

Methods of Policy Analysis
Course: Public Policy 873
Masters of National Security Policy
Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University
Elizabeth M.F. Grasmeder

Synchronous Sessions will occur via Zoom on Tuesdays from 6-7:15pm.

Introduction

It's a delight to welcome you to our course on Methods of Policy Analysis. This course has two interrelated goals, both of which aim to prepare you for successful tenures at Duke and in the national security policy community.

First and fundamentally, this is a course about studying politics and policy—how it's done, the tradeoffs of various approaches, and the unique “language” of research design. The substance we tackle throughout the term—in our readings, discussions, interviews, and assignments—will span various aspects of research design to provide you this foundation. In achieving this goal, this course will enable you to be “savvy consumers” of academic studies and policy proposals you encounter in the future.

Second, and of equal importance, this is a course that aims to sharpen the communication and critical thinking skills that are fundamental to your graduate experience and your policy work. To that end, this course will use our study of different research design topics to create opportunities for you to demonstrate and improve your core skills in writing, critiquing, briefing, and in providing actionable feedback.

To meet those goals, we'll have to strike a fine balance. I expect you to share your unique perspectives, voices, and opinions—and in return, I will ensure our environment is a supportive and safe one in which that can occur. I expect you to try on new skills and ideas and to step out of your comfort zone when I challenge you—but the goal is not that every assignment or comment is perfect. The point is to show improvement and for all of us to find new ways to advance our skills.

I hope to show you that research methods aren't just for academics. Thinking about causes, effects, data collection, and analysis with rigor and precision makes us better students, professionals, and practitioners of politics, whether we're working for a university, an advocacy organization, or state and federal government. And I can speak from experience when saying that, whether I'm wearing my scholar hat or national security hat, the topics and issues we'll explore in our course are always shaping my thinking and have improved it immeasurably.

In this document, you'll find:

- 1) Learning objectives for this term;
- 2) A list of topics and agenda for each week;
- 3) An overview of assignments and grading; and
- 4) Class expectations and university rules and resources

While this syllabus will guide our course, I very much welcome your questions and hope you will contact me via Sakai or at elizabeth.grasmeder@duke.edu should things arise. As a norm, in class and in email, please address me as Prof. Grasmeder, rather than Elizabeth.

I. Learning Objectives

- Understand key qualitative and quantitative research methods, and the debates surrounding them
- Identify the strengths, limitations, and tradeoffs of various research methods and approaches to policy analysis.
- Show your understanding of the research methods we review by applying them to a project of your choosing
- Strengthen your ability to effectively write and brief in a national security setting
- Develop effective and constructive skills in providing feedback and criticism to colleagues
- Gain proficiency in the vocabulary, lexicon, and language of research design

II. Topics, Readings, and Agenda

I have selected a combination of materials to (1) introduce you to core aspects of research methods and design in public policy and the social sciences; and (2) illustrate these core aspects using interesting and engaging examples from recent social science research. In large part, I draw these examples from various bodies of research using areas of work that I know best. Despite my own focus on security issues, I encourage you to think about how the lessons that we draw from the syllabus-assigned work apply to your own areas of study and interest.

The course will employ a mixture of academic articles and non-academic articles, as well as asynchronous lectures and pre-recorded podcast-style interviews I conduct with scholars and/or national security practitioners. Authors marked with an (*) indicate an individual with whom I will conduct an interview, which will be included in your asynchronous lecture for that week. I divide the course into four parts: (1) introduction to research design and professional norms; (2) qualitative research approaches, (3) quantitative research approaches, and (4) course synthesis.

The bulk of our reading materials are academic, government, or news articles readily available online. These items will be listed in Sakai, and I have also provided a web address below if you prefer. Additionally, we will read three books during the term, which can be purchased on websites like Amazon:

- George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Ma: MIT Press.
- Hudson, Pat and Mina Ishizu. 2017. *History By Numbers*. 2nd Edition. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- David Priess. 2017. *The President's Book of Secrets*. New York: Public Affairs.

