-institutional and regional cooperation.	In Toulmin’s framework, the qualifier indicates the scope of the argument. Here, it is acknowledged that the recommendation is neither absolute nor uniform for all states. The applied rule has limits: it depends on the political, technological, and cooperative context. The qualifier prevents a relevant case from becoming a blanket generalization.
Learning Resource Center and Library 05		

Rebuttal

(Rebuttal)

It can be argued that controlling the misuse of AI is primarily the responsibility of the companies that develop it.

In Toulmin's model, a rebuttal arises when the same evidence allows for an alternative interpretation. In this case, the fact that Anthropic detected and mitigated the attack could be interpreted as evidence that private self-regulation is sufficient. Acknowledging this alternative interpretation strengthens the analysis.

Rebuttal Response

The protection of critical infrastructure and national defense require government coordination that goes beyond private self-regulation.

Responding to the refutation reaffirms the initial claim by invoking a higher-ranking principle: national security is the responsibility of the state. In Toulmin's terms, this response shows that the objection was considered and overcome by a broader normative rule. This reinforces the coherence of the argument.

WHAT THE STUDENT SHOULD OBSERVE

- A. The evidence describes verifiable facts.
- B. The warrant establishes the principle that supports the strategic inference.
- C. Recognizing limits defines the scope of the argument.
- D. A rebuttal acknowledges plausible alternative interpretations.
- E. The response reaffirms the coherence of the reasoning.

CONCEPTUAL MINI-TEST

- Fact: "The attack was more automated."
- Principle (guarantee): "If the threat outpaces the defense, the defense must adapt."
- Conclusion: "Therefore, capabilities must be strengthened."

This illustrates the logical link between information and decision.

In strategic documents such as the Policy Memo or the Decision Paper, this structure allows for comparing options without making unsubstantiated claims.

Applied Critical Thinking

Critical thinking requires evaluating arguments according to standards of clarity, precision, relevance, and logical coherence.⁵ These standards are not limited to the formal correctness of language; they apply to the very content of the reasoning.

Richard Paul and Linda Elder point out that all reasoning involves a purpose, a question at hand, information used, inferences drawn, concepts employed, and consequences derived.⁶ In a strategic document, these elements must be aligned. The purpose must be explicit; the question must be clearly formulated; the information must be relevant; and the inferences must be justified by recognizable logical principles.

When these elements are not clearly articulated, the document may appear comprehensive in length but insufficient in argumentative strength.

3

Operationalizing Strategic Thinking

Although strategic documents take different forms depending on their purpose, the intellectual process underlying them can be organized into a common sequence. In public policy analysis, this type of sequence is used to avoid two common pitfalls: (1) starting with an intuitive recommendation and then “searching” for ways to justify it; and (2) describing the context without translate it into comparable options.⁷ IADC’s strategic writing approach ensures that papers are analytically rigorous and decision oriented.

The sequence proposed below is not intended to replace the IADC academic methodology or to impose a single writing format. It serves as a guide for organizing one’s reasoning prior to drafting and for reviewing the internal coherence of the argument. In terms of structure, it requires distinguishing between (a) what is being claimed, (b) the factual basis supporting it, and (c) the rule of inference connecting the two.⁸ This distinction is consistent with the applied argumentation approach and reduces the likelihood of presenting claims that “sound good” but are not justified.

Operational Sequence (Workflow Guide)

1 Precisely define the problem or strategic issue.

2 Identify relevant and verifiable information.

3 Formulate an initial decision-oriented statement.

4

Establish the rule or principle that connects the information to the conclusion (logical warrant).

5

Acknowledge reasonable limitations, risks, or objections.

6

Adjust the conclusion in light of the analysis conducted and review it against quality standards.

Practical application of the sequence

The operational sequence described above outlines the intellectual logic that should underpin the development of a strategic document. However, in professional practice, difficulties do not typically arise at the theoretical level, but rather in the implementation phase.

The following table translates each phase of the sequence into operational terms, identifying common errors observed even in the writing of high level officers with extensive professional experience. The purpose is not to alter the conceptual framework outlined above, but to facilitate its rigorous implementation in real-world strategic writing contexts.

Phase	What it means	What to avoid	Common mistake among senior officers	Practical example (AI Case)
1. Define the problem	Lay out the strategic issue in a concrete an decision-oriented manner.	General topics or broad descriptions lacking focus.	Confusing “topic” with “problem” and starting to write without a clear strategic question.	No: “AI is changing security.” Yes: “How should national capabilities adapt to the automation of cyberattacks using AI?”
2. Identify relevant information	Select verifiable data that are directly related to the issue.	Gather extensive irrelevant or historical background information.	Include everything that has been researched, even if it does not contribute to the decision.	Technical report documenting the automation of multiple phases of the attack.
3. Formulate a claim	Propose a conclusion or clear course of action.	Describe without drawing a conclusion or suggest without taking a position.	Write a descriptive analysis without taking an explicit stance.	“States must strengthen their capabilities to counter automated cyberattacks.”
4. Establish logical warrant	Explain the rule: that connects the evidence to the assertion.	Assume the connection is "obvious" without explaining it.	Present but fail to explain why it justifies the recommendation.	“If the attack increases in speed and scale, traditional defense tends to be overwhelmed.”
5. Recognize limits or risks	Define the scope of the argument and its conditions.	Draw absolute or unqualified conclusions.	Ignore reasonable objections or present the recommendation as a complete solution.	"The response must strike a balance between security and technological innovation."
6. Adjust and review	Verify consistency, relevance, and clarity of reasoning.	Submit the first draft without critical evaluation.	Review only spelling and style, overlooking the logic of the argument.	Does the recommendation flow from the evidence presented?

BRIEF TEACHING NOTE

This sequence is not a rigid writing format. It is a tool for organizing your thoughts before writing and for checking the coherence of your argument before submission.

4

Disciplined Review

Review is not merely a formal stage of the writing process: it is an analytical stage designed to verify the coherence and soundness of the reasoning before the final submission.

In strategic documents, the central question is not only whether the text is correctly written, but whether the argument is intellectually defensible. From the perspective of critical thinking, all reasoning must be evaluated according to standards of clarity, precision, relevance and coherence.¹¹ A disciplined review involves deliberately applying these standards

Furthermore, based on the argumentation model applied, the review requires verifying that the claim is supported by relevant evidence and that the rule of inference connecting the two (logical justification) is identifiable and consistent.¹² In the professional fields of defense and security, where decision-makers need to quickly identify the main proposal, the review must also verify that the central message is prioritized and presented with executive clarity.

Levels of Review

Level	Check Question	Common Error
1. Structural Coherence	Does the main claim clearly follow from the analysis presented?	The conclusion does not correspond to the problem as defined.
2. Sufficient rationale	Is the evidence relevant and sufficient to justify the recommendation?	Interesting but inconclusive information is presented.
3. Logical consistency	Is the connection between the evidence and the conclusion explicit or clearly inferred?	Logical validity is assumed to be obvious and is not justified.
4. Scope and Risks	Are limitations, risks, or reasonable objections acknowledged?	The recommendation is presented as a comprehensive solution without nuance.
5. Clarity of Execution	Can a decision-maker identify the main proposal in the first few paragraphs?	The reader must read through several pages before understanding the recommendation.

10-Minute Pre-submission Checklist

Before submitting a strategic document, the author should conduct a brief but thorough review:

- 1 Read only the first paragraph.**
Is the main recommendation clear?
- 2 Underline the central statement.**
Is it phrased as a clear position rather than a description?
- 3 Identify the key evidence.**
Is it directly relevant to the defined problem?
- 4 Ask yourself:**
What is the rule that connects this evidence to my conclusion? Is it explicit, or at least clearly inferable?
- 5 Review risks and limitations.**
Do I acknowledge any conditions or reasonable potential objections?
- 6 Remove background information that does not affect the decision.**
Does this paragraph help with the decision or is it merely informative?

This protocol does not replace a thorough review, but it serves as a minimum mechanism for ensuring intellectual quality.

At the IADC, where documents can serve as high-level institutional or academic advisory materials, disciplined review is a professional responsibility, not an administrative formality.

5

IADC Academic Methodology and Types of Documents

Throughout its academic history, the Inter-American Defense College has established a tradition of written work focused on strategic reflection and the formulation of actionable recommendations. Writing at the IADC is not merely an evaluative exercise, but a means of structuring analysis, systematizing experiences, and translating professional knowledge into documents that can have strategic implications.

Among the main academic products developed in the program are the professional reflective essay, the reflective post based on academic activities and study trips, the decision brief, and the policy memo. Each serves specific purposes and is aimed at different audiences, but all require a rigorous connection between the problem, the evidence, the reasoning, and the implications.

Methodologically speaking, these pieces share elements recognized in applied analysis: a precise definition of the issue under study, identification of relevant information, formulation of justified conclusions, and consideration of risks or limitations. Although this structure is not always explicitly presented, it constitutes the common foundation of strategic writing in both academic and professional contexts.

This manual organizes and clarifies these principles in order to strengthen the analytical quality of the documents produced at the IADC. The following sections will examine the main strategic deliverables for the program, focusing on their purpose, structure, and evaluation criteria.

Principles of Strategic Writing

1

Strategic writing involves taking a position.

A document of this nature does not merely describe situations. It defines a problem, takes a stance on it, and guides a possible decision.

2 **Conclusions are not supported by authority, but by evidence.**

Professional experience and technical knowledge are relevant, but they only carry weight when they translate into arguments backed by relevant and verifiable data.

3 **There is always a line of reasoning between the facts and the recommendation.**

The validity of a proposal depends on the strength of the link connecting the evidence to the conclusion. When that link is not made explicit, the text may seem convincing without actually being so.

4 **Every recommendation is subject to certain conditions.**

No strategic decision is formulated in absolute terms. Recognizing limitations, risks, and possible objections is part of conducting a responsible analysis.

5 **Precision is a form of institutional responsibility.**

In contexts where decisions affect capabilities, resources, and public policy, clarity is not a stylistic choice but a professional obligation. A strategic document must allow readers to quickly understand what it proposes and the rationale behind it.

These principles summarize the conceptual framework developed in this first part. Building on them, the following sections will examine the strategic products used at the IADC and the criteria that guide their development.



IADC's Strategic Deliverables

01 Reflective Essay

02 Reflective Post

03 Policy Memo

04 Decision Brief

05 Critical Review

06 Opinion Paper

1

Framework Used

IADC documents serve different academic and professional purposes, but they share a common requirement: to provide applied reasoning with clear, strategic implications.

Each product fulfills a specific function in the program's educational process. Some emphasize conceptual integration, others critical evaluation, others decision-oriented advising, and still others reflective professional development. None is incidental; each develops a particular competency within the comprehensive educational framework for training strategic advisors.

The difference between them lies not in the level of rigor required, but in the starting point of the analysis, the intended audience, and the type of strategic impact expected.

STANDARDS THAT APPLY IN ALL CASES

- A clear definition of the strategic issue.
- Appropriate and sufficient use of information.
- Explicit reasoning that links evidence to conclusions.
- Recognition of limitations, risks, or conditions.
- Clear, well-structured, and purpose-driven writing.

The framework for building arguments developed in Part I is the foundation that underpins all the papers described below.

IADC uses five types of academic papers as the formats for structuring written work in the program, serving as the institution's framework for developing analytical, argument-based, strategic communication skills.

Instructors will determine which type of paper will be assigned for different courses, and that information will be included in the syllabus, based on Course Learning Objectives (CLO's) and the stage in the program at which the course is offered. Instructors have academic discretion to lay out in the syllabus which type of paper will be assigned and which assessment criteria will be used.

This decision does not alter the institutional typology described in this section; it merely determines its pedagogical application based on course objectives.

Reflective Essay. A document demonstrating conceptual integration and a reasoned position grounded in theory, readings, and professional experience.

■ **Reflective Post.** A structured record of professional learning that integrates experience, critical analysis, and personal development within the framework of the program.

■ **Policy Memo.** A concise strategic communication document aimed at a specific audience, designed to influence through clear analysis and well-reasoned recommendations.

■ **Decision Brief.** A document designed to recommend a course of action in response to a specific strategic problem. It may take an analytical format or an executive memo format, depending on the academic purpose.

■ **Critical Review.** An evaluative analysis of a specific work, article, or argument aimed at examining its thesis, assumptions, evidence, and coherence

■ **Opinion Paper.** A tool for articulating a well-founded opinion into a logical and professional argument supported by rigorous analysis.

Common Methodological Foundation

Although these papers differ in format and purpose, they are all based on a shared logic.

- Define a relevant issue or situation with precision.
- Identify relevant information.
- Formulate a position, implication, or recommendation.
- Explain the reasoning that connects the information to the conclusion.
- Acknowledge limitations, conditions, or risks.

This sequence is not a rigid writing template, but a cross-disciplinary intellectual framework. The diversity of formats does not diminish the requirement for argumentative coherence.

In the following sections, each assignment will be developed in accordance with these criteria, specifying its academic and professional purpose within the IADC program.

ACADEMIC DELIVERABLE 01

Reflective Essay

1 Purpose and Audience

- **Definition:** The purpose of the Professional Reflective Essay is to transform academic and professional experiences into lessons learned that have strategic value, integrating the student's experience, rigorous analysis, and applied theory. It is an applied analytical tool designed to draw useful implications for future decision-making.
- **Target Audience:** It is primarily intended for an institutional audience (staff members, decision-makers) and academic evaluators.
- **What the student should avoid (common mistakes):** Understand that this document is not a narrative exercise, a chronological log, an introspective text, or an informal account of activities. Nor is it equivalent to expressing an unstructured opinion or recounting an anecdote.
- **Distinction from a military operational report:** It should not be confused with the traditional operational format used in military reports or institutional performance reports (rigidly structured around: what happened, what should have happened, and recommendations). While the operational report identifies deviations and proposes immediate corrections in response to a specific event, the professional reflective essay identifies patterns and establishes far-reaching relationships between conditions and effects to produce transferable professional criteria.

