

**IS 320: U.S. National Security Policy**  
Department of International Studies and Political Science  
Virginia Military Institute

**Dr. Aaron Gold**

Office hours: MWF 1300-1350  
Office: 441 Scott Shipp Hall  
Email: goldaj@vmi.edu

**Spring 2019**

Section 1: MWF 1000-1050  
Section 2: MW 1400-1450; F 1415-1505  
Location: 449 Scott Shipp Hall

**Description**

This course examines the development and execution of American national security policy with an emphasis on its institutions. The course is divided into three sections. The first examines the origin and evolution of three American national security institutions, the National Security Council, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Central Intelligence Agency. In the second section, we assess the debate over and elements of American post-WWII strategy, including the liberal international order, engagement, restraint, coercion, and decapitation. The last section examines specific national security issues prominent in the post-Cold War era – the cyber domain, nuclear security, and counterterrorism.

**Required Texts**

Zegart, Amy B. (1999). *Flawed By Design: The Evolution of the CIA, JCS, and NSC*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

**Classroom Policies**

No tobacco products, food, beverages (except water in a closed container), or gum are allowed. Profanity and racial or gender slurs will not be tolerated. Use of cell phones or smart phones or other electronic devices for non-course-related communication during class is prohibited. Late submission results in ten points per day. Qualified cadets are permitted to take 3.2 cuts with the prior approval of the instructor.

**Disabilities and Accommodations**

VMI abides by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which mandate reasonable accommodations are provided for all cadets with documented disabilities. If you have a registered disability and may require some type of instructional and/or examination accommodations, please contact me early in the semester so that I can provide or facilitate provision of accommodations you may need. If you have not already done so, you will need to register with the Office of Disabilities Services, the designated office on Post to provide services for cadets with disabilities. The office is located on the 2nd floor of the VMI Health Center. Please call or stop by the office of LTC Jones, Director of Disabilities Services, for more information, 464-7667 or jonesl10@vmi.edu.

## **Grading**

The requirements for this course include a participation grade (10%), four policy memos (20%), four response questions (20%), a midterm (20%), and a final exam (30%).

### **Participation: 10%**

Cadets are expected to attend every class period on time, having read the material and ready to make reasonable contributions to the day's topic. While this is a lecture class, we will also have simulations and group discussions that cadets are expected to fully participate in.

### **Policy Memos: 20% (four memos at 5% each)**

Policy Memo #1 ("Boko Haram in Nigeria"): Due on 2/15 at 2359 via Canvas

Policy Memo #2 ("Russia and NATO in the Baltics"): Due on 3/6 at 2359 via Canvas

Policy Memo #3 ("Drones in Pakistan"): Due on 4/5 at 2359 via Canvas

Policy Memo #4 ("Cyber Clash with China"): Due on 4/17 at 2359 via Canvas

See the formatting guidelines below and the example at the end of the syllabus.

- 1) **Recipient's Address:** Decide whom to address your memo to (e.g., President, the Secretary of Defense, etc.) and write their address, not their name. See example.
- 2) **Memorandum For:** Write the primary recipient after "MEMORANDUM FOR:" and subsequent recipients left-centered on the next line before the "the". Every recipient should be on its own line. The word "the" before their name should not be capitalized. For example, "the Vice President" and "the Secretary of State" should be on their own line right under "MEMORANDUM FOR:" See example.
- 3) **Subject:** The subject and purpose of your memo. Can be the subject matter, your argument in a brief sentence, or what you deem appropriate for your audience.
- 4) **Background (one short paragraph):** Give a brief background of the crisis and how the issue relates to U.S. national security policy. Provide just enough information about the crisis so the reader can understand your memo's purpose and importance.
- 5) **Recommendation and Justification (several paragraphs):** This is the memo's main section. Identify and explain your preferred policy option(s) in detail. I prefer that you pick *one or two policy options* and go in-depth into them instead of presenting a vague general grand strategy (e.g., "we should go to the UN, sanction them, work with our allies, gather more intelligence, and further assess the situation"). Be specific. For instance, if you are going to argue in favor of using economic sanctions, what specific individuals, institutions, sectors of the economy should be sanctioned? How will these sanctions work (e.g., quotas, bans, tariffs) and why will they have the intended effect on the president's goal/grand strategy. Most importantly, your recommendations should be tailored to your position. If you are the DNI, you should focus on intelligence operations; if you are the Attorney General, on legal and prosecutorial recommendations; the Secretary of State, on diplomatic options.
- 6) **Reflection (one short paragraph):** Give a short reflection on the simulation, what you learned, ways it can be improved, and whether it contributed to your understanding of the national security decision-making process.