Week 1: June 6-10 (at Duke) – Getting Familiar with Research Design: Language and Concepts

- Readings:

- Grasmeder, Elizabeth M.F., “Leaning on Legionnaires: Why Modern States Recruit Foreign Soldiers.” *International Security* 2021; 46 (1): 147–195.
doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00411.
 - Grasmeder, Elizabeth M.F., Appendix for "Leaning on Legionnaires: Why Modern States Recruit Foreign Soldiers," *International Security*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Summer 2021), pp. 147–195, doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00411. Accessible at:
<https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/U8GLNS>
 - Office of the Director of National Intelligence. 2022. *Annual Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community—Unclassified Report*.
<https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/assessments/ATA-2022-Unclassified-Report.pdf>.
 - George and Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development*. Chapter 1.
- Assignments due this week: none

Week 2: June 13-17 – Qualitative Methods: Foundations and Debates

- Readings
 - George and Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development*. Chapters 4, 5, and 7.
 - Gerring, John. 2004. “What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good For?” *The American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 341–54
- Assignments
 - Via Sakai, submit 1-3 sentence(s) question, observation, opinion on week’s reading by 11:59pm Monday 13 June
 - *Student Choice*: If you wish to submit one of your weekly memos, do so by 11:59pm Monday 13 June via Sakai.

Week 3: June 20 – 24 – Qualitative Methods: Frameworks and Comparative Analysis

- Readings
 - * Krause, Lincoln B. "Playing for the breaks: insurgent mistakes." *Parameters*, vol. 39, no. 3, autumn 2009, pp. 49+. Gale Academic OneFile Select, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A214603036/EAIM?u=duke_perkins&sid=summon&xid=6f5f4c28.
 - Vipin Narang; Strategies of Nuclear Proliferation: How States Pursue the Bomb. *International Security* 2017; 41 (3): 110–150.
doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00268.
 - George and Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development*. Chapters 6 and 8.
- Assignments (*Please note the adjusted due dates and times due to Juneteenth holiday, observed Monday 20 June)
 - Via Sakai, submit your proposed empirical puzzle and research question for your capstone project by 10am Tuesday 21 June.
 - Via Sakai, submit 1-3 sentence(s) question, observation, opinion on week’s reading by 10am Tuesday 21 June.

- *Student Choice*: If you wish to submit one of your weekly memos, do so by 10am Tuesday 21 June via Sakai.

Week 4: June 27 to July 1 – Qualitative Methods: Historical Analysis and Case Studies

- Readings
 - Thomas, Ward. “Norms and Security: The Case of International Assassination.” *International Security* 25, no. 1 (2000): 105-133. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/447719/pdf>
 - Tannenwald, Nina. “Stigmatizing the Bomb: Origins of the Nuclear Taboo.” *International Security*, vol. 29 no. 4, 2005, p. 5-49. Project MUSE muse.jhu.edu/article/184429.
 - Grasmeder, Elizabeth M.F. “Lessons from Finland for Ukraine and Its Foreign Legion.” *War on the Rocks*. <https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/lessons-from-finland-for-ukraine-and-its-foreign-legion/>.
 - George and Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development*. Chapter 9 and 10.
- Assignments
 - Via Sakai, submit 1-3 sentence(s) question, observation, opinion on week’s reading by 11:59pm Monday 27 June.
 - *Student Choice*: If you wish to submit one of your weekly memos, do so by 11:59pm Monday 27 June via Sakai.