2 Starting point for the analysis

The analysis of this essay must begin with one of the following two options:

- A specific experience within the program (a committee exercise, a strategic simulation, a lecture, a field trip, or a technical security matter).
- A situation observed in the professional environment that presents an analytical challenge, an institutional difficulty, or a significant decision.

KEY GUIDELINE

Empirical data serves only as a foundation; students should not stop at describing what happened, but should immediately move on to conceptualization and strategic abstraction.

3 Writing Structure (Outline)

For its formal presentation, the student's final document must adhere strictly to the following linear structure:

- **A. Introduction:** Briefly and objectively present the context or experience to be analyzed; formally define the strategic question guiding the essay (what is actually being analyzed); state the author's thesis or initial position; and clearly anticipate the lessons learned that will be elaborated upon in the document.
- **B. Analytical Development (Main Body):** This constitutes the conceptual core of the paper. It presents the critical analysis by linking empirical evidence with theoretical justification. In this section, students must individually construct and develop between 2 and 4 Lessons Learned, at most.
- **C. Conclusion (linked to and complementary to the introduction):** It synthesizes the lessons learned that were described in the main body; clearly articulates their strategic relevance and potential professional application in future scenarios; and concludes with a final statement consistent with the thesis presented at the beginning.

4 Internal Structure (the DNA of the lesson learned)

The 2 to 4 lessons learned in the main body of the essay are not written haphazardly; they must be conceived and deconstructed individually based on their “analytical DNA,” which requires the inseparable fusion of a four-part sequence in the following order:

1 The Main Lesson (Assertion)

This is the main premise of the analytical section. It must be formulated as a strategic conclusion, or a clear, concise, and defensible value judgment; never as a factual description. It must explicitly address and align with a specific Learning Outcome (LO) from the course syllabus.

2 The Theoretical Link (Academic Contrast)

This is the scientific justification for the statement. Students are not permitted to write a passive summary of the bibliography but develop a critical dialogue that contrasts at least two or three authors or doctrinal bodies (for example, by evaluating conceptual tensions, gaps, or convergences between OAS statements, UNDP frameworks, or the analyses of hemispheric security analysts).

3

Links to course objectives and activities (Relevance)

Explicitly connects the lesson to the learning activities at the College (conferences, auditorium debates, joint simulations or institutional field trips).

4

Critical reflection based on prior experience (Practical Evidence)

Serves as empirical validation and demonstrates the actual scope of the statement. The student should use his/her professional career and institutional context as a scenario for analysis in terms of the causes, consequences, and practical limitations of the lesson, explaining how the course altered or reinforced his/her views as a strategic leader.

Pedagogical Example for Deconstructing the DNA of a Lesson Learned

If the essay topic involves multidimensional security and crisis response, the student must articulate these four elements in the body of the essay.



INCORRECT APPROACH · DESCRIPTIVE AND WITHOUT DNA

“In the course, I learned about military involvement in disasters. We read two authors who discuss this, and during the lecture, the general explained how it works. In my country, the Armed Forces also provide a lot of help during hurricanes, which is great.” *(This is a superficial account that shows no critical thinking.)*



CORRECT APPROACH · SEQUENCE FOUR-PART

(1. The lesson — statement): “Prolonged militarization in natural disaster response generates immediate tactical stability but erodes democratic governance in the long term, in alignment with RA 2 of the course.”

(2. Theoretical link): “While author ‘X’ defends military effectiveness due to its intact chain of command during crises, the UNDP frameworks and author ‘Y’ warn against the atrophy of civilian institutions. The contrast between these positions demonstrates that operational effectiveness does not equate to strategic success.”

(3. Connection to the course): “This theoretical tension played out during last week’s Crisis Simulation by Committee 3, where the fictional collapse of the civilian agency forced us to order a military intervention without a defined exit strategy.”

(4. Practical Reflection): “From my experience leading interagency operations in my home country during the 2018 hurricane, I observed that the lack of a transition plan to return control to local authorities prolonged the government’s legitimacy crisis. This lesson redefines my criteria, compelling me, as a strategic leader, to always demand a ‘civil transition strategy’ in joint operational planning.”

5

Checklist and Quality Control

Before submitting the document or sending it for peer review, the author must validate the draft by addressing the following minimum quality control questions:



Criteria or chronicle? Does the text describe what happened during the visit/class (incorrect) or identify analytical patterns that can be applied to other contexts (correct)?

☐ Is the theoretical contrast sufficient? In the theoretical component of each lesson, am I summarizing a single book, or have I managed to critically compare and contrast at least two authors or doctrinal documents with one another?

☐ Pedagogical traceability? Is each of my lessons explicitly linked to a Learning Outcome (LO) of the program?

☐ Technical format? Does the analytical section of each lesson rigorously follow the four strands of the DNA sequence (statement – contrast – relevance – evidence)?

☐ Critical apparatus? Are the endnote references numbered consecutively and formatted in 10-point Arial, single-spaced, following the strict Chicago Manual of Style, 17th edition (without using “*Ibid.*” for consecutive citations)?

ACADEMIC DELIVERABLE 02

Reflective Post

1 Purpose and Audience

- **Definition:** The Reflective Post is a tool for recording and assimilating concepts, and identifying between two and four high-impact lessons learned from a specific academic activity. Its purpose is to articulate the student's personal ideas and synthesize them within the context of the College's objectives, the student's professional experience, and the course content.
- **Target Audience:** It is primarily intended for peers, the student themselves, and the course instructor or evaluator.
- **What to avoid (common mistakes):** It is recommended that posts not be structured like a chronological log, travel itinerary, or record focused on the logistics of an event. The document's effectiveness is significantly diminished when it is limited to a superficial description of "which places were visited" or "who spoke." It is essential to avoid generic or obvious takeaways that do not reflect a true understanding or deep internalization of the event's academic content.

2 Starting point for the analysis

- **Initial input:** This document begins with and is directly related to activities outside the classroom, such as field trips, institutional visits, or IADC academic symposia.
- **Reflective approach:** The starting point is the student's direct, active observations. The student must identify those moments or topics that had an impact on their professional perspective, using them as raw material for analytical introspection.

3 Writing Structure (Outline)

Unlike other school essays, the Reflective Post is less rigid and does not require a specific introduction or conclusion. Its structure consists of a modular approach focused directly on the learning blocks:

- **Analytical Block 1:** Development of the first lesson learned.
- **Analytical Block 2:** Development of the second lesson learned.

- Analytical Blocks 3 and 4 (optional): Development of subsequent lessons (minimum of 2, maximum of 4 lessons in total).

4 Internal Structure Method (minimum required)

To flesh out each of the 2 to 4 lessons learned, the student must structure each block by combining three essential dimensions:

1

Description of the lesson learned

Clearly identify the key lesson or its impact, providing supporting details and comments that provide context.

2

Links to course objectives and activities

A direct connection demonstrating how the lesson reinforces the specific learning objectives of the activity, symposium, or core themes of the IADC program.

3

Critical reflections related to prior experiences

Incorporation of self-reflection, providing an in-depth analysis of how the themes of the activity—These questions specifically refer to the student's career path or previous experiences.

Pedagogical example of the structure for a block in the Reflective Post

If the activity was an institutional visit to OAS headquarters or a multinational command center, the student must articulate the three dimensions to avoid a “news report” format.



INCORRECT APPROACH · CHRONICLE OF TRAVEL AND LOGISTICS

“This morning we visited the OAS headquarters. The ambassador gave us a tour of the facilities and spoke to us about migration issues. It was very interesting to hear the panelists, and the event was very well organized.” *(This text lacks analytical value and does not demonstrate learning.)*



CORRECT APPROACH · THREE KEY POINTS

(1. Lesson Description): “During the panel at OAS headquarters, the most impactful lesson was understanding that the lack of standardization in regional asylum systems creates legal bottlenecks, which act as the primary driver of human trafficking networks, beyond the simple lack of physical resources.”

(2. Links to the Objectives): “This on-the-ground observation directly reinforces Learning Objective 2 of the Hemispheric Security program by empirically demonstrating how legal asymmetries among member states limit the effectiveness of multilateralism in the face of transnational threats.”

(3. Critical Reflections and Prior Experience): “By contrasting this institutional reality with my prior experience as a border control director, I now understand that our national containment strategies failed not because of tactical shortcomings, but because we were operating in a vacuum of regional interoperability. This visit has transformed my professional perspective: my agency’s future efforts must prioritize the standardization of intelligence protocols with neighboring countries rather than the mere deployment of operational forces.”

5

Checklist and Quality Control

Before final submission, student must review their drafts in light of the following questions:

☐

Is the number correct? Did I clearly outline between 2 and 4 distinct lessons learned, or did I fall short with just a general idea?

☐

Did I avoid writing a travelogue? Does each section focus on an insightful analytical lesson, or does my text read like a list of the event's visits and lectures?

☐

Pedagogical alignment? Did I explicitly link each lesson to the learning objectives and core themes designed by the school?

☐

Professional depth? Did I analyze in detail how the event modifies or reinforces my practical knowledge and prior experiences?

☐

Format consistency? Did I adhere to standard IADC format (Arial 12, 1.5 line spacing, and 1-inch margins) even though this is a simplified document?

ACADEMIC DELIVERABLE 03

Policy Memo

1 Purpose and Audience

- **Definition:** The Policy Memo is a concise and impactful strategic communication tool designed to inform decision-makers about urgent issues and propose viable courses of action. Unlike an academic essay, its value lies not in historical comprehensiveness, but in its ability to synthesize information to guide public policy.
- **Target audience:** This document is intended exclusively for decision-makers (ministers, secretaries, commanders, directors). The reader is pressed for time and needs to understand the problem, the evidence, and the proposal with a quick read.
- **What students should avoid (common mistakes):** Students should avoid “endless descriptions,” which involve devoting most of the space to explaining the problem without offering concrete solutions. Likewise, they must avoid ambiguity when proposing “general” or “ideal” recommendations that do not take into account institutional realities or budgetary constraints. Finally, students should avoid a passive, academic tone—characterized by speculative or overly theoretical language—and always replace it with a proactive, direct, and professional style.

2 Starting Point for the Analysis

The analysis begins with the identification of a specific strategic problem that requires a decision. The student must assume the role of an impartial strategic advisor who, after analyzing solid evidence, translates complex information into realistic and “context-specific” options for action (that is, options tailored to the actual capacity of the state or institution).

3 Writing Structure (Outline)

For the Policy Memo to fulfill its function as a decision-making tool, the student must apply three structural principles

- **Translating Knowledge into Action:** It's not enough to have data; you have to turn it into insight. The evidence (data, reports, studies) must support the recommendation, not serve as mere academic embellishment.
- **Visual Architecture:** The text must be scannable. Use clear headings, bullet points for recommendations, and sidebars to highlight critical findings. The reader should be able to find the "decision" without having to search for it.
- **Realistic Implementation:** The most critical part of the memo is the "Implementation Plan." Strategic advisors do not deliver problems; they deliver actionable solutions. If the proposal fails to consider stakeholder interests or resource constraints, the recommendation is deemed "unsatisfactory."

4 Internal Structure (Design and Persuasion)

For the document to be effective, the student must account for the following:

Translation of Technical Details into Executive Language:

1

- ◆ Transform findings from complex research, theoretical frameworks, and data (indicators) into clear and accessible language.
- ◆ Design the content with a decision-maker in mind who is not an academic expert on the subject.

Visual "Architecture" of the Information:

2

- ◆ Avoid solid blocks of text. Use headings, bullet points, bold text, sidebars, and graphics.
- ◆ Ensure that the reader can find the main recommendation immediately.

Feasibility and Practical Constraints (Contextual Proposal):

3

- ◆ Go beyond theoretical analysis to propose concrete, context-specific solutions.
- ◆ Consider real-world constraints—such as budget, policies, and institutional weaknesses—and demonstrate how to overcome these obstacles.

**✗ INCORRECT APPROACH •
PURELY ACADEMIC**

The student merely describes the history of cyber attacks, quotes at length from the theory of asymmetric warfare and concludes with a generic, vague recommendation disconnected from reality.

"The State should invest more of its budget into technology and raise awareness among the population."

**✓ CORRECT APPROACH •
POLICY BRIEF**

- ✓ The student summarizes the urgency of the problem with clear evidence (ex: "the attacks increased by 40% this year"), assesses the failure of current policy and proposes specific intervention:
- ✓ It is recommended that a Joint Cyber Command be created by joining resources from ministries A and B in order to overcome budgetary constraints and begin operations in 6 months."

5 Checklist and Quality Control

Before uploading the final document to the virtual learning environment, the author must review their draft against the following quality control questions:



Is this my own work? Did I write the document entirely based on my own analysis, in compliance with the prohibition on the use of Artificial Intelligence stated in the syllabus?



Are the title and abstract effective? Is my title straightforward and fewer than 12 words, and does my executive summary allow the reader to understand the entire paper by reading just one or two paragraphs?



Is the design scannable? Did I include lists, charts, or sidebars to break up the monotony of the text and make it visually engaging?



Theoretical rigor and realism? Did I identify and explain two IR theories applied to the problem, and do my proposals for action take real-world constraints into account?



IADC format and citations? Does the paper use authoritative and recent sources under a single citation system, and does it comply with the standard format (Arial/Times 12 pt, 1.5 line spacing)?

ACADEMIC DELIVERABLE 04

Decision Paper

1 Purpose and Audience

- **Definition:** The Decision Essay is a highly analytical document, derived from the doctrine of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Ministry, adapted for decision-making in public policy, security, and defense. Its purpose is not to educate the reader on a general topic, but to resolve a specific strategic problem. It requires the author to assess a crisis, develop alternative Courses of Action (COAs), and formulate a well-reasoned and actionable recommendation.
- **Target Audience:** It is written strictly for a strategic decision-maker (a Head of State, Minister of Defense, Secretary General, or Commander) who has limited time and needs executive, objective, and evidence-based answers.