Policy Memo Formatting Guidelines (see example at the end of this syllabus)

- 1) See the example memo at the end of this syllabus
- 2) Times New Roman, 12-point font, single-spaced, 1-inch margins, and no title page.
- 3) Limit: 600 words minimum (approximately 1 ½ pages single-spaced with formatting). Put the word count on top.
- 4) Every section header needs to be capitalized and in bold.

**Response Questions:** 20% (four sets of answers at 5% each).

The response questions are due the day of the assigned reading at the start of class via Canvas. Every day will have multiple questions. Cadets will answer four sets of questions of their choice. The questions are located in Canvas. A set includes all assigned readings for a day. Cadets must correctly answer all of the questions listed in order to receive full credit.

Response Questions Formatting Guidelines

- 1) Times New Roman, 12-point font, double-spaced, 1-inch margins, and title page.
- 2) Limit: 300 words minimum (approximately 1 page double-spaced for the entire set of questions for the assigned day, not individual questions). Write the word count on top.
- 3) References: In-text citations only (no footnotes or endnotes).

**Midterm Exam:** 20%

**The in-class midterm exam is on 25 February.** It covers the origin and evolution of U.S. national security agencies as well as the arguments surrounding grand strategy (stopping at “restraint” on the syllabus). Cadets will pick two out of three essay questions to answer. A study guide will be given out two weeks before the exam.

**Final Exam:** 30%

The in-class final exam is on the following days and times: **Section 1 (1000): Final Exam on Thursday, 5/9 at 1000. Section 2 (1400): Final Exam on Saturday, 5/11 at 1400.** The final exam is cumulative and will cover the major themes in class. Cadets will pick two out of three essay questions to answer. A study guide will be given out two weeks before the exam. More information about the exam will be given out as it approaches.

**Syllabus Alteration**

The instructor reserves the right to revise, alter and/or amend this syllabus, as necessary. Students will be notified by email and/or Canvas of any such revisions, alterations, and/or amendments.

### Due Dates in One Place

1/16:	First day of class
1/23:	Last day for curriculum and course changes
<b>2/15:</b>	<b>Policy Memo #1 Due at 2359 on Canvas (“Boko Haram in Nigeria”)</b>
<b>2/25:</b>	<b>Midterm Exam</b>
<b>3/1:</b>	<b>Policy Memo #2 Due at 2359 on Canvas (“Russia and NATO in the Baltics”)</b>
3/22-4/2:	Spring Furlough
<b>4/5:</b>	<b>Policy Memo #3 Due at 2359 on Canvas (“Drones in Pakistan”)</b>
4/6-4/10:	Spring FTX
<b>4/17:</b>	<b>Policy Memo #4 Due at 2359 on Canvas (“”)</b>
4/20-4/21:	1 <sup>st</sup> Spring Reunion Weekend
4/23-4/24:	2 <sup>nd</sup> Spring Reunion
5/4:	Classes end
5/5:	Reading Day
<b>5/9:</b>	<b>Final Exam (1000, Section 1)</b>
<b>5/11:</b>	<b>Final Exam (1400, Section 2)</b>
5/14:	Institute Awards Ceremony
5/14:	Graduation Parade
5/15:	Commissioning Ceremony
5/15:	New Market Day Ceremony
5/16:	Commencement