Week 5: July 4-8 – Quantitative Methods: Core Concepts and Vocabulary

- Readings
 - Downes, Alexander. 2006. “Desperate Times, Desperate Measures: The Causes of Civilian Victimization in War.” *International Security* 30, no. 4, pp 152-195. <https://alexanderdownes.weebly.com/uploads/9/2/6/8/92684520/isec.2006.30.4.pdf>.
 - Friedman, Jeffrey A. 2011. “Manpower and Counterinsurgency: Empirical Foundations for Theory and Doctrine,” *Security Studies*, 20:4, 556-591. <https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.duke.edu/doi/full/10.1080/09636412.2011.625768?scroll=top&needAccess=true>
 - Holland, Paul W. “Statistics and Causal Inference.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81, no. 396 (1986): 945–60. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2289064>.
 - Hudson and Ishizu. *History By Numbers*. Chapters 1, 3, Glossary
- Assignments (***Please note the adjusted due dates and times** due to Independence Day holiday, observed Monday 4 July)
 - Via Sakai, send me with a summary of the Universe of Cases for that apply to the research question for your capstone project by 10am Tuesday July 5.
 - Via Sakai, submit 1-3 sentence(s) question, observation, opinion on week’s reading by 10am Tuesday July 5.
 - *Student Choice*: If you wish to submit one of your weekly memos, do so by 10am Tuesday July 5 via Sakai.

Week 6: July 11-15 – Quantitative Methods: Regression Models

- Readings

- * Doctor, Austin C. & John D. Willingham (2020) “Foreign Fighters, Rebel Command Structure, and Civilian Targeting in Civil War,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, <https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.duke.edu/doi/full/10.1080/09546553.2020.1763320>.
- * Doctor, Austin C. “Foreign Fighters and Conflict-Related Sexual Violence,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 65, Issue 1, March 2021, Pages 69–81, <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.duke.edu/10.1093/isq/sqaa087>.
- * Doctor, Austin C. “Making the Most of Foreign Volunteers in Ukraine”, *War on the Rocks*. <https://warontherocks.com/2022/03/making-the-most-of-foreign-volunteers-in-ukraine/>.
- Hudson and Ishizu. *History By Numbers*. Chapter 6, 7, Glossary
- Assignments
 - Via Sakai, submit a brief summary of the data collection strategy you will describe in your capstone project by 11:59pm Monday 11 July.
 - Via Sakai, submit 1-3 sentence(s) question, observation, opinion on week’s reading by 11:59pm Monday 11 July.
 - *Student Choice*: If you wish to submit one of your weekly memos, do so by 11:59pm Monday 11 July via Sakai.

Week 7: July 18-22 – Quantitative Methods: Interviews and Experiments

- Readings
 - * Gilbert, Danielle. “The Logic of Kidnapping in Civil War: Evidence from Colombia,” *American Political Science Review* (2022), 1-16. <http://www.danigilbert.com/uploads/7/6/8/7/76876413/the-logic-of-kidnapping-in-civil-war-evidence-from-colombia.pdf>.
 - * Gilbert, Danielle. Online Appendix “The Logic of Kidnapping in Civil War.” <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/file.xhtml?fileId=5679450&version=1.0>.
 - Tomz, Michael. 2007. “Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach.” *International Organization*, 61(4), 821-840. <https://www-cambridge-org.proxy.lib.duke.edu/core/journals/international-organization/article/domestic-audience-costs-in-international-relations-an-experimental-approach/DE9C218365E2AF849FC6ECF67CCC45F1>.
 - Erikson, Robert S. and Laura Stoker. “Caught in the Draft: The Effects of Vietnam Draft Lottery Status on Political Attitudes.” *American Political Science Review* 105, no. 2 (2011): 221–37. doi:10.1017/S0003055411000141. <https://www-cambridge-org.proxy.lib.duke.edu/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/caught-in-the-draft-the-effects-of-vietnam-draft-lottery-status-on-political-attitudes/37B0E3788769BF032C516E6F93794F97>
- Assignments
 - Via Sakai, submit 1-3 sentence(s) question, observation, opinion on week’s reading by 11:59pm Monday 18 July.
 - *Student Choice*: If you wish to submit one of your weekly memos, do so by 11:59pm Monday 18 July via Sakai.