What students should avoid (common mistakes):

- **The historian's syndrome:** filling pages with background information and context that the decision-maker already knows, rather than focusing on forward-looking analysis.
- **Confirmation bias:** taking an intuitive stance from the outset and creating illogical, ridiculous, or weak alternative options just to ensure the favorite option wins.
- **The magic solution:** presenting the recommended course of action as a foolproof plan. A mature strategic analysis always acknowledges that the chosen option has costs, residual risks, and vulnerabilities that must be mitigated.

2 Starting point of the analysis

- **The problem statement:** The document fails from the outset if the problem is not clearly defined. The student should not investigate a "topic" (e.g., drug trafficking in the region), but rather formulate an "actionable strategic problem" (e.g., How should State X restructure its border forces to mitigate the flow of narcotics without violating the current trade agreement?).
- **Facts vs. Assumptions:** Before writing, students must rigorously distinguish between facts (verifiable, up-to-date, and cited data) and assumptions (conditions that, in the absence of complete information, are assumed to be true for planning purposes; e.g., "It is assumed that the neighboring country will maintain its neutrality for the next 6 months").

3 Essay Structure (BLUF Outline)

This document completely departs from the traditional essay structure (introduction, body, conclusion). It uses the BLUF (*Bottom Line Up Front*) format:

BLUF STRUCTURE

- **Paragraph 1 · The BLUF:** Precisely defines the strategic problem and immediately states, on the first page, what the final recommendation is. The reader should not have to reach the end of the document to know what to do.
- **Main Body (key for the General Staff):** Organized into visually separated technical subsections:
 - I. Constraints, facts, and assumptions: What we know, what we assume to be true, and what constraints (legal, time-related, resource-related) limit our scope of action.
 - II. Evaluation Criteria: The “yardstick.” What will be the fixed factors for evaluating the options?
 - III. Courses of Action (COA): Descriptive elaboration of strategic alternatives (at least COA 1 and COA 2).
 - IV. Comparative analysis: A methodical comparison of each COA against the established criteria.
- **Final paragraph (conclusion and risk mitigation):** Reaffirms the winning COA, summarizing why it outperformed the alternatives and briefly detailing how its major operational risks will be mitigated.

4 Internal Structure (DNA of the report)

For the report to be a powerful decision-making tool rather than a mere list of good intentions, the student must master the integration of three methodological components. To illustrate this, we will use a crisis scenario: the sudden arrival of 10,000 refugees at a national border lacking the infrastructure to receive them.

Cog A · Design Differentiated Courses of Action (COA)

A COA is a strategic, operational, and viable plan. To be valid, each COA must always articulate the three-step formula: the What (strategic action), the How (operational method), and the With What (resources or agencies involved). Furthermore, COAs must be mutually exclusive options.

 WHAT NOT TO DO · FALSE COAS

Create options that are exactly the same strategy, but with a change in a number, a deadline, or a cosmetic detail.

Weak COA 1: Send 500 tents to the border today.

Weak COA 2: Send 1,000 tents to the border tomorrow.

(Error: Both are the same logistical plan; they do not offer the decision-maker different strategic paths.)

 WHAT TO DO · PROFESSIONAL COAs

Design completely different response doctrines to solve the same problem.

COA 1 (security and containment approach):

[What] Seal the border and facilitate controlled returns. *[How]* Establish a security cordon and a rapid-processing center outside national territory. *[With what]* Ministry of Defense troops and immigration enforcement agents.

COA 2 (multilateral humanitarian approach):

[What] Absorb the wave of migrants through internal relocation. *[How]* By establishing humanitarian corridors toward three provinces in the interior requesting international technical assistance. *[With what]* contingency budget, the Foreign Ministry, and UN agencies (UNHCR).

Cog B · Establish Evaluation Criteria

Criteria are the “rules for measuring.” They are the fixed, technical, and objective standards by which all COAs will be judged equally to avoid bias. The student must choose between 2 and 4 criteria and define them before beginning to compare.



WHAT NOT TO DO · SUBJECTIVE OR MANIPULATED CRITERIA

Avoid abstract concepts that depend on the reader's opinion, or criteria designed as a tailor-made "trap" to automatically cause a COA to fail.

Example (incorrect): Use "Moral Acceptance" or "Ease" as criteria. How do you measure the morality of sealing a border (COA 1) versus that of relocating thousands of people without funding (COA 2)? It is an endless philosophical debate, not an operational metric. Furthermore, what is "easy" for the military is not "easy" for diplomats.



WHAT TO DO · STANDARDIZED AND IMPARTIAL CRITERIA

Define strategic variables that can be evaluated with evidence and that support a clear measurement scale (e.g., high, medium, or low performance; or a time/cost metric).

Criterion 1 · Operational deployment time.

This is a strong criterion because the decision-maker can objectively measure whether the option will take 24 hours or 2 weeks to execute.

Criterion 2 · Legal feasibility. This is a strong criterion because it can be measured by comparing the actions of each COA with current international treaties.

Criterion 3 · Estimated financial cost. This is a strong criterion because it allows for an assessment of whether the option requires an extraordinary budget or can be covered by current resources.

Cog C · Comparative Analysis (the Matrix)

This is the comparison phase. The student should not compare COA 1 with COA 2 in a direct "narrative battle." Instead, they must evaluate each COA in isolation and objectively against the pre-established criteria.



WHAT NOT TO DO · A DISORGANIZED ANALYSIS

“COA 1 is much faster than COA 2, and it also costs less, so it’s the best option in light of the crisis.” *(Fails to provide a technical breakdown of why or to rigorously cross-reference the variables.)*



WHAT TO DO · CROSS-EVALUATION BY CRITERION

Criterion Assessment: Deployment Time

COA 1 (containment): Its performance is LOW (negative). Mobilizing military units and establishing a physical cordon will take a minimum of 72 hours, during which time the humanitarian crisis will overwhelm ground zero.

COA 2 (multilateral): Its performance is HIGH (positive). Activating UN protocols and , along with funds from and emergency resources , allows for the deployment of first-response assistance modules in less than 24 hours.

(Note: The student will repeat this exact cross-check with the rest of the criteria: cost, legal feasibility, etc.) The COA that achieves the best objective performance will be the one the student justifies and recommends in their conclusion.

5

Checklist and Quality Control

Before final submission, the author must subject their document to the following tactical review:

☐

BLUF technique? Is my main recommendation clearly stated in the first paragraph of the report?

☐

Distinction between fact and assumption? Have I based my analysis on documented evidence and clearly stated the assumptions necessary for my plan?

☐

Mutually exclusive options? Are my alternative COAs truly distinct, detailing the What, How, and With What, or are they simply variations on the same idea?

☐

Consistency with the criteria? Did I evaluate all the COAs using the same criteria objectively, or did I change the rules halfway through the text to favor my preferred option?



Documentary rigor? Are the technical justifications and basis for the information supported according to IADC citation standards?

ACADEMIC DELIVERABLE 05

Critical Review

1 Purpose and Audience

- **Definition:** The Critical Review focuses specifically on the student's ability to conduct research and apply critical thinking. It typically involves analyzing published texts or the arguments of a specific author, usually a well-known "subject matter expert."
- **Target audience:** This is intended for an academic audience and the course instructor.
- **What students should avoid (common mistakes):** It is important to note that the critical review is not and should not be understood as a "book report" or "summary of an article." Students should avoid passive descriptions and demonstrate critical analysis, engaging with the author's ideas through reading, research, critical thinking, and discussions with others. Likewise, students should avoid expressing an intuitive opinion; critical thinking is a process that goes beyond the mere formulation of an isolated logical opinion.

2 Starting Point of the Analysis

- **The initial input:** The analysis begins with the assigned articles or other relevant materials within the course syllabus.
- **The Analytical Foundation:** The student begins with an in-depth reading and research exercise, through which they identify the text's main arguments and subject them to a careful comparison with the views of other experts and with specified criteria.

3 Writing Structure (the Outline)

A good structure for this type of assignment should reflect the steps taken to read and critically analyze the assigned text. Two formal writing outlines are permitted:

STANDARD OUTLINE · INDEPENDENT BLOCK ANALYSIS

- **Introduction:** This should include the author's thesis, the student's thesis for the essay, their evaluation criteria, key assumptions, contextual considerations, and an overview of the proposed structure for the essay.
- **Main Body · Part I — Analysis of the Author's Argument and Assumptions:** A detailed breakdown of the author's argument and assumptions #1, #2, and #3 as reviewed.
- **Main Body · Part II — Analysis of the Arguments and Assumptions of Other Scholars (and Your Own):** A systematic comparison of arguments and assumptions #1, #2, and #3 derived from your own contrast and analysis.
- **Conclusion paragraph (linked and complementary to the introduction):** Contains a summary of the results (synthesis) and a restatement of the thesis.

ALTERNATIVE OUTLINE · FOR DIRECT CONTRAST

- **Introductory paragraph:** Include the author's thesis statement, the thesis you propose for your essay, your evaluation criteria, assumptions, contextual considerations, and a concise overview of your essay's structure.
- **Main Body · Analysis of Arguments and Assumptions:** Include a point-by-point comparison in the following order:
 - Argument and assumptions of Author #1 versus the arguments and assumptions of other authors and your own #1.
 - Argument and assumptions of Author #2 versus the arguments and assumptions of other authors and your own #2.
 - Argument and assumptions of Author #3 versus the arguments and assumptions of other authors and your own #3.
- **Conclusion paragraph (linked and complementary to the introduction):** A summary of the results (synthesis) and a restatement of the thesis.

4 Internal structure (criteria and doctrinal contrast)

37

To develop the body of the paper, students must follow these three internal methodological guidelines:

1 Focused Evaluation Criteria (assessment system)

The student must select clear criteria that will depend on the specific topic.

For example, if the article proposes a new foreign policy, one might choose to evaluate the recommendation in terms of its legitimacy, ethics, legality, risk, or public opinion. These criteria function as the “rule” or system of objective values used to judge the author’s arguments; they are the lens through which the text will be examined.

2 Comparative Analysis with Contemporaries

The process requires comparing the main author’s arguments with those of their contemporaries (other scholars who have written on the same topics or in the same academic field). Students should compare the different positions to validate, qualify, or refute the premises of the work under review.

3 Emphasis on Sources and Citations

Because it requires comparing multiple researchers, this paper deliberately places greater emphasis on citing appropriate references (for example, using international legal documents to challenge the legality of another’s proposal). The use of “sources and citations” constitutes one of the four most important evaluation criteria for the paper.

EDUCATIONAL EXAMPLE

If an evaluator is asked to assess a vehicle, they cannot simply offer an intuitive opinion such as “I like it because it’s eye-catching.” They need fixed criteria: if evaluating based on fuel economy, they will measure fuel consumption; if evaluating based on safety, they will assess the brakes and airbags. The vehicle is the same, but the technical conclusion will depend on the criteria applied.

In a critical review, the object of analysis is the expert’s text. Although it is preferable to use several criteria for an in-depth analysis, an excessive number runs the risk of compromising coherence or complicating the subject; therefore a critical review requires focusing on two or three of the most relevant criteria and examining them rigorously.

5 Checklist and Quality Control

Before proceeding to the final submission in Moodle or to the peer review process, the author must validate their draft by addressing the following direct quality control questions:

☐ Did I avoid summarizing? Does my paper critically engage with the author's ideas through research, or did I fall into the trap of writing a book report?

☐ Do I meet the maximum number of criteria? Did I carefully choose between two or three applicable evaluation criteria (risk, legality, ethics), or did I overload the text, risking its overall coherence?

☐ Is the contrast effective? Are the main author's arguments explicitly contrasted with the ideas published and developed by other relevant scholars in the field?

☐ Is the citations section validated? Have I taken special care in the use of sources and citations, keeping in mind that this is one of the most important evaluation criteria for this assignment?

☐ Symmetrical structure? Does my essay clearly follow either the standard outline or the alternative outline of paragraphs and blocks of arguments without mixing the two formats?

ACADEMIC DELIVERABLE

06

Opinion Piece

1 Purpose and Audience

- **Definition:** A tool for articulating a well-reasoned personal stance on a topic. It prepares students to promote or defend positions before professional audiences

Teaching Note: Although it is called an “opinion piece,” it should not be confused with a subjective or informal exercise. Its value lies in documenting a logical and well-founded position based on a rigorous analysis of real-world facts.

- **Target Audience:** This is intended for academic and professional settings where persuasive argumentation, debate on controversial topics, or the defense of an established position is required.
- **What Students Should Avoid (Common Mistakes):** Students should avoid submitting an opinion paper based solely on the idea of undermining others’ arguments or presenting only opposing arguments, as a paper of this nature is incomplete. It is essential to define and maintain a logical and positive argument at all times. Likewise, students should avoid submitting a purely subjective or informal piece, since the value of an opinion piece lies in documenting a logical and solid position, supported by a rigorous analysis of facts drawn from the real world and not from imagined or invented situations.

2 Starting Point for the Analysis

The Opinion Piece is structured around logical reasoning and persuasion, transforming a personal stance into a defensible professional argument. To ensure the strength of your analysis, consider these three key points:

- **Accurate evidence:** Every argument must be based on real-world facts, never on imagined or fabricated situations.
- **Quality of sources:** The power of persuasion stems from the use of data from high-quality sources, not mere intuition.
- **Proactive thesis:** The goal is to construct and uphold a positive position; not simply refute or debunk others’ arguments.

3 Writing Structure (the Framework)

The optimal structure is that of a logical argument (Toulmin model), which organizes an argument in a persuasive manner:

- **Introductory Paragraph:** Includes the central thesis (the opinion).
- **Main Body:**
 - **Evidence #1 / Justification #1:** Supporting data and reasoning.
 - **Evidence #2 / Justification #2:** Development of the argument.
 - **Evidence #3 / Justification #3:** Logical elaboration.
- **Questioning:** Analysis of counterarguments or relevant objections.
- **Conclusion Paragraph:** Restatement of the thesis and concise summary of the evidence and justifications.