\*\*Six response questions are due via Canvas the day of the assigned reading

## Course Schedule and Reading Assignments

### **I. Introduction and Development of U.S. National Security Institutions**

1/16: Introduction and review of the syllabus

- No readings

1/18: Foundations of U.S. National Security Policy

- Snow, Chapters 1 and 2

1/21: National Security Agencies

- Zegart, Chapter 1

1/23: NSC Origins

- Zegart, Chapter 2

1/25: NSC Evolution

- Zegart, Chapter 3

1/28: JCS Origins

- Zegart, Chapter 4

2/1: JCS Evolution

- Zegart, Chapter 5

2/4: CIA Origins

- Zegart, Chapter 6

2/6: CIA Evolution and Conclusion

- Zegart, Chapters 7 and 8

2/8 (Monday classes): Simulation #1: “Boko Haram in Nigeria”

- Read/watch the preparation materials and prepare for the simulation

### **II. Evaluating Elements of American Strategy**

#### *Debating Grand Strategy*

2/11: Is Grand Strategy Possible?

- Hemmer, Christopher (2015). *American Pendulum: Recurring Debates in U.S. Grand Strategy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Chapter 1.

2/13: The Liberal International Order

- Ikenberry, John G. (2012). *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 1.

**2/15: Policy Memo #1 due at 2359 via Canvas**

2/15: Liberal Engagement

- Brooks, Stephen G., G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth (2013) "Don't Come Home, America: The Case Against Retrenchment." *International Security* 37(3): 7-51.

2/18: Neoconservatism and Realism

- Schmidt, Brian C., and Michael C. Williams (2008). "The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives Versus Realists." *Security Studies* 17(2): 191-220.
- Mearsheimer, John J. and Walt M. Walt (2016). "The Case for Offshore Balancing." *Foreign Affairs* 95(4): 70-83.

2/20: Restraint

- Posen, Barry R. (2014). *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Chapter 2.

2/22: Simulation #2: "Russia and NATO in the Baltics."

- Read/watch the preparation materials and prepare for the simulation

**2/25: Midterm Exam**

***Success During War***

2/27: Congress and U.S. War Finance

- Kreps, Chapters 1 and 2

**3/1: Policy Memo #2 due at 2359 via Canvas**

3/1: Military Doctrine and Material Power

- Biddle, Stephen D. *Military power: Explaining victory and defeat in modern battle*. Princeton University Press, 2004, Chapter 3.

3/4: Democratic Institutions and Individuality

- Reiter, Dan, and Allan C. Stam (2002). *Democracies at War*. Princeton University Press, Chapters 1 and 2.

3/6: Political-Military Integration

- Bakich, Spencer D. (2014). *Success and Failure in Limited War: Information & Strategy in the Korean, Persian Gulf & Iraq Wars*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. Chapters 1 and 2

### 3/8: Counterinsurgency

- Lyall, Jason, and Isaiah Wilson (2009). "Rage Against the Machines: Explaining Outcomes in Counterinsurgency Wars." *International Organization* 63(1): 67-106.

### *Air Power and Coercion*

### 3/11: Military (Denial) and Civilian (Punishment) Vulnerability Models

- Pape, Robert A. (1990). Coercive Air Power in the Vietnam War." *International Security* 15(2): 103-146.
- **Skim:** Allen, Susan Hannah, and Carla Martinez Machain (2017). "Understanding the Impact of Air Power." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 1-14.

### 3/13: Combined Arms

- Press, Daryl G. (2001) "The Myth of Air Power in the Persian Gulf War and the Future of Warfare." *International Security* 26(2): 5-44.

### 3/15: Compellence

- Stigler, Andrew L. (2003). "A Clear Victory for Air Power: NATO's Empty Threat to Invade Kosovo." *International Security* 27(3): 124-157.