Week 8: July 25-29 – Professionalization: Communicating National Security

- Readings
 - * Priess. *The President's Book of Secrets*.
 - Jonathan D. Caverley & Peter Dombrowski (2020) "Too Important to Be Left to the Admirals: The Need to Study Maritime Great-Power Competition," *Security Studies*, 29:4, 579-600. <https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.duke.edu/doi/full/10.1080/09636412.2020.1811448>.
- Assignments
 - Via Sakai, submit 1-3 sentence(s) question, observation, opinion on week's reading by 11:59pm Monday 25 July.
 - Via Sakai, submit your written capstone paper by 11:59pm on Thursday 28 July.
 - *Student Choice*: If you wish to submit one of your weekly memos, do so by 11:59pm Monday 25 July via Sakai.

Week 9: 1-5 August (in person, at Duke) – Capstone Projects and Course Wrap Up

- Readings: None
- Assignments:
 - Presentation of capstone project.
 - Via Sakai, submit a written evaluation of classmate's capstone proposal, by 11:59pm Friday 5 August.

III. Assignments and Grading

Your grade will reflect: 1) your class participation, 2) weekly memos, and 3) a final project, which will comprise a) a written element, b) a class presentation, and c) feedback remarks on a colleague's project.

Grading scale:

A+ = 97-100	C+ = 77-79
A = 93-96	C = 73-76
A- = 90-92	C- = 70-72
B+ = 87-89	D+ = 67-69
B = 83-86	D = 63-66
B- = 80-82	D- = 60-62

Participation and Contribution (20%)

I will evaluate your class participation and contributions during our in-person meetings and our synchronous zoom sessions. While a portion of each session will comprise a lecture, this class is

ultimately a graduate seminar and discussion is at its heart. Here, “discussion” refers to any form of conversation about the class material---if you feel comfortable participating during our regular class sessions, please do; you can also email me and your classmates with questions and comments or set up time to discuss the course material during office hours. However, you should still be present in class; listening to your classmates is as essential as interacting with me about the class material. As I evaluate your participation and contributions, I consider:

- *Attendance*: Are you showing up to class?
- *Respectfulness*: Do you create an inclusive space for discussion that’s accepting of different points of view? Do you build on others’ remarks and are you constructive and tactful when you disagree?
- *Preparation*: Do you demonstrate that you’ve read the material and reflected on it in preparation for class or other discussions? Are you identifying insights from past sessions or synthesizing from other material we’ve read in the course?
- *Insight*: Does your discussion of key topics demonstrate your ability to think critically about the course materials, or to relate the topics of the week to others we’ve explored in the course?

As a part of your participation grade, I ask that every student email me a brief (1-3 sentences) question, comment, or observation about the week’s reading by 11:59pm the day before our synchronous Zoom session.

Weekly Memos (40%)

I will evaluate your writing, communication, and critical thinking skills via three memos and one revised memo. These should be 1.5 or more pages single-spaced (or 2.5 pages or more double spaced) in length, and turned in by 11:59pm the day before our synchronous session of the week. The goal of an effective memo is not to summarize the week’s reading – rather, they should evaluate and critique the material we read and the ideas and insights that it prompts in you. **Your** voice and opinions—and communicating them clearly—are the key.

You will provide a memo on the material of three separate weeks (10% each, totaling 30%). For example, you could pick materials from Weeks 3, 5, and 6. Or you could choose a different combination of weeks. Additionally, you will revise and resubmit the first of these three memos to incorporate the feedback that I provide you on the first draft (10%, bringing the total to 40%). You have the option to select the substance we discuss in weeks 2-8 of our course for a memo (i.e., not the in-person Duke sessions). I strongly encourage you to space out the memos during our course, rather than wait until the last sessions.