4 Internal Structure Method (Design and Persuasion)

For the argument to be sound, four essential pillars must be articulated:

1 Claim: Position taken on the matter.

2 Evidence: Objective facts used to support the claim.

3 Justification or Warrant: Reasoning that demonstrates how the evidence actually supports the claim.

4 Qualifiers: Contextual information (region, time period, profession) that makes the claim valid.

Educational example

The Impact of Cybersecurity on Regional Strategy.

To distinguish a subjective exercise from a genuine professional opinion summary, compare the following approaches to the same topic:

✗ INCORRECT APPROACH · (Subjective and incomplete)

"I believe that cyber attacks are bad for the region. The other authors are wrong to say that cooperation is difficult, because in reality everyone should help each other. It's unfair that countries don't share their data."

Flaw: It relies exclusively on undermining others' ideas without providing evidence, uses emotional language ("unfair," "bad") and fails to construct a logical argument.

✓ CORRECT APPROACH · (Logical Argument)

✓The integration of regional cyber defense protocols is critical for ensuring stability in the face of asymmetric attacks. Given the 30% increase in vulnerabilities in 2025, it would be strategic to implement a platform for the exchange of information. This measure is technically viable provided interoperability protocols safeguard the national sovereignty of each participating State.

Correct: Constructs a clear statement, supports it with evidence (30%), provides a justification (strategic necessity) and establishes conditions (respect for sovereignty).

5 Checklist and Quality Control

Before uploading the final document to the virtual learning environment, the author must review the draft using the following quality control questions:

☐ Have I defined and supported a logical, positive, and structured argument?

☐ Did I use real-world facts (avoiding made-up situations)?

☐ Did I identify and address potential objections or counterarguments?

☐ Is the central thesis clearly defined in the introductory paragraph?

☐ Is my opinion persuasive because of logical analysis (and not merely subjective)?



Formatting and Citation Style Guidelines

01 General Format

02 Citation Ethics

03 Chicago Manual of Style

04 Examples and
Tables

INTRODUCTION

Standards for Submissions

This section sets forth the mandatory rules for submitting all academic and professional work at the Inter-American Defense College (IADC). The way you present your information is just as critical as the analysis itself, since attention to detail is a direct indicator of your professional competence.

1. General Presentation Format

First, we will define the formatting parameters. Consistency in margins, font type, pagination, and overall structure is not merely an aesthetic exercise but an institutional requirement. These guidelines ensure that any document submitted to the College has a neat and professional appearance, allowing the evaluator to focus exclusively on the content of your work.

2. Citation Style: Chicago Manual of Style

IADC uses the Chicago Manual of Style, exclusively, for all references and citations. This is the College's official standard for academic research and source management.

IMPORTANT NOTE FOR YOUR REFERENCE

If you have used other formats, such as APA, in your previous academic work, please note that the system is different at this College. At the IADC, we do not insert in-text citations in parentheses (e.g., "Author, Year"). Instead, the Chicago style employs superscript numbers (1, 2, 3...) within the paragraphs, which direct the reader to a list of Endnotes located exclusively at the end of the document.

Below, you will find the technical specifications and practical examples necessary to correctly apply both the format and this citation system. Please note that strict adherence to these guidelines is mandatory for all your submissions, as they ensure the accuracy, traceability of your sources, and the documentary rigor expected of a strategic leader.

1

General Formatting Guidelines

Consistency in document formatting is an academic requirement at the Inter-American Defense College. All submitted papers must strictly adhere to the following technical guidelines to ensure a professional and organized presentation.

TECHNICAL DESIGN PARAMETERS

- **Font:** Use only Arial or Times New Roman.
- **Font size:** The body of the text must be written in 12-point font.
- **Line spacing:** The entire body of the essay must use 1.5 line spacing.
- **Margins:** Set margins to 2.54 cm (1 inch) on all four sides of the page.
- **Alignment:** The text must be justified to maintain a clean and professional visual layout.
- **Indentation:** Each new paragraph must begin with a 1.27 cm (0.5-inch) indentation on the first line. Do not leave extra space between paragraphs.
- **Endnotes:** Since we use the endnote system, the text of these notes must be set in 10-point font with single line spacing.
- **Pagination:** Page numbers should be placed at the bottom, centered or right-aligned. The title page is not numbered; pagination begins on the first page of text with the number “1.”

2. Hierarchy and Structure

The visual organization of your document allows the grader to quickly understand the structure of your arguments. We recommend following this hierarchy:

- **Cover Page:** Required for all assignments. It must include: the IADC logo, the title of the assignment, the course name, the student’s name, the instructor’s name, and the due date.
- **Headings:** They must be clear and concise. It is recommended to use bold type to distinguish them from the rest of the text.

- Figures and tables: If you include visual elements, they must have a descriptive title at the top and the required citation immediately below, using Chicago Manual of Style formatting.

3. Quality Control Checklist (Final)

Before submitting any document, use this checklist as a final step to ensure that your work complies with IADC standards. If you cannot check off all the items, make the necessary adjustments:

	[]
Formatting Checklist	[]
2.54 cm margins on all four sides?	[]
12-point Arial or Times New Roman font for the text?	[]
1.5 line spacing in the body of the text?	[]
0.5" (1.27 cm) indentation at the beginning of each paragraph?	[]
Is the text justified?	[]
Are the endnotes in 10-point font and single-spaced?	[]
Is the page numbering consecutive and does it start on the first page of text?	
Does the title page include all the required institutional information?	

Citations: Chicago Manual of Style

INTRODUCTION TO THE ETHICS OF CITATIONS

INSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE

"When you submit a written paper, your name appears on the title page: that document is your voice." Therefore, it is assumed that every concept, idea, and argument is your own, except for those you clearly identify as belonging to others. At the IADC, citation is not an administrative formality; it is a matter of professional integrity. Failure to cite correctly is equivalent to claiming intellectual work as one's own, a violation that compromises the legitimacy of both military and civilian service.

"Our academic goal is to contribute to the collective effort to generate knowledge. When you cite sources, you are not only complying with a regulatory requirement; you are also enabling other researchers to verify your data, continue your analysis, and strengthen the scientific method. Citing sources is, in essence, an invitation to others to participate in an intellectual conversation based on transparency."

Citation Style: The Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS)

Context: What is CMOS?

The *Chicago Manual of Style* (CMOS) is one of the most prestigious and widely used standards in academia, particularly in history, humanities, defense studies, and the social sciences. Unlike other manuals that focus solely on citations, the CMOS is a comprehensive work that covers everything from grammar to editorial formatting.

IMPORTANT NOTE FOR STUDENTS

The IADC does not use the entire manual (we will not apply the editorial guidelines, editorial typography, or manuscript preparation for printing). Our use focuses strictly on documenting sources. We are interested exclusively in its citation system to ensure accuracy, intellectual integrity, and source traceability.

The Two Chicago Systems

The Chicago Manual of Style offers two citation systems:

- 1 Author-Date: Similar to the APA format, in which parentheses are inserted into the text. (Not used at the IADC for academic papers.)
- 2 Notes and Bibliography: This is the system we will use. This method allows us to acknowledge documents and ideas from other authors “outside the text” using superscript numbers (1, 2, 3...) that refer to a citation.

INSTITUTIONAL ADAPTATION · ENDNOTES

Although standard CMOS typically uses footnotes, IADC has adapted this system to endnotes. This means that, instead of placing the citation at the bottom of each page, you will compile all your references in a numbered section at the end of your document.

Indentation and Style Settings (Editing Rules)

To ensure your endnotes are displayed correctly, strictly follow these rules:

A · “ENDNOTES” SECTION

- Indentation: Use first-line indentation (the first line of the note starts at 1.27 cm, and subsequent lines return to the left margin).
- Line spacing: single (1.0), leaving a blank space between each entry to make it easier to read.

B · “BIBLIOGRAPHY” SECTION

- Indentation: Use a *hanging indent*. The first line starts at the left margin, and all subsequent lines are indented by 1.27 cm.
- Line spacing: Single (1.0), leaving a blank space between each entry.

10 Practical Examples of Citations

To standardize your submissions, use the following table as a quick reference. Remember, at the IADC, commas are used to separate fields in the Endnotes, while periods are used in the Bibliography.

Entry Type	Endnote (example)	Bibliography (example)
Book (1 author)	1. Carles Puyol, History of Barcelona (Spain: Editorial de Cultura Deportiva, 2010), 218.	Puyol, Carles. History of Barcelona. Spain: Editorial de Cultura Deportiva, 2010.
Book (2 or 3 authors)	2. Juan Pérez and Ana Soto, Cyberdefense (Madrid: Tecnos, 2022), 45.	Pérez, Juan, and Ana Soto. Cyberdefense. Madrid: Tecnos, 2022.
Book (4 or more authors)	3. David Smith et al., Global Strategy (NY: Academic, 2023), 10.	Smith, David, et al. Global Strategy. NY: Academic, 2023.
Book chapter (with editor)	4. Mario Silva, “Geopolitics,” in Analysis, ed. Luis Vaca (Lima: Fondo, 2023), 12.	Silva, Mario. “Geopolitics.” In *Analysis*, edited by Luis Vaca, 10–25. Lima: Fondo, 2023.
Academic journal (online)	5. G. Piqué, “La Masia,” Todo Deportes 3, no. 3 (2014): 4, https://doi.org/10.123/td33 .	Piqué, Gerard. “La Masia.” Todo Deportes 3, no. 3 (2014): 1–6, https://doi.org/10.123/td33 .
Popular magazine (online)	6. Luis Suárez, “The Rise,” Todo Deportes (July 2014): 2, www.tododeportes.com/ascenso .	Suárez, Luis. “The Promotion.” Todo Deportes, July 2014, 1–6, www.tododeportes.com/ascenso .
Newspaper article (web)	7. J. Puyal, “Iniesta’s Goal,” Sport, March 8, 2017, www.sport.es/gol .	Puyal, Joaquim. “Iniesta’s Goal.” Sport, March 8, 2017, www.sport.es/gol .
Found online	8. World Bank, “Indicators,” accessed May 10, 2024, www.bm.org .	World Bank. “Indicators.” Accessed May 10, 2024. www.bm.org .
Presentation or conference	9. Joan Laporta, “Messi” (presentation, Barcelona, August 7, August 2021).	Laporta, Joan. “Messi.” Presentation at an event, Barcelona, August 7, 2021.
Translation (by the CID)	10. Defense Policy (trans. by the CID, 2025).	Defense Policy. Translated by the CID, 2025.
Laws or Regulations	11. National Security Act, Official Gazette, January 31, 2005.	National Security Act. Official Gazette, January 31, 2005.

Ethical Optimization with Artificial Intelligence

The complexity of metadata (the author, what to italicize, where to place the comma) can be efficiently managed with AI.



PERMITTED USE

You can use AI to help you organize your bibliographic data in the correct order according to the Chicago Manual of Style.

For example, when entering your source data, ask it: “Organize this data according to the Chicago Manual of Style’s note and reference system for the IADC.”



YOUR RESPONSIBILITY

AI is an administrative assistance tool, not a final proofreader or an author. You are solely responsible for the content and accuracy of your document, and you have the inescapable obligation to verify each citation before final submission.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) should be understood solely as an administrative assistance tool for organizing your references. Within the framework of IADC’s Academic Integrity Policy—whose guidelines are provided in detail in a later section of this manual—you are solely responsible for the content and accuracy of your document.

AI is not a final proofreader or an author; it is an assistant. Therefore, you are entirely responsible for verifying each citation before final submission. Personally verify that AI has not changed authors, dates, titles, or page numbers. Digital tools may contain inaccuracies or invent sources (known as “hallucinations”); a document containing false or miscited references—regardless of the method used to generate them—compromises intellectual rigor and loses all credibility before any evaluation panel at the College.

Formatting of Endnotes

TABLE 1: EXAMPLES OF ENDNOTE CITATIONS

IADC 2026

Below are examples of endnote citations for different types of sources. Remember that with endnotes, fields are separated by commas.