### 3/15 CAD-3/24: Spring Break

### 3/25: Decapitation Does Not Work

- Jordan, Jenna (2014). "Attacking the Leader, Missing the Mark: Why Terrorist Groups Survive Decapitation Strikes." *International Security* 38(4): 7-38.

### 3/27: Decapitation Does Work

- Johnston, Patrick B. (2012) "Does Decapitation Work? Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership Targeting in Counterinsurgency Campaigns." *International Security* 36(4): 47-79.

### 3/29: Simulation #3: "Drones in Pakistan"

- Read/watch the preparation materials and prepare for the simulation

## III. National Security Issues

### *Cyber Warfare*

### 4/1: Introduction and Cyber Rivals

- Valeriano, Brandon, Benjamin Jensen, and Ryan C. Maness. *Cyber Strategy: The Evolving Character of Power and Coercion*. Oxford University Press, 2018, Chapters 1 and 2.

### 4/3: The Correlates of Cyber Strategy

- Valeriano et al., Chapter 3

- 4/5: The U.S. Cyber Strategy
- Valeriano et al., Chapters 7 and 8

**4/5: Policy Memo #3 due at 2359 via Canvas**

**4/8: FTX (No classes)**

- 4/10 (Monday classes): Simulation: “Cyber Clash With China”
- Read/watch the preparation materials and prepare for the simulation

***Nuclear Weapons***

- 4/12: Nuclear and Conventional Forces
- Sechser, Todd S. and Matthew Fuhrmann (2017). *Nuclear Weapons and Coercive Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 2
- 4/15: Nuclear Coercion Failures and Possible Successes
- Sechser, Todd S. and Matthew Fuhrmann, Chapters 5 and 6.
- 4/17: Nuclear Coercion in Myth and Reality
- Sechser, Todd S. and Matthew Fuhrmann, Chapter 7.

**4/17: Policy Memo #4 due at 2359 via Canvas**

***Counterterrorism***

- 4/19: September 11<sup>th</sup> and Adaption Failure
- Zegart, Amy B. (2005). “September 11 and the Adaptation Failure of U.S. Intelligence Agencies.” *International Security* 29(4): 78-111.
- 4/22: Easter break (No class)**
- 4/24: Terrorism Strategies and Lessons from Failed Attacks
- Kydd, Andrew H., and Barbara F. Walter (2006). “The strategies of Terrorism.” *International Security* 31(1): 49-80.
- 4/26: Failed Attacks
- Dahl, Erik J. (2011). “The Plots that Failed: Intelligence Lessons Learned from Unsuccessful Terrorist Attacks Against the United States.” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 34: 621-648.
- 4/29: U.S. Counterterrorism Cooperation
- Tankel, Stephen (2018). *With Us And Against US: How America’s Partners Help and Hinder the War on Terror*. New York: Columbia University Press, Intro and Chapter 1



5/1: Simulation: "Interrogation Policy"

- Read/watch the preparation materials and prepare for the simulation

5/3: Makeup day

**Section 1 (1000): Final Exam on Thursday, 5/9 at 1000**

**Section 2 (1400): Final Exam on Saturday, 5/11 at 1400**

## Sample Policy Memo

(Originally written by the Council on Foreign Relations, edited by Dr. Gold)

**Note: This is a much longer memo than is required. You are only required to write a minimum of 600 words (approximately 1 ½ pages single-spaced with formatting).**

Office of the Secretary of Defense  
Washington, DC  
January 1, 2018

**MEMORANDUM FOR:** The President  
the Vice President  
the Secretary of State

**SUBJECT:** U.S. Policy Toward Soviet Missiles in Cuba

### **BACKGROUND:**

The Soviet Union, in an attempt to expand their influence in the Western Hemisphere and bolster client communist regimes, is giving military support to Cuba. American U-2 reconnaissance has provided evidence of MiG fighter jets, IL-28 bombers, and sites for SS-4 and SS-5 missiles that are capable of launching against Washington and other U.S. cities within eighteen hours. The president should revise his orders and launch a full-scale invasion of Cuba to stop all missile activity, destroy existing equipment, prevent a nuclear attack on the United States, and clearly demonstrate to the Soviet Union that its actions will not be tolerated.