Here are some questions to help spark your thinking as you read each week’s materials, and to help jump-start critiques that you can write about in your memos:

- What is the author’s main argument? How compellingly have they convinced you – and why, or why not?
- If the author’s argument is correct, what does that tell us about other phenomena and historical events?

- What approach does the author use to substantiate their argument? Does their chosen method “fit” the data they have and the question they’re investigating? What are the limits and advantages of their approach?
- What do you think would have been a more compelling or convincing way to answer their question, or to test their argument?
- What assumptions does the author make, about their argument or about the types of cases they investigate? Do you think those assumptions are valid?
- What alternative arguments—that is, explanations other than the author’s own theory—does the article present? Does the author convince you that their explanation is superior to these alternatives, and why or why not?

As I evaluate your memos for grading, I consider:

- *Clarity*: is the structure of each paragraph and the main ideas clear? Is the memo generally free of spelling or grammatical mistakes? Does the memo provide a “roadmap” early on so that I know what to expect is coming later on?
- *Accuracy*: is the memo able to correctly and succinctly “gist” the material under review, and to allude to the material throughout the text?
- *Originality*: is the memo clearly expressing a view, opinion, critique, etc. from your point of view? Are you drawing insights or making comparisons between this week’s materials, or between the week’s materials and other topics, ideas, or readings we’ve discussed in class?
- *Readability*: does the memo’s prose and language read fluidly? Does the memo make effective use of connecting sentences? Is the memo free of jargon or awkward phrasing?

Final Project (40%)

Our second in-person session at Duke—the last week of our course—will be dedicated to your final projects, which provide you an opportunity to operationalize and apply the research design concepts we will have explored throughout the term. The final project comprises three sub-components. Two of those components will relate to a project of your choosing. The third will represent assistance you provide a classmate on their project.

- a. ***Capstone Paper (20%)***. Having spent the course learning about research design—it’s what’s, why’s, and how’s—the capstone paper will push you to apply those lessons to a national security problem of your choosing. Given the short length of the term, you will not *actually* conduct this research. Instead, the goal is to ensure you can create, present, and defend a plan to tackle a topic of importance to US national security, broadly defined.

Your paper should be roughly 9-10 pages double-spaced and will be due at **midnight (11:59pm) Thursday July 28**. Keep in mind that any lateness will disadvantage your classmate who has been tasked to provide you feedback.

An effective capstone paper should comprise the following elements. Next to each component, I have outlined questions to help prompt your writing, and offered rough suggestions for each component’s length. You’ll observe that these elements conform to the

structure and presentation of the materials we've read throughout the course. Your paper should also plan to include an introduction and conclusion.

- (1) *Empirical Puzzle/Research Question*: what issue of international security you want to investigate (the puzzle)? What analogous question can you ask that would apply to that particular puzzle and to other phenomena more broadly (the research question)? – roughly a paragraph or two
- (2) *Concepts and definitions*: What are the bounds of the concepts under study? What processes or phenomena do these concepts include, and which do they exclude? Your discussion should capture the multiple dimensions of your topics under study, rather than their dictionary definitions. – a paragraph or a few paragraphs
- (3) *Universe of cases*: What is the universe of cases under study? To what broader process or phenomenon do these cases relate? How might other cases of this process or phenomenon resemble or differ from your case(s) of interest? – a paragraph or a few paragraphs
- (4) *Methods*: Consider the analytic toolbox we've discussed in class. Pick **two** methods that you will propose to analyze the data that you've collected. Why are these methods more appropriate to the data you're studying than other methods? What might other methods contribute that your method does not? What are the tradeoffs—benefits and drawbacks—of the way you've chosen to approach answering this question? You could pick one from our qualitative methods portion of the class, and one from the quantitative methods section – or you could pick two qual./two quant. The choice is yours, as long as you can justify your selections and answer the questions outlined here. – several paragraphs to a few pages
- (5) *Data Collection*: If you were going to collect data to use the two research methods described above, how would you do it? What kinds of indicators and measurements would you look to match/represent your questions of interest? In addition to looking at online archives like those mentioned in this syllabus, you may consider, notionally, collection conducted by the U.S. intelligence community or by partner intelligence agencies. – several paragraphs to a few pages