Entry Type	Endnote Format	Endnote Example
Book by One Author	Firstname Lastname, <i>Title of Book</i> (Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication), page number(s).	John M. Collins, <i>Grand Strategy: Principles and Practices</i> (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1973), 1-13.
Book by Multiple Authors* *Four or more authors include name of first author followed by "et al."	First author Firstname Lastname, Second author Firstname Lastname, and Third author Firstname Lastname, <i>Title of Book</i> (Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication), page number(s).	Todd Sandler and Keith Hartley, <i>The Economic of Defense</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 45.
Book Chapter	Chapter author Firstname Lastname, "Title of Chapter" in <i>Title of Book</i> , ed. Editor(s) Firstname Lastname (Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication), page number(s).	Pablo José Molina Serrano, "Amenazas emergentes en Ceuta: relación entre pobreza y yihadismo," in <i>Problemas emergentes en Seguridad: Riesgos y amenazas presentes y futuros</i> , coord. José Domínguez León, 91-98 (España: CISDE Editorial, 2018)
Scholarly Journal Article	Firstname Lastname, "Title of Article," <i>Journal Title</i> vol. #, no. # (Month/Season Year of publication): page number(s), accessed date, URL.* **"vol." is not written. Also, not all journals provide issue numbers, seasons, etc.	Adelaida Sarukhan, "Covid-19: crónica de una pandemia anunciada," <i>Foreign Affairs Latinoamérica</i> 20, no. 3 (julio-septiembre 2020): 2-8.
Magazine Article	Firstname Lastname, "Title of Article," <i>Magazine Title</i> , Date, page number(s).	Aixa Jorquera Trascastro, "La originalidad de El cuento de la criada. La representación de la gestación subrogada," <i>Creatividad y Sociedad</i> , mayo 2019, 2-39.
Newspaper Article	Firstname Lastname, "Title of Article," <i>Newspaper Title</i> , Date, accessed date, URL.	Amanda Mars, "Donald Trump presenta demandas por censura contra Facebook, Twitter y Google," <i>El País</i> , 7 de julio de 2021
Book, Journal, Magazine, or Newspaper Article found online	Follow the appropriate format listed above, followed by the URL at the end of the citation. Include the access date. If it is found in a database like ProQuest or EBSCO, just list the URL of the main entrance of the service. For example, http://proquest.com/	James Rodgers, "Revolution in the air," <i>History Today</i> , no. 7 (June 2021): 90-93, accessed July 8, 2021, http://www.proquest.com/ . Zhaoying Feng, "Going undercover to infiltrate Chinese-American far-right networks," <i>BBC</i> , 8 de julio de 2021, accessed July 12, 2021, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-57587364 .
Webpage* *Remember that a book, article, etc. found online is not the same as a webpage!	Firstname Lastname, "Title of the page," Title or owner of the site, modification or access date, URL* *If no author, owner of the site may stand in for the author.	Office of the Inspector General, "Activities," Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, accessed July 2, 2018, http://www.fao.org/aud/48636/en/ .
Online Statistical Database	Name of Database, URL (descriptive phrase indicating part of the database being cited and nature of information accessed; access date).	World Bank Databank, http://databank.worldbank.org/ (World Development Indicators, military expenditure in Latin America, 1960-2010; accessed February 8, 2013).
Presentation/Lecture	Presenter's Firstname Lastname, "Title of Presentation/Lecture" (presentation, Seminar Title, City, State, Date).	Daniel Masís, "Academic Citation" (lecture, Advanced Research and Writing Workshop, Washington, DC, August 12, 2015).
Public Documents (Laws, census, etc.)	Discretion and common sense should dictate how much information is necessary for a reader to locate the material. See p. 25 above.	Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, <i>The Mutual Security Act of 1956</i> , 84 th Cong., 2d sess., 1956, S. Rep. 2273, 9-10.
Unofficial Translation (by IADC)	Follow the format above for the type of entry of the translated document. Write the original title, then "trans. by Inter-American Defense College as" followed by the translated title. Maintain the titles of books, journals, magazines, etc. in original language.	Patricio H. Randel, <i>La desterritorialización</i> , trans. by Inter-American Defense College as <i>Deterritorialization</i> (Buenos Aires: Ciudad Argentina, 1999).

Formatting for References / Bibliographic Citations

Below are examples of bibliographic citations for different types of sources. Remember that with endnotes, fields are separated by periods and are indented.

TABLE 2: EXAMPLES OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES/CITATION

Entry Type	Bibliography Format	Bibliography Example
Book by One Author	Lastname, Firstname. <i>Title of Book</i> . Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication.	Collins, John M. <i>Grand Strategy: Principles and Practices</i> . Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1973.
Book by Multiple Authors* *Four or more authors include name of first author followed by "et al."	First author Lastname, Firstname, Second author Firstname Lastname, and Third author Firstname Lastname. <i>Title of Book</i> . Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication.	Sandler, Todd y Keith Hartley. <i>The Economic of Defense</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
Book Chapter	Chapter author Lastname, Firstname. "Title of Chapter." In <i>Title of Book</i> , edited by Editor(s) Firstname Lastname, inclusive page numbers. Place of publication: Publisher, Year of publication.	Molina Serrano, Pablo José. "Amenazas emergentes en Ceuta: relación entre pobreza y yihadismo." en <i>Problemas emergentes en Seguridad: Riesgos y amenazas presentes y futuros</i> , coordinado por José Domínguez León, 91-98. España: CISDE Editorial, 2018.
Scholarly Journal Article	Lastname, Firstname. "Title of Article." <i>Journal Title</i> vol. #, no. # (Month/Season Year of publication): page number(s). Accessed Date. URL.* *vol. is not written. Also, not all journals provide issue numbers, seasons, etc.	Sarukhan, Adelaida. "Covid-19: crónica de una pandemia anunciada." <i>Foreign Affairs Latinoamérica</i> 3, no. 3 (julio-septiembre 2020): 2-8.
Magazine Article	Lastname, Firstname. "Title of Article." <i>Magazine Title</i> , Date. Access date.	Jorquera Trascastro, Aixa. "La originalidad de El cuento de la criada." <i>Creatividad y Sociedad</i> , mayo 2019.
Newspaper Article	Lastname, Firstname. "Title of Article." <i>Newspaper Title</i> , Date. Access date.	Mars, Amanda. "Donald Trump presenta demandas por censura contra Facebook, Twitter y Google." <i>El País</i> , 7 de julio de 2021.
Book, Journal, Magazine, or Newspaper Article found online	Follow the appropriate format listed above, followed by the URL at the end of the citation. Include the access date. If it is found in a database like ProQuest or EBSCO, just list the URL of the main entrance of the service. For example, http://proquest.com/	Rodger, Jamews. "Revolution in the air." <i>History Today</i> , no. 7 (Junio 2021): 90-93. Accessed July 2, 2018. http://proquest.com/ . Feng, Zhaoying. "Going undercover to infiltrate Chinese-American far-right networks." <i>BBC</i> , July 2, 2018. Accessed July 12, 2021. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-57587364 .
Webpage* *Remember that a book, journal article, etc. found online is not the same as a webpage.	Lastname, Firstname. "Title of the page." Title or owner of the site. Modification or access date. URL* *If no author, owner of the site may stand in for the author.	Office of the Inspector General. "Activities." Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Accessed July 2, 2018. http://www.fao.org/aud/48636/en/
Online Statistical Database	Name of Database. URL (descriptive phrase indicating the part of the database being cited and nature of information accessed; access date).	World Bank Databank. http://databank.worldbank.org/ (World Development Indicators, military expenditure in Latin America, 1960-2010; accessed February 8, 2013).
Presentation/Lecture	Presenter's Lastname, Firstname. "Title of Presentation/Lecture." Presentation, Seminar Title, City, State, Date.	Masís, Daniel. "Academic Citation." Lecture, Advanced Research and Writing Workshop, Washington, DC, August 12, 2015.
Public Documents (Laws, census, etc.)	Discretion and common sense should dictate how much information is necessary for a reader to locate the material. See p. 25 above.	U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. <i>The Mutual Security Act of 1956</i> . 84 th Cong., 2d sess., 1956. S. Rep. 2273.
Unofficial Translation (by IADC)	Follow the format above for the type of entry of the translated document. Write the original title, then "Trans. by Inter-American Defense College as" followed by the translated title. Maintain the titles of books, journals, magazines, etc. in original language.	Randel, Patricio H. <i>La desterritorialización</i> . Trans. by Inter-American Defense College as <i>Deterritorialization</i> . Buenos Aires: Ciudad Argentina, 1999.

IV

Academic Integrity

01 Academic Integrity

02 Ethical Use of AI

CHAPTER IV

Academic Integrity and the Ethical Use of Technology

At the Inter-American Defense College, moral values and ethical conduct are at the core of our professions in the military, law enforcement, and civilian spheres. Academic integrity is, therefore, a non-negotiable commitment to the College's mission and an inescapable obligation for every student, faculty member, and staff member. This commitment goes beyond the mere submission of assignments; it constitutes the very foundation of the legitimacy of our service and demands transparent, honest, and responsible conduct in every intellectual activity.

The IADC recognizes that the academic landscape has evolved with the integration of new technologies. Therefore, to ensure that our academic excellence remains at the forefront, these regulations are strictly based on three official documents that you must be familiar with and apply:

1 Academic Integrity Policy

This document is the institution's ethical cornerstone. It defines the five core values—honesty, trust, impartiality, respect, and responsibility—and establishes disciplinary procedures for violations. This text serves as the overarching framework for all activities at the College.

2 Memorandum on the Policy for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)

This document establishes the institutional mandate for interacting with AI tools. It underscores that technology should enrich learning without compromising standards of integrity, emphasizing data protection, security, and a public forum mindset to prevent the disclosure of confidential or restricted information.

3 AI-Generated Research and Writing Guidelines

This document provides operational methodology. It details precise instructions on when and how to use AI, mandatory citation protocols, technical limitations (such as the 20% limit on AI contribution), and specific security guidelines to prevent plagiarism or the substitution of critical thinking.

Integrating these three documents into your daily practice is what distinguishes a student who simply “turns in an assignment” from an academic who demonstrates rigor, honesty, and professional judgment. Negligence in understanding these standards will not be accepted as an excuse for potential violations of academic integrity.

1. Framework of Fundamental Values

IADC adopts the Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) model, which is based on five values that govern all academic activity:

- **Honesty:** the absolute foundation of integrity. It requires sincerity and truthfulness in every academic endeavor. Any form of deception—whether copying, plagiarism, or fabricating information—contradicts this value.
- **Trust:** the foundation of academic freedom. Mutual trust between instructors and students fosters an environment where ideas can be exchanged without fear of reprisal, provided that the work submitted is original and honest.
- **Impartiality:** IADC ensures that all academic procedures are objective, consistent, and fair, and that expectations are clear to all students.
- **Respect:** a fundamental value in the Inter-American system. The value of diverse cultures and perspectives must be recognized. Academic criticism must be constructive, based on research, logic, and analysis, and always directed at ideas, never at a person.
- **Accountability:** Each member of the community assumes personal responsibility for upholding these values and a shared responsibility for ensuring that integrity is the guiding principle for all institutional activities.

2. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy

The IADC promotes the use of generative AI as a complementary, human-centered tool designed to improve learning and efficiency, but under strict conditions of responsible, ethical, and traceable use.

Rules of Use and Transparency

The use of tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, or Perplexity is permitted under the following guidelines, which are part of the IADC Policy:

- **A complement, not a substitute:** AI should enhance critical judgment and problem-solving skills, never replace the student's original critical thinking.
- **Transparency requirement:** Any substantial use of AI must be disclosed. Students must specify which tool they used, what prompts (instructions) they employed, and how these influenced the development of their ideas.
- **Citation Guidelines:** AI-generated content must be cited according to the Chicago Manual of Style (as a personal communication). Example: ChatGPT, response to "analysis of defense companies in the hemisphere," February 22, 2026, OpenAI.
- **Content Limits:** The final paper must primarily reflect the student's own analysis. As a guideline, the AI's contribution should not exceed 20% of the original work.

EXPLANATORY NOTE ON THE 20% MEASURE AND DETECTION TOOLS

It is imperative to distinguish between the 20% limit established in this manual and the "AI Score" provided by detection tools such as Turnitin. The limit described here is an integrity standard regarding the balance between technical support and the student's intellectual contribution. In contrast, AI detectors provide a probabilistic prediction of artificial generation, not an exact measurement of authorship. Compliance with academic integrity is determined by the honesty of the student's thought process and the traceability of their ideas, not by the percentage of automated detection reported by software.

Verification and Security

- **Critical Skepticism:** AI responses may contain biases or "hallucinations." It is mandatory to verify any data or references using reliable primary sources.
- **Prohibition on Sensitive Data:** It is strictly prohibited to enter classified, restricted, or confidential information, or personally identifiable information (PII), into any AI tool.

57

Note: It is not required to disclose the use of AI for basic bibliographic searches or minor stylistic corrections.

3. Academic Dishonesty: Serious Offenses

Any action intended to gain academic merit through deception is subject to disciplinary action. The following behaviors are specifically identified as dishonest:

- **Plagiarism:** presenting someone else's words, ideas, or work as one's own without proper attribution. This includes paraphrasing without citing the source or using text excerpts without quotation marks.
- **Fabricating or Inventing Information:** Falsifying or distorting data, quotes, numbers, or bibliographic sources.
- **Reusing work:** Submitting work completed for one course to a different course without the explicit consent of the instructors involved.
- **Unauthorized use of AI:** Generating entire assignments using AI, concealing the use of these tools, or presenting AI-generated results as one's own analysis.
- **Bribes, favors, or threats:** Any attempt to pressure or bribe staff members or faculty to alter evaluations.

4. Procedure for Handling Violations

IADC follows a strict protocol to ensure that cases of academic dishonesty are handled with transparency and fairness.

- 1 **Detection and reporting:** Any observer (student, staff, or faculty member) is responsible for reporting the incident to the Chief of Studies.
- 2 **Technical verification:** In cases of alleged misuse of AI, additional protocols will be applied, including the use of AI detectors (acknowledging their limitations) and technological audits of originality in code and sources.
- 3 **Investigation and Arbitration:** The process follows a logical sequence: analysis (determining whether a violation occurred), investigation (Review Committee), and arbitration (Academic Council and the Director's decision). The IADC Director will make the final decision in cases of intentional violations.
- 4 **Sanctions:** Consequences may include a grade reduction, a failing grade for the course, denial of the degree, or expulsion from the College, depending on the severity and intent of the offense.

For more details on the procedures, please refer to the detailed flowchart in the corresponding Appendix.

IMPORTANT NOTE

Using previous student work as a template is prohibited. If you need assistance, always consult your mentors, facilitators, or instructor.





EVALUATION CRITERIA

01 Rubrics Structure

CRITERIA FOR EXCELLENCE

The Structure of the Rubrics

At the Inter-American Defense College (IADC), rubrics are not simply grading tables; they are road maps that define what constitutes academic excellence. A rubric is an assessment tool that breaks down expected performance into specific aspects, levels of achievement, and weighted scores.

How is a rubric structured at the IADC?

For a rubric to fulfill its educational purpose, it is structured around three fundamental pillars that you will see in all of the College's assessment documents:

- 1 Assessment elements (aspects / criteria)**
These are the specific dimensions that are analyzed (e.g., "logical reasoning," "use of sources," "persuasion"). Each one measures a distinct competency necessary for professional success.

- 2 Performance Scale (Levels)**
The IADC uses a standard scale to measure the quality of each item, ranging from Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0) to Unsatisfactory (0.0 to 2.0). This scale allows you to identify not only what you did well, but also exactly what level of depth is expected to achieve the highest score.

- 3 Weighting (scores)**
Each aspect carries a specific weight in the final grade (e.g., critical analysis usually carries carry more weight than formatting). This allows you to focus your efforts on the components that have the greatest impact on your academic performance.