### **RECOMMENDATION AND JUSTIFICATION:**

The president's decision to establish a naval quarantine around Cuba and to continue military preparations will not adequately deter Soviet aggression. The U.S. military should implement the quarantine, then execute air strikes and invade Cuba.

The obvious disadvantage of an invasion is that it significantly elevates the risk of casualties. However, other U.S. responses also involve risks, such as miscommunication between U.S. and Soviet ships during a quarantine or attacks on U.S. pilots conducting air strikes. These could cause casualties and ultimately create a slow and costly path to on-the-ground combat. Launching a swift and contained U.S. invasion capable of decisively ending this dispute is a far more preferable course of action and more likely to deter further Soviet aggression, now and in the future.

First, the United States should reinforce its naval base at Guantanamo Bay, evacuate dependents of U.S. personnel there, raise military alert levels, strengthen air defenses in the southeastern United States, and take measures to protect U.S. shipping interests in the Florida Strait. In addition, reconnaissance missions over Cuba should continue.

Next, the U.S. Navy should establish a quarantine line and signal ships approaching it to stop for boarding and inspection, turning back any ships that carry offensive military equipment. The U.S. Air Force should simultaneously conduct air strikes on Soviet medium-range ballistic

missile sites, IL-28 bombers, MiG jets, patrol boats, tanks, and airfields in Cuba. These would begin eliminating missile sites as well as limit Soviet capability to retaliate against U.S. forces and U.S. bases in Florida.

Finally, a full-scale ground invasion of Cuba should commence within seven days of air strikes. This invasion would focus on eliminating all existing Soviet military installations and equipment, especially missiles. An invasion would not pursue regime change or occupation of Cuba, because without Soviet military assets, regardless of its leader, Cuba cannot seriously endanger the United States. However, an invasion is necessary because a U.S. presence on the island is the only way to ensure the complete destruction of all Soviet military equipment in Cuba.

There is understandable fear that a U.S. invasion of Cuba would provoke a severe Soviet response, including a nuclear attack on the United States. However, the Soviet Union is aware that if it uses nuclear weapons, the United States will retaliate accordingly. This is a crucial deterrent. Moreover, as the CIA noted, the Soviet Union and Cuba are not linked by a public treaty, and the Soviet Union has not recognized its bases in Cuba, so it is not obliged to defend the island if the United States invades. It may not even be willing to do so.

**REFLECTION:**

The presidential directive on this subject overlaps only somewhat with this proposal, which advocates for a ground invasion of Cuba in addition to a naval quarantine and air strikes, but not diplomatic negotiations. Though the president's commitment to diplomacy is laudable, the current situation is far too grave to allow time for such discussions. Only a full-scale invasion of Cuba will signal to the Soviet Union that the United States will not accept its aggression while ensuring the destruction of Soviet military capability just ninety miles from the U.S. coast. Had I been president, I would have ordered this step in my directive. I would also have used the directive to inform the American public and Soviet leaders why I believed an invasion was necessary. Only by clearly articulating and pursuing its policy goals can the United States maintain its leadership in the world.

## WORK FOR GRADE POLICY

Development of the spirit as well as the skills of academic inquiry is central to the mission of VMI's Academic Program. As a community of scholars, posing questions and seeking answers, we invariably consult and build upon the ideas, discoveries, and products of others who have wrestled with related issues and problems before us. We are obligated ethically and in many instances legally to acknowledge the sources of all borrowed material that we use in our own work. This is the case whether we find that material in conventional resources, such as the library or cyberspace, or discover it in other places like conversations with our peers.