During our first week session, we will talk in greater depth about this project and what a successful assignment will look like. Across the syllabus, you will see that I ask that you email me one paragraph or less outlining your ideas on three of these elements—the empirical puzzle/research question, universe of cases, and data collection. These will not be provided a letter grade or be part of your final paper evaluation. Rather, the goal of this is to help ensure you are on the right track for a successful capstone, and to provide a tool to ensure you are making progress on the assignment throughout the course.

- b. ***Presentation of Research Proposal (10%)***. Clear, effective writing and clear, effective presentations often require different skills. To build on the communication and presentation skills you have honed throughout the course, during our final in-person session you will provide an 8-10 min presentation recapping the content you provide in the written paper. While Power Point is optional, it is not required. If you do use Power Point or a visual aid, slides should supplement your remarks, not eclipse them—so keep any wording on the slides

brief and minimal. I will provide a signup sheet via Sakai for you to select a slot to present in.

- c. ***Written Feedback for Classmate (10%)***. The social sciences and policymaking alike are both social endeavors—providing clear feedback, both in the form of kudos and praise for a project’s strengths and constructive, supportive ideas for its improvement, is an essential skill. To facilitate your development in this area, the weekend before our final in-person session I will assign each of you a copy of the written capstone of a classmate. Reflecting on the criteria above and topics we’ve discussed throughout the course as you build your remarks. You will provide 1-2 pages of written feedback on your assigned classmate’s proposal – which you will submit to me via Sakai –by **midnight (11:59pm) Friday 5 August**. (Keep in mind that this will provide you a full week, after you turn in your proposal on July 28, to receive your colleague’s paper, review it, and provide feedback).

IV. Class Expectations, Resources, and Duke Standards

Office hours

Rather than standing office hours, I will plan to begin our zoom discussions a few minutes early and to keep the session open a few minutes late, and invite you to raise any questions you like at that time. If it’s a topic related to that class or that I believe other students will benefit from, I may hold off addressing it until the broader session.

Additionally, please send me an email if you would like to set up a time to chat one-on-one. We can use this time to talk about course material that excites, interests, or puzzles you, to chat about your professional or graduate school interests, or about assignments. These appointments will be your time to use—come prepared with whatever you’d like to discuss.

Because this is your first term in Duke’s program, and because the program itself is new, I will also email midway through the term soliciting your feedback about how the course is going. The goal will be to incorporate your feedback, as appropriate, to ensure that this course is meeting your needs and expectations.

Etiquette for In-Person Class and Zoom Class

During our two weeks at Duke, I invite you to use laptops during class if they help you learn. This class will demand discussion and participation from all of us, so please be respectful of your classmates as you use laptops, and ensure that your focus remains on our discussion. I also request that you silence your phones or set them to vibrate. During our in-person and Zoom sessions, I have no objections if you eat a snack, have a beverage, use the restroom, or stand up if this helps you focus and best participate. Again, I simply ask that you be respectful of your colleagues.

During our synchronous Zoom sessions, I ask that you keep your cameras on. I also expect your questions, voices, and opinions to arise during those sessions, and for you to be actively engaged. Participation is a core component of your grade, and the social sciences in general—and research methods in particular—are an inherently social endeavor. The ability to see your responses to our material and to facilitate your engagement in our discussion will enable me to be a more effective (and engaging) instructor for the course.

Both in class and during our synchronous Zoom sessions, I ask that you encourage and amplify the ideas of your colleagues. We can still critique each other's ideas and debate the pro's and con's of different issues—let's be sure to do so supportively and courteously.