Master Table of Institutional Rubrics

The following is a list of the assessment tools used in the various academic formats. Use this table as a checklist before submitting any work:

Rubric / Activity	Main Objective	Assessment Elements
Individual contribution in the classroom	Assess preparation and contribution to academic discussions during class sessions.	• Completion of assignments (level of completion) • Academic participation (attention, interaction, timeliness)
Individual contribution in groups. (Seminar Leader)	Assess preparation, active participation, and collaborative contribution to group tasks.	• Preparation (level of understanding of the readings) • Active listening (academic interest and ability to work in a group) • Individual contribution (completion of assigned tasks, contribution to the group, ability to synthesize information)
Oral presentations	Evaluate clarity, professionalism, and persuasiveness.	• Content (position, foundation, logic, and persuasion) • Oral presentation (confidence, clarity, timing) • Organization (structure and coherence)
Reflective journal	Integrate lessons learned with personal experience.	• Organization (coherence) • Understanding and lessons (understanding, learning, relevance) • Critical reflection
Reflective Essay	Thoroughly analyze lessons learned and prior knowledge.	• Organization (structure, coherence) • Understanding and lessons (understanding, explanation, relevance) • Critical reflection • Citations and sources (format)
Critical review	Analyze a topic based on readings and academic discourse.	• Organization (structure, thesis, coherence) • Definition of topics/criteria (topics, criteria) • Synthesis and Analysis (synthesis, analysis) • Citations and Sources (format)

Rubric / Activity	Main Objective	Assessment Criteria
Decision Paper	Assess the ability to propose viable courses of action.	• Organization (structure, coherence) • Topics / criteria (topics, criteria) • Development of courses of action (action, evaluation) • Persuasion • Citations and sources (formatting)
Policy Memo	Propose practical and feasible solutions to security or public policy problems, geared toward decision-making.	• Introduction: Present the problem (context and impact). • Options: Analysis of alternatives (cost/benefit) • Recommendations: Actionability and feasibility • Implementation: Plan, timeline, stakeholders and resources. • Conclusion: Summary and call to action - Sources: IADC and CMOS formatting
Opinion Piece	Articulate and defend a personal position through logical reasoning, critical analysis, and persuasive argumentation.	• Organization: Introduction, clear and coherent thesis. • Persuasion: Defend the main argument with convincing evidence. • Logical reasoning: Argument and counter argument techniques - Sources: Quality articles and sources, with IADC and CMOS formatting.

Why study these rubrics before writing?

- **Clarity of expectations:** Every academic assignment has unique criteria for success. Understanding which aspects are most highly valued in your assignment—whether it’s feasibility in a Policy Memo or the strength of your argument in an Opinion Piece—allows you to focus your efforts strategically. It’s not enough to simply write “a lot”; you must write precisely according to what is required.
- **Self-Assessment:** Before the final submission, use the rubric as a checklist. This allows you to act as your own evaluator, checking whether your work meets the standard of “excellence” or whether it requires further refinement and rigor before it is submitted.
- **Integrity:** The rubrics penalize the lack of sources or their incorrect use. Knowing in advance the weight given to citations allows you to ensure that compliance with the Chicago Manual of Style and CID formatting is a non-negotiable standard in your writing, thereby guaranteeing the scientific validity of your work.

This structure not only organizes the evaluation but also ensures that the feedback you receive is professional, constructive, and objective.



APPENDIX 1

ASSESSMENT OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION IN CLASS

Feedback For: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

DESCRIPTION: *To meet IADC Course Objectives, students are expected to prepare, contribute and engage academically in class sessions.*

TASK COMPLETION RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Completion of the Assigned Task(s):	☐ Completes all assigned and additional tasks with excellence.	☐ Completes assigned tasks with quality.	Adequately completes assigned tasks.	☐ Poorly completes assigned tasks.	☐ Fails to complete the assigned tasks.
Record your quantitative evaluation (Weight = 40%)					

ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Academic Attention:	☐ Demonstrates superb attention and interest in the ideas discussed in class and offers timely, appropriate participation.	☐ Demonstrates keen attention and interest in the ideas discussed in class and provides appropriate participation.	☐ Shows attention and interest in most ideas discussed in class and usually participates appropriately.	☐ Sometimes shows inattention/indifference to class discussion and provides inappropriate participation (excessive or minimal inputs).	☐ Consistently shows inattention, indifference or hostility to the ideas shared in class and fails to participate effectively.
➤ Respectful and Relevant Interaction:	☐ Respectfully acknowledges and synthesizes the ideas discussed in class and provides insightful and relevant academic context in offering perspective(s).	☐ Respectfully acknowledges the ideas discussed in class and provides some academic context before offering perspective(s).	☐ Appropriately acknowledges the ideas discussed in class or provides academic context before offering perspective(s).	☐ Sometimes blurts out personal perspective(s) without providing academic context or linkages to classroom discussion.	☐ Often interrupts flow of academic discourse to inject personal or irrelevant ideas without providing context or links to classroom discussion.
➤ Conciseness of Class Inputs:	☐ Prioritizes conciseness in class inputs and sets an excellent example in respecting time limits and others' opportunity to participate.	☐ Offers concise class inputs and respects time limits and others' opportunity to participate.	☐ Offers sufficiently concise class inputs and usually respects time limits and others' opportunity to participate.	☐ Often rambles in class inputs and lacks appropriate respect for time limits and others' opportunity to participate.	☐ Consistently fails to respect time limits and others' opportunity to participate.
Record your quant. evaluation (Weight = 60%)					

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK: As needed, please add comments or recommendations for improvement					
Record your OVERALL quantitative evaluation	TASK COMPLETION	+	ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT		Overall Score:
	_____ (*.40)	+	_____ (*.60)	=	_____



APPENDIX 2

FACILITATOR ASSESSMENT OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION IN GROUPS

Feedback For: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

DESCRIPTION: *To meet IADC Strategic Course Objectives, students will prepare for, actively participate in, and contribute to assigned group work.*

PREPARATION RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Comprehension of Plenary Content, Assigned and Supplementary Readings:	☐ Demonstrates nuanced understanding of assigned readings, plenary content and most supplemental readings.	☐ Demonstrates very good understanding of assigned readings, most plenary content & some supplemental readings.	☐ Demonstrates adequate comprehension of assigned readings and plenary content.	☐ Demonstrates marginal familiarity with key concepts in the assigned readings or plenary content.	☐ Demonstrates disregard or ignorance of key concepts in assigned readings or plenary content.
Record quantitative evaluation (Weight = 40%)					

ACTIVE LISTENING & COOPERATION RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Academic Interest:	☐ Demonstrates superb academic engagement with others' ideas.	☐ Demonstrates keen academic interest in others' ideas.	☐ Demonstrates appropriate academic interest in others' ideas.	☐ Sometimes shows indifference to others' academic ideas.	☐ Often demonstrates indifference or hostility to others' views.
➤ Group Communication & Language Issues:	☐ Displays excellent skills working through complex group communication and language issues.	☐ Displays skill in working through group communication or language issues.	☐ Demonstrates acceptable patience with group communication or language issues.	☐ Sometimes displays impatience with others in communication or language issues.	☐ Often displays impatience with respect to communication or language issues.
Record evaluation (Weight = 20%)					

ACADEMIC CONTRIBUTION RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Completion of the Assigned Academic Task(s):	☐ Exceeds expectations for assigned tasks and catalyzes group to achieve objectives with excellence.	☐ Completes tasks with quality and contributes significantly to achieving the group objectives.	☐ Completes assigned tasks, with adequate focus on achieving group objectives.	☐ Poorly completes assigned tasks or offers insufficient focus on group objectives.	☐ Fails to complete the assigned tasks and distracts from achieving group objectives.
➤ Contribution to Group Analysis:	☐ Consistently offers creative and challenging insights that deepen the level of group analysis.	☐ Offers creative and useful insights that advance group analysis.	☐ Provides adequate insights that contribute to group analysis.	☐ Offers inadequate insights and does not contribute significantly to group analysis.	☐ Fails to offer useful insights and often undermines the level of group analysis.
➤ Synthesis of Support from Relevant Sources:	☐ Skillfully synthesizes innovative arguments and offers excellent support, with critical analysis of the most relevant readings.	☐ Synthesizes very logical arguments, with strong support from the most relevant readings.	☐ Synthesizes adequate arguments, with some support from relevant readings.	☐ Offers inadequate or unclear arguments and/or lacks support from relevant readings.	☐ Fails to synthesize arguments and lacks attention to the readings.
Record evaluation (Weight = 40%)					

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK: As needed, please add comments or recommendations for improvement					
Record OVERALL quantitative evaluation	PREPARATION + ACTIVE LISTENING & COOPERATION + CONTRIBUTION _____ (*.40) + _____ (*.20) + _____ (*.40) =				Overall Score: _____



APPENDIX 3

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR IADC ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Feedback for Group #: _____ (See syllabus for list of group members' names) Date _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity/Theme _____

DESCRIPTION: *Students will generate and share effective and creative oral presentations that contribute to the IADC knowledge base.*

CONTENT RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Position on the Assigned Issue(s): ➤ Main Points & Assumptions: ➤ Logical Reasoning / Argumentation: ➤ Persuasion:	☐ Presents an insightful, coherent & clear position on the assigned issue(s). ☐ Comprehensively and skillfully covers briefing's main argument, key assumptions and caveats. ☐ Appropriately uses and cites many relevant sources that greatly enhance the content and credibility of the presentation. FOR DECISION BRIEFINGS: ☐ Superbly develops persuasive argument(s) that convince audience to support/agree with course(s) of action.	☐ Delivers a coherent & clear position on the assigned issue(s). ☐ Skillfully covers the briefing's main argument and key assumptions or caveats. ☐ Cites relevant sources that enhance the presentation's content and credibility. FOR DECISION BRIEFINGS: ☐ Frames a very influential argument to influence audience to agree with proposed course(s) of action.	☐ Provides a sufficiently clear position on the assigned issue(s). ☐ Adequately covers the briefing's main argument and key assumptions. ☐ Cites sources to adequately support the presentation's content or credibility. FOR DECISION BRIEFINGS: ☐ Offers an adequate argument for audience to agree with major proposed course(s) of action.	☐ Lacks sufficient clarity on the assigned issue(s). ☐ Inadequately covers the briefing's main argument or its key assumptions. ☐ Cites sources; but none sufficiently support the briefing's content or credibility. FOR DECISION BRIEFINGS: ☐ Presentation lacks persuasiveness for audience to agree with one or more course(s) of action.	☐ Fails to deliver a briefing on the actual assigned issue(s). ☐ Fails to provide the briefing's main argument and key assumptions. ☐ Fails to cite any relevant sources that support the content or credibility of the presentation. FOR DECISION BRIEFINGS: ☐ Fails to frame arguments adequate to influence audience to agree with any key course(s) of action.
Record evaluation (Weight = 50%)					

DELIVERY RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Delivery Confidence and Preparedness: ➤ Engagement: ➤ Effective Use of Allocated Time:	☐ Enthusiastic delivery; Shows excellent confidence and relies minimally on outline notes. ☐ Captures full audience attention and interest throughout. ☐ Masterfully utilizes all the available time to comprehensively cover the desired briefing points.	☐ Shows very good level of confidence, but occasionally depends on notes. ☐ Captures audience attention & interest. ☐ Very good use of the available time to clearly cover all key points.	☐ Shows acceptable confidence; at least half of the briefing is delivered without reading notes. ☐ Keeps audience interest for majority of presentation. ☐ Remains aware of specified time limits and sufficiently wraps up all key points within 30 seconds of specified limit.	☐ Shows marginal confidence or reads from notes for majority of the presentation. ☐ Loses audience interest for majority of presentation ☐ Loses track of specified time limits; appears rushed; or provides a marginal coverage of key points.	☐ Speaks w/extreme discomfort or reads from notes throughout the presentation. ☐ Completely loses the audience. ☐ Shows complete lack of attention to time limits and fails to cover key points in the specified time limits.
Record evaluation (Weight = 20%)					

ORGANIZATION RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Introduction and Conclusion: ➤ Organization of Main Ideas and Use of Transitions:	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive, and skillfully link key ideas. ☐ Superb organizational coherence between main ideas and skillful use of transitions between ideas.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive, and mostly complementary. ☐ Conveys very good organizational coherence and incorporates clear transitions.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear and adequately complete. ☐ Organized main body of presentation with use of necessary transitions.	☐ Introduction or conclusion is unclear or incomplete. ☐ Marginally organized briefing. Inadequate coherence or necessary transitions are missing.	☐ Fails to provide an introduction/conclusion or both are poorly developed. ☐ Organization is incoherent, lacking focus and fails to employ necessary transitions.
Record evaluation (Weight = 30%)					

QUALITATIVE SUMMARY: COMMENTS, EXAMPLES, AND RATIONALE FOR RUBRIC ASSESSMENTS

As necessary, add comments and recommendations for improvement.	
--	--

Record your OVERALL quantitative evaluation	CONTENT + DELIVERY + ORGANIZATION _____ (*.50) + _____ (*.20) + _____ (*.30) =	Overall Score: _____
--	---	------------------------------------

Feedback for Group #: _____ (See syllabus for list of group members' names.) Date _____



APPENDIX 4

RUBRIC ASSESSMENT OF IADC OPINION BRIEF

(PLEASE COMPLETE BOTH SIDES)

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

DESCRIPTION: *Paper presented as a position taken on an issue, with primary emphasis on logical analysis and argumentation.*

ORGANIZATION & STYLE RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Introduction and Conclusion: ➤ Thesis: ➤ Body Coherence:	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive and skillfully link key ideas. ☐ Provides a well-written, appropriate and clearly identifiable thesis. ☐ Demonstrates excellent organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive and mostly complementary. ☐ Provides an appropriate and clearly identifiable thesis. ☐ Demonstrates good organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear and adequately complete. ☐ Provides an appropriate and identifiable thesis. ☐ Demonstrates adequate coherence.	☐ Introduction or conclusion is poorly written or incomplete. ☐ Provides an incomplete or unclear thesis statement. ☐ Inadequate sense of coherence.	☐ Fails to provide an introduction/conclusion, or both are poorly written. ☐ Fails to provide an identifiable thesis statement. ☐ Completely lacking focus.
Record your evaluation (Weight = 15%)					