Absences

Please send me an email ahead of time if you expect to be absent from class. Missing one class won't have a dramatic effect on your participation grade, and as a make-up assignment I will expect you to turn in an additional critique memo, as outlined in the course assignments below, before the next synchronous session. If you anticipate additional or recurrent absences, please contact me and we can discuss as appropriate.

Late work and Deadlines

Deadlines allow us to prioritize our various responsibilities. At the same time, conflicting responsibilities make deadlines challenging—I am certainly very familiar with the tricky balance graduate students who work fulltime must maintain. All assignments are due via email by “close of eyes” on the specified due date. By this, I mean that I'd prefer that you submit the assignment by 11:59 pm on the date indicated, but I won't penalize you as long as the assignment is in Sakai/Sakai Dropbox by 6am the next morning. I discourage all-nighters, but I trust your process. In general, for each calendar day that an assignment is late, I will subtract a half letter grade (an A would become an A-). Please note that two Federal Holidays will occur during our course – please consult the syllabus for adjusted due dates on assignments that week.

Assignment Formatting

Unless otherwise specified, assignments should use a 12pt serif font (Times New Roman, Garamond, etc.) and normal (1”) margins. When citing materials in your written work, please use the Chicago style Author-Date in-text approach – information and tips on that can be found here: https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-2.html.

Resources

Clear critical writing is a skill that takes a while to master, and one of the best ways to learn is to read widely. As you craft your own memos and as you look to sharpen your writing skills, a good website to peruse is *the International Security Studies Forum page on Diplomatic History*, as they have scholars write short (1-2pg) critiques of recently published articles on security issues, broadly defined. Their primary website has an article review page (<https://issforum.org/category/articlereviews>), but you may also browse the site more broadly.

Both for projects for this class and for others in your Duke career, you should spend time exploring some of the great archival information available on line on security and intelligence. A few of my favorites are below:

- The Central Intelligence Agency Reading Room for FOIA and Declassified Documents -- <https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/search/site>
- The US Department of State Office of the Historian - <https://history.state.gov/>

- The National Security Archive Virtual Reading Room and Document Repository - <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/virtual-reading-room>
- The Wilson Center Declassified History Archive - <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/>

Academic Integrity

Plagiarism is a serious academic offense that can result in a failing grade on the submitted assignment, an F in the course, and/or expulsion from Duke University. Plagiarism includes paraphrasing (even a sentence or a phrase), cutting and pasting directly from another person's writing without proper citation, or submitting work done by someone else but claiming it as yours. Always give credit where credit is due, and never cut and paste from an article without using quotation marks. Practical policy writing sometimes handles citations differently from more formal academic writing, such as by using URLs and parenthetical citations in line rather than using footnotes or endnotes. If you have questions about how to cite sources in your work, please contact me directly. Additional information on the Duke Community Standard can be found here: <https://studentaffairs.duke.edu/conduct/about-us/duke-community-standard>.

Duke and Sanford Ethical Standards

Duke University is a community dedicated to scholarship, leadership, and service and to the principles of honesty, fairness, respect, and accountability. Citizens of this community commit to upholding these principles in all academic and nonacademic endeavors.

The [Duke Community Standard](#) requires students to affirm the following three principles:

1. I will not lie, cheat, or steal in my academic endeavors;
2. I will conduct myself honorably in all my endeavors; and
3. I will act if the Standard is compromised.

The Sanford Code of Professional Conduct promotes and enforces the Duke Community Standard. The Sanford Code addresses standards expected of, and violations committed by, all students taking courses for credit at the Sanford School of Public Policy. Please consult the [Sanford School Student Handbook](#) (p. 18) for a complete description of the Sanford Code, including student obligations, honor code violations, and adjudication procedures.

All members of the Duke community are expected to adhere to the terms of the [Duke Compact](#), which affirms our collective responsibility to abide by public health guidelines and to protect ourselves and the people around us during the COVID-19 pandemic.