PERSUASION & EVIDENCE RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Persuasion: ➤ Use of Supporting Evidence:	☐ Superbly develops a coherent and persuasive position on central issue and all supporting issues. ☐ Superbly defends all persuasive argument(s) with diverse and convincing evidence.	☐ Skillfully frames a clear and influential position on the central issue and in most supporting issues. ☐ Skillfully defends key and most supporting argument(s) with convincing evidence.	☐ Provides a clear and sufficiently persuasive position regarding the central or assigned issue(s). ☐ Defends key persuasive argument(s) with sufficient supporting evidence.	☐ Lacks clarity or develops insufficient persuasiveness in the central or assigned issue(s). ☐ Lacks sufficient evidence to support key argument(s).	☐ Fails to take a clear position or to persuade the reader to agree with position on central or assigned issue(s). ☐ Fails to provide adequate evidence to defend any argument(s)
Record your evaluation (Weight = 40%)					

LOGICAL REASONING RUBRIC

Assessment Element	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Use of Logical Reasoning:	☐ Employs excellent techniques in logical argumentation and reasoning to address all major aspects of issue(s).	☐ Employs skillful logic or reasoning to address most aspects of issue(s).	☐ Employs sound and sufficient logic or reasoning as support for key aspects of issue(s).	☐ Employs logical inconsistencies or faulty reasoning in arguments as support for key aspects of issue(s).	☐ Demonstrates serious logical inconsistencies and considerably poor reasoning throughout the paper.
Record your evaluation (Weight = 30%)					

SOURCES & CITATIONS RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Use of Relevant Sources: ➤ IADC and the <u>Chicago Manual of Style</u> Formatting:	☐ Skillfully frames and employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs superb IADC formatting and excellent Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs proper IADC formatting and, with few exceptions, proper Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs adequate relevant citations from readings. ☐ For the most part, employs proper IADC formatting and Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Either cites insufficient number of readings; or cites irrelevant content. ☐ Either does not employ proper IADC formatting or multiple Chicago Manual of Style citation errors.	☐ Fails to cite relevant content from any of the activity-related readings. ☐ Fails to employ the proper IADC formatting AND disregards Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.
Record your evaluation (Weight = 15%)					

QUALITATIVE SUMMARY: COMMENTS, EXAMPLES, AND RATIONALE FOR RUBRIC ASSESSMENTS

In addition to the specific qualitative feedback that you embed within the paper, you may record additional comments and recommendations for improvement.	
Record your OVERALL quantitative evaluation	ORG/STYLE + PERSUASION/EVIDENCE + LOGICAL REASONING + SOURCES/CITATIONS _____ (*.15) + _____ (*.40) + _____ (*.30) + _____ (*.15) = Overall Score: _____

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____



APPENDIX 5

RUBRIC ASSESSMENT OF IADC REFLECTIVE LOG

Feedback For: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

DESCRIPTION: *Paper presented as lessons learned from an academic activity, integrating personal reflections with course content.*

ORGANIZATION & STYLE

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Body Coherence:	☐ Demonstrates excellent organizational coherence.	☐ Demonstrates very good organizational coherence.	☐ Demonstrates adequate coherence.	☐ Inadequate sense of coherence.	☐ Completely lacking focus.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 10%)					

COMPREHENSION & LESSONS LEARNED

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Comprehension of Relevant Readings & Plenary Content:	☐ Demonstrates deep understanding via clear synthesis of relevant activity/event content (readings, lectures, presentations, group discussions, etc.).	☐ Demonstrates very good understanding via clear synthesis of the relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.).	Demonstrates adequate comprehension and synthesis of relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.).	☐ Demonstrates marginal familiarity with relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.).	☐ Demonstrates disregard, ignorance, or no familiarity with relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.).
➤ Explanation of Lessons Learned:	☐ Skillfully explains all required lessons learned.	☐ Clearly explains all required lessons learned.	☐ Adequately explains all lessons learned.	☐ Lacks explanation of a sufficient number of lessons learned.	☐ Fails to explain any lessons learned.
➤ Relevance of Lessons Learned to Major Themes:	☐ All articulated lessons relate skillfully to core themes of the assigned academic activity/event.	☐ All articulated lessons relate clearly to themes discussed for the assigned academic activity/event.	☐ All lessons learned relate adequately to themes from the assigned academic activity/event.	☐ Not all lessons relate to themes discussed for the assigned academic activity/event.	☐ Several lessons learned fail to relate to themes of the assigned academic activity/event.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 50%)					

CRITICAL REFLECTION

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Critical Reflection:	☐ Superbly integrates critical self-reflection for each lesson learned and analyzes with great depth & nuance how core activity themes relate specifically to previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Skillfully integrates critical self-reflection for most lessons learned & analyzes with some depth how core activity themes relate to one's previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Integrates critical self-reflection in discussion of lessons learned and provides analysis of how activity themes relate generally to previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Provides less than adequate self-reflection or lacks clarity in relating the activity themes to previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Fails to integrate self-reflection and/or fails to analyze the relationships between activity themes and previous knowledge or personal experiences.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 40%)					

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK: As needed, please add comments or recommendations					
Record your OVERALL evaluation	ORG/STYLE	+	COMPREHENSION/LESSONS	+	CRIT. REFLECTION
	_____ (*.10)	+	_____ (*.50)	+	_____ (*.40)
				=	Overall Score: _____



APPENDIX 6

RUBRIC ASSESSMENT OF IADC REFLECTIVE ESSAY

(PLEASE COMPLETE BOTH PAGES OF THIS FORM & EMBED RELEVANT COMMENTS WITHIN EVALUATED PAPER)

Feedback For: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

DESCRIPTION: *Paper presented as lessons learned from an academic activity, integrating personal reflections with course content.*

ORGANIZATION & STYLE

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Introduction and Conclusion: ➤ Body Coherence:	☐ Introduction and conclusion are well-written, clear, comprehensive, and complementary. ☐ Demonstrates excellent organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are well-written, clear and partially linked. ☐ Demonstrates very good organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are both clear and adequate. ☐ Demonstrates adequate coherence.	☐ Includes poorly written introduction or conclusion. ☐ Inadequate sense of coherence.	☐ Fails to provide an introduction/conclusion, or both are poorly written. ☐ Completely lacking focus.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 10%)					

COMPREHENSION & LESSONS LEARNED

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Comprehension of Relevant Readings & Plenary Content: ➤ Explanation of Lessons Learned: ➤ Relevance of Lessons Learned to Major Themes:	☐ Demonstrates deep understanding via clear synthesis of relevant activity/event content (readings, lectures, presentations, group discussions, etc.). ☐ Skillfully explains all required lessons learned. ☐ All articulated lessons relate skillfully to core themes of the assigned academic activity/event.	☐ Demonstrates very good understanding via clear synthesis of the relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.). ☐ Clearly explains all required lessons learned. ☐ All articulated lessons relate clearly to themes discussed for the assigned academic activity/event.	- Demonstrates adequate comprehension and synthesis of relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.). ☐ Adequately explains all lessons learned. ☐ All lessons learned relate adequately to themes from the assigned academic activity/event.	☐ Demonstrates marginal familiarity with relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.). ☐ Lacks explanation of a sufficient number of lessons learned. ☐ Not all lessons relate to themes discussed for the assigned academic activity/event.	☐ Demonstrates disregard, ignorance, or no familiarity with relevant activity/event content (readings, presentations, group discussions, etc.). ☐ Fails to explain any lessons learned. ☐ Several lessons learned fail to relate to themes of the assigned academic activity/event.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 40%)					

CRITICAL REFLECTION

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Critical Reflection:	☐ Superbly integrates critical self-reflection for each lesson learned and analyzes with great depth & nuance how core activity themes relate specifically to previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Skillfully integrates critical self-reflection for most lessons learned & analyzes with some depth how core activity themes relate to one's previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Integrates critical self-reflection in discussion of lessons learned and provides analysis of how activity themes relate generally to previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Provides less than adequate self-reflection or lacks clarity in relating the activity themes to previous knowledge or personal experiences.	☐ Fails to integrate self-reflection and/or fails to analyze the relationships between activity themes and previous knowledge or personal experiences.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 30%)					

SOURCES & CITATIONS

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Use of Relevant Sources: ➤ IADC and the <u>Chicago Manual of Style</u> Formatting:	☐ Skillfully frames and employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs superb IADC formatting and excellent Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs proper IADC formatting and, with few exceptions, proper Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs adequate relevant citations from readings. ☐ For the most part, employs proper IADC formatting and Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Either cites insufficient number of readings; or cites irrelevant content. ☐ Either does not employ proper IADC formatting or multiple Chicago Manual of Style citation errors.	☐ Fails to cite relevant content from any of the activity-related readings. ☐ Fails to employ the proper IADC formatting AND disregards Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 20%)					

QUALITATIVE SUMMARY: COMMENTS, EXAMPLES, AND RATIONALE FOR RUBRIC ASSESSMENTS

In addition to the specific qualitative feedback that you embed within the paper, you may record additional comments and recommendations for improvement.	
--	--

Record your OVERALL quantitative evaluation	ORG/STYLE + COMPREHENSION/LESSONS + CRIT.REFLECTION + SOURCES/CITATIONS ____ (*.10) + ____ (*.40) + ____ (*.30) + ____ (*.20) =	Overall Score: _____
---	--	----------------------

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____



APPENDIX 7

RUBRIC ASSESSMENT OF IADC CRITICAL REVIEW (PAPER)

(PLEASE COMPLETE BOTH SIDES)

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

DESCRIPTION: *Paper presented as an issue analyzed in context of course readings and academic discourse.*

ORGANIZATION & STYLE RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Introduction and Conclusion: ☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive and skillfully link key ideas. ➤ Thesis: ☐ Provides a well-written, appropriate and clearly identifiable thesis. ➤ Body Coherence: ☐ Demonstrates excellent organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive and skillfully link key ideas. ☐ Provides a well-written, appropriate and clearly identifiable thesis. ☐ Demonstrates excellent organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive and mostly complementary. ☐ Provides an appropriate and clearly identifiable thesis. ☐ Demonstrates good organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear and adequately complete. ☐ Provides an appropriate and identifiable thesis. ☐ Demonstrates adequate coherence.	☐ Introduction or conclusion is poorly written or incomplete. ☐ Provides an incomplete or unclear thesis statement. ☐ Inadequate sense of coherence.	☐ Fails to provide an introduction/conclusion, or both are poorly written. ☐ Fails to provide an identifiable thesis statement. ☐ Completely lacking focus.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 15%)					

KEY ISSUE(S) & CRITERIA RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Define Key Issues and Context: ☐ Very clearly defines all the assigned issue(s) and identifies all relevant context considerations. ➤ Identify Adequate Evaluation Criteria: ☐ Superbly develops comprehensive, clear and logical evaluation criteria.	☐ Very clearly defines all the assigned issue(s) and identifies all relevant context considerations. ☐ Superbly develops comprehensive, clear and logical evaluation criteria.	☐ Clearly defines the assigned major issue(s) and identifies additional context considerations. ☐ Identifies clear and logical evaluation criteria.	☐ Adequately defines the assigned major issue(s) and identifies at least one relevant context consideration. ☐ Identifies adequate evaluation criteria to analyze arguments.	☐ Lacks clarity and/or context in defining one or more of the assigned major issue(s). ☐ Struggles to provide clear evaluation criteria for analysis in one or more major area(s).	☐ Fails to adequately define any of the assigned major issue(s). ☐ Fails to articulate or provide adequate criteria for analysis in more than one major area.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 15%)					

SYNTHESIS & ANALYSIS RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Synthesis of Support from Relevant Sources: ☐ Synthesizes logical and innovative arguments from a comparative review of the most relevant readings and/or resources. ➤ Analysis using Comparison and Contrast: ☐ Effectively analyzes and compares/contrasts all arguments with relevant scholars' published ideas using depth or nuance.	☐ Synthesizes logical and innovative arguments from a comparative review of the most relevant readings and/or resources. ☐ Effectively analyzes and compares/contrasts all arguments with relevant scholars' published ideas using depth or nuance.	☐ Synthesizes logical arguments from a comparative review of relevant readings and/or resources. ☐ Clearly analyzes and compares/contrasts key arguments with relevant scholars' published ideas.	☐ Synthesizes adequate arguments or generalizations from a comparative review of assigned readings. ☐ Analyzes key arguments by using appropriate comparison & contrast with scholars' published ideas.	☐ Provides a less than adequate synthesis of source information to support arguments, generalizations or claims. ☐ Inadequately employs comparison & contrast with scholars' published ideas.	☐ Fails to synthesize source information to support arguments, generalizations & claims. ☐ Fails to compare or contrast major arguments against relevant scholars' published ideas.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 50%)					

SOURCES & CITATIONS RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Use of Relevant Sources: ➤ IADC and the <u>Chicago Manual of Style</u> Formatting:	☐ Skillfully frames and employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs superb IADC formatting and excellent Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs proper IADC formatting and, with few exceptions, proper Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs adequate relevant citations from readings. ☐ For the most part, employs proper IADC formatting and Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Either cites insufficient number of readings; or cites irrelevant content. ☐ Either does not employ proper IADC formatting or multiple Chicago Manual of Style citation errors.	☐ Fails to cite relevant content from any of the activity-related readings. ☐ Fails to employ the proper IADC formatting AND disregards Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 20%)					

QUALITATIVE SUMMARY: COMMENTS, EXAMPLES, AND RATIONALE FOR RUBRIC ASSESSMENTS

In addition to the specific qualitative feedback that you embed within the paper, you may record additional comments and recommendations for improvement.	
--	--

Record your OVERALL quantitative evaluation	ORG/STYLE + KEY ISSUE/CRITERIA + SYNTHESIS/ANALYSIS + SOURCES/CITATIONS _____ (*.15) + _____ (*.15) + _____ (*.50) + _____ (*.20) =	Overall Score: _____
---	--	----------------------

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____



APPENDIX 8

RUBRIC ASSESSMENT OF IADC DECISION REPORT

(PLEASE COMPLETE BOTH SIDES)

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

DESCRIPTION: Paper presented as a problem to be solved in context of a case study related to course readings and/or plenary sessions.

ORGANIZATION & STYLE RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Introduction and Conclusion: ➤ Body Coherence and Use of Transitions:	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive and skillfully link key ideas. ☐ Demonstrates excellent organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear, comprehensive and mostly complementary. ☐ Demonstrates good organizational coherence.	☐ Introduction and conclusion are clear and adequately complete. ☐ Demonstrates adequate coherence.	☐ Introduction or conclusion is poorly written or incomplete. ☐ Inadequate sense of coherence.	☐ Fails to provide an introduction/conclusion, or both are poorly written. ☐ Completely lacking focus.
Record your quantitative evaluation (Weight = 10%)					

KEY ISSUE(S) & CRITERIA RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Define Key Issues and Context: ➤ Identify Adequate Evaluation Criteria:	☐ Very clearly defines all the assigned issue(s) and identifies all relevant context considerations. ☐ Superbly develops clear & comprehensive evaluation criteria and assumptions.	☐ Clearly defines the assigned major issue(s) and identifies additional context considerations. ☐ Develops clear & comprehensive evaluation criteria and assumptions.	☐ Adequately defines the assigned major issue(s) and identifies at least one relevant context consideration. ☐ Identifies adequate evaluation criteria and assumptions to support analysis.	☐ Lacks clarity and/or context in defining one or more of the assigned major issue(s). ☐ Struggles to provide clear evaluation criteria or key assumptions for analysis of one or more major area(s).	☐ Fails to adequately define all of the assigned major issue(s). ☐ Fails to provide adequate evaluation criteria/assumptions for analysis of more than one major area.
Record your quantitative evaluation (Weight = 10%)					

COURSE(S) OF ACTION [COA] DEVELOPMENT RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Reasonable Primary and Alternate COA Development: ➤ COA Evidence and Synthesis:	☐ Develops innovative and comprehensive primary and alternate course(s) of action with attention to accuracy. ☐ Superbly develops evidence for each COA and clearly synthesizes relevant findings.	☐ Develops reasonable primary and alternate course(s) of action with attention to accuracy. ☐ Develops more than adequate evidence for each COA & synthesizes relevant findings.	☐ Presents reasonable primary and alternate course(s) of action. ☐ Adequately provides evidence for each COA and synthesizes key findings.	☐ Presents incomplete or unreasonable primary or alternate course(s) of action. ☐ Provides incomplete evidence to support recommended COA; or falls short in attempts to synthesize findings.	☐ Fails to provide any reasonable alternate course(s) of action. ☐ Fails to provide relevant evidence in support of proposed COAs and fails to synthesize findings.
Record your quantitative evaluation (Weight = 30%)					

PERSUASION RUBRIC

Assessment Element	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Persuasive Argumentation:	☐ Superbly develops coherent and persuasive arguments for reader's agreement with proposed course(s) of action.	☐ Skillfully develops persuasive arguments for reader's agreement with proposed course(s) of action.	☐ Offers adequate persuasive arguments for reader's agreement with proposed course(s) of action.	☐ Lacks sufficient persuasiveness for agreement with some elements of proposed course(s) of action.	☐ Fails to persuade reader to accept most of the key elements of proposed course(s) of action.
Record your quantitative evaluation (Weight = 30%)					

SOURCES & CITATIONS RUBRIC

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Use of Relevant Sources:	☐ Skillfully frames and employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles.	☐ Employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles.	☐ Employs adequate relevant citations from readings.	☐ Either cites insufficient number of readings; or cites irrelevant content.	☐ Fails to cite relevant content from any of the activity-related readings.
➤ IADC and the <u>Chicago Manual of Style</u> Formatting:	☐ Employs superb IADC formatting and excellent Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs proper IADC formatting and, with few exceptions, proper Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ For the most part, employs proper IADC formatting and Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Either does not employ proper IADC formatting or multiple Chicago Manual of Style citation errors.	☐ Fails to employ the proper IADC formatting AND disregards Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.
Record your quantitative evaluation (Weight = 20%)					

QUALITATIVE SUMMARY: COMMENTS, EXAMPLES, AND RATIONALE FOR RUBRIC ASSESSMENTS

In addition to the specific qualitative feedback that you embed within the paper, you may record additional comments and recommendations for improvement.	
--	--

Record your OVERALL quantitative evaluation	ORG/STYLE + ISSUES/CRITERIA + COA DEV'T + PERSUASION + SOURCES/CITATIONS _____ (*.10) + _____ (*.10) + _____ (*.30) + _____ (*.30) + _____ (*.20) =	Overall Score: _____
---	--	----------------------

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____



APPENDIX 15

RUBRIC ASSESSMENT OF IADC POLICY MEMO

Feedback For: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator: _____ Academic Activity / Theme: _____

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

A policy memorandum should open with a concise summary introduction that defines the policy problem, offers essential contextual background information, and outlines the issues to be addressed. This introduction should be followed by a brief justification for the memo's creation, explaining why a decision is necessary and answering the crucial "So what?" question. The introduction ensures that the reader has a clear understanding of the memo's purpose, content, and structure from the outset.

The problem statement clearly defines the problem or issue being addressed. This section details the scope, significance, and impact of the problem, supported by evidence and data to illustrate why it is a pressing issue that needs a solution.

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
- Purpose of the memo: - Policy problem or issue:	- Purpose of the memo is clearly and well stated in the introduction. - The memo clearly identifies the policy problem or issue	- Purpose of the memo is stated in the introduction. - The memo identifies the policy problem or issue	- Purpose of the memo is adequately stated in the introduction. - The memo adequately identifies the policy problem or issue.	- Purpose of the memo is poorly stated in the introduction. - The memo inadequately identifies the policy problem or issue	- Fails to provide a policy memo purpose. - Fails to identify the policy problem or issue.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 20%)					

POLICY OPTIONS

This section evaluates diverse policy alternatives to address the problem, assessing each option's feasibility, benefits, drawbacks, costs, and potential impacts. By presenting a comprehensive analysis of various approaches, it equips decision-makers with the necessary insights to weigh the pros and cons of each solution.

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
- Cost/benefit options - Alternative options	- The causes and consequences of options are clearly identified. - Alternative options are clearly and concisely presented.	- The causes and consequences of options are identified. - Alternative options are well stated.	- The causes and consequences of options are adequately addressed. - Alternative options are adequately addressed, although not concisely or explicitly.	- Only marginally addresses options, but not in a comprehensive way. - Alternative options are barely discussed or just stated, as opposed to explained and analyzed.	- Demonstrates disregard, ignorance, or no familiarity with policy options. - Fails to address the alternative options.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 20%)					

RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the preferred policy option(s) and the specific actions recommended. This section should clearly articulate why the recommended approach is the best solution, supported by the analysis section. Recommendations should be practical and actionable.

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Recommended action ➤ Viability	☐ Proposed policy recommendations are clear, actionable, and feasible. ☐ The recommendations clearly and directly address the problem stated.	☐ Proposed policy recommendations are actionable, and feasible. ☐ The recommendations address the problem stated.	☐ Proposed policy recommendations are adequate but require major adjustments. ☐ The recommendations address part of the stated problem.	☐ Recommended policy is viable only in very extreme or exceptional scenarios. ☐ The recommendations marginally address the stated policy problem.	☐ The recommendation is not executable in the short or long-run. ☐ The recommendation fails to address the policy issue or problem.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 20%)					

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

This section outlines how the recommended policy can be put into action. This may include steps for implementation, timeliness, required resources, and identification of key stakeholders involved. It provides a roadmap for moving from recommendation to execution.

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Implementation plan ➤ Stakeholders	☐ The plan explicitly considers factors such as hiring, training programs, metrics, and resources needed to execute policy. ☐ The plan considers all relevant stakeholders involved, including government, agencies, private sector, or allies.	☐ The plan considers factors such as hiring, training programs, metrics, and resources needed to execute policy. ☐ The plan considers most stakeholders involved, including government, agencies, private sector, or allies.	☐ The plan considers some factors needed to execute policy. ☐ The plan considers some stakeholders involved, including government, agencies, private sector, or allies.	☐ The plan only marginally examines the factors needed to execute policy. ☐ The plan cites stakeholders but fails to explain why the matter in the execution of the policy.	☐ The plan fails to consider how the policy will be implemented in practice. ☐ The plan ignores or disregards the role played by key actors involved in executing a plan.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 20%)					

CONCLUSION

This section summarizes the main points, reinforcing the importance of the recommendation actions and the expected benefits. It often includes a call to action, urging the recipient to take specific steps. The idea is not to repeat what has been said, but to reinforce and make any call to action clear, compelling, and actionable.

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Final Reflection:	☐ Superbly integrates all the information with a summary of findings, providing a final statement that recognizes the benefits and potential drawbacks of the recommendation discussed.	☐ Skillfully summarizes the information, with some depth of benefits and drawbacks.	☐ The section provides a summary that is essentially a repeat of the information, without a critical reflection of recommended policies.	☐ Provides less than adequate summary of findings; instead, it presents merely a final statement.	☐ Fails to provide a summary of findings. There is no call to action or path to take urgent implementation plans.
Record your quant. evaluation score (Weight = 10%)					

SOURCES & CITATIONS

List the sources cited in the memo, including data, reports, studies, and other references. This ensures transparency and allows readers to verify the information and analysis presented.

Assessment Elements	Excellent (>3.7 to 4.0)	Very Good (>3.4 to 3.7)	Good (3.0 to 3.4)	Marginal (>2.0 to 2.9)	Not Satisfactory (0.0 to 2.0)
➤ Use of Relevant Sources: ➤ IADC and the <u>Chicago Manual of Style</u> Formatting:	☐ Skillfully frames and employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs superb IADC formatting and excellent Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs multiple, relevant citations from readings, additional scholarly articles. ☐ Employs proper IADC formatting and, with few exceptions, proper Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Employs adequate relevant citations from readings. ☐ For the most part, employs proper IADC formatting and Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.	☐ Either cites insufficient number of readings; or cites irrelevant content. ☐ Either does not employ proper IADC formatting or multiple Chicago Manual of Style citation errors.	☐ Fails to cite relevant content from any of the activity-related readings. ☐ Fails to employ the proper IADC formatting AND disregards Chicago Manual of Style citation formatting.
Record your quantitative evaluation score (Weight = 10%)					

QUALITATIVE SUMMARY: COMMENTS, EXAMPLES, AND RATIONALE FOR RUBRIC ASSESSMENTS

In addition to the specific qualitative feedback that you embed within the paper, you may record additional comments and recommendations for improvement.	
--	--

Record your OVERALL quantitative evaluation	Intro. + Options + Recommendation + Implementation + Conclusion + Sources (*.20) + __(*.20) + ____(*.20) + ____(*.20) + ____(*.10) + ____(*.10) =	Overall Score: _____
---	---	-------------------------

Feedback For: _____ Date: _____

Notes

- 1 Eugene Bardach, *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*, 4th ed. (Los Angeles: Sage; CQ Press, 2012), 14.
- 2 United States Department of the Air Force, **The Tongue and Quill**, Air Force Handbook 33-337 (Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Curtis E. LeMay Center for Doctrine Development and Education, 2015), 143.
- 3 Stephen E. Toulmin, **The Uses of Argument**, updated ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 89–94.
- 4 Anthropic, “Disrupting the First Reported AI-Orchestrated Cyber Espionage Campaign,” report published November 2025, <https://assets.anthropic.com/m/ec212e6566a0d47/original/Disrupting-the-first-reported-AI-orchestrated-cyber-espionage-campaign.pdf>.
- 5 Richard Paul and Linda Elder, **The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools**, 8th ed. (Tomaes, CA: Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2020), 7.
- 6 Paul and Elder, **Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking**, 9–11.
- 7 Bardach, **Practical Guide for Policy Analysis**, 18–22.
- 8 Toulmin, **Uses of Argument**, 101.
- 9 Paul and Elder, **Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking**, 9.
- 10 Department of the Air Force, **Tongue and Quill**, 145.
- 11 Paul and Elder, **Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking**, 12.
- 12 Toulmin, **Uses of Argument**, 115.

Bibliography

- Anthropic. *Disrupting the First Reported AI-Orchestrated Cyber Espionage Campaign*. Corporate Report, November 2025. <https://assets.anthropic.com/m/ec212e6566a0d47/original/Disrupting-the-first-reported-AI-orchestrated-cyber-espionage-campaign.pdf>.
- Bardach, Eugene. *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving*. 4th ed. Los Angeles: Sage; CQ Press, 2012.
- El Colegio de México A.C. (November 22, 2022). *How to Write a Policy Brief?* [<https://www.youtube.com/live/zTE1Av4oD7Y?si=sskrtQsTffZPwwe->]. YouTube.
- Herazo Mayorga, Tania Marcela. (2024). *How to Write a Policy Brief? Some Recommendations for Presenting Your Research Findings in the Context of Public Policy*. Bucaramanga: Autonomous University of Bucaramanga. <https://unab.edu.co/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Como-escribir-un-Policy-Brief.pdf>
- Paul, Richard, and Linda Elder. *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools*. 8th ed. Tomaes, CA: Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2020.
- Toulmin, Stephen E. *The Uses of Argument*. Updated ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- United States Department of the Air Force. **The Tongue and Quill**. Air Force Handbook 33-337. Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Curtis E. LeMay Center for Doctrine Development and Education, 2015.