Academic integrity requires the full and proper documentation of any material that is not original with us. It is therefore a matter of honor. To misrepresent someone else's words, ideas, images, data, or other intellectual property as one's own is stealing, lying, and cheating all at once. Because the offense of improper or incomplete documentation is so serious, and the consequences so potentially grave, the following policies regarding work for grade have been adopted as a guide to cadets and faculty in upholding the Honor Code under which all VMI cadets live:

### 1) Cadets' responsibilities

**“Work for grade”** is defined as any work presented to an instructor for a formal grade or undertaken in satisfaction of a requirement for successful completion of a course or degree requirement. All work submitted for grade is considered the cadet's own work. **“Cadet's own work”** means that he or she has composed the work from his or her general accumulation of knowledge and skill except as clearly and fully documented and that it has been composed especially for the current assignment. No work previously submitted in any course at VMI or elsewhere will be resubmitted or reformatted for submission in a current course without the specific approval of the instructor.

In all work for grade, failure to distinguish between the cadet's own work and ideas and the work and ideas of others is known as **plagiarism**. Proper documentation clearly and fully identifies the sources of all borrowed ideas, quotations, or other assistance. The cadet is referred to the VMI-authorized handbook for rules concerning quotations, paraphrases, and documentation.

In all written work for grade, the cadet must include the words **“HELP RECEIVED”** conspicuously on the document, and he or she must then do one of two things: (1) state “none,” meaning that no help was received except as documented in the work; or (2) explain in detail the nature of the help received. In oral work for grade, the cadet must make the same declaration before beginning the presentation. Admission of help received may result in a lower grade but will not result in prosecution for an honor violation.

Cadets are prohibited from discussing the contents of a quiz/exam until it is returned to them or final course grades are posted. This enjoinder does not imply that any inadvertent expression or behavior that might indicate one's feeling about the test should be considered a breach of honor. The real issue is whether cadets received information, not available to everyone else in the class, which would give them an unfair advantage. If a cadet inadvertently gives or receives information, the incident must be reported to the professor and the Honor Court. Each cadet

bears the responsibility for familiarizing himself or herself thoroughly with the policies stated in this section, with any supplementary statement regarding work for grade expressed by the academic department in which he or she is taking a course, and with any special conditions provided in writing by the professor for a given assignment. If there is any doubt or uncertainty about the correct interpretation of a policy, the cadet should consult the instructor of the course. There should be no confusion, however, on the basic principle that it is never acceptable to submit someone else's work, written or otherwise, formally graded or not, as one's own. The violation by a cadet of any of these policies will, if he or she is found guilty by the Honor Court, result in his or her being dismissed from VMI. Neither ignorance nor professed confusion about the correct interpretation of these policies is an excuse.

## **2) Faculty members' responsibilities**

Each academic department will publish an official statement of supplementary departmental policies regarding work for grade, titled "Departmental Statement Concerning VMI's Policies Regarding Work for Grade." Each departmental statement will include explicit policies on the following: (a) tutoring\* [e.g., Writing Center, Learning Center, athletic tutors, private tutors], (b) peer collaboration\*, and (c) computer aids, including calculators, translators, spelling, style, and grammar checkers. Individual course assignments that deviate from the departmental work for grade policies must be approved by the department head in advance and must be explained to cadets in writing.

No departmental or individual assignment policies may contradict or compromise the Institutional principles expressed in the Academic Regulations, particularly notions of academic integrity and the requirement to document borrowed material and help received. Each departmental statement must be approved by the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty following review by the Academic Policy Committee of the Academic Board. A copy of the document must be filed with the Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty, and the Superintendent's Representative to the Honor Court. Such a statement must be signed by the department head and must be posted in each classroom used by the department.

As an essential part of the duty of teaching and a matter of professional citizenship, faculty are expected to adhere to established work for grade policies and to communicate clearly and regularly with their cadets about the values and practices of academic honesty and integrity. Each faculty member must therefore include work for grade policies in a syllabus for every course he or she teaches. Each syllabus must include an exact transcription of the section titled "Cadets' Responsibilities" from "Work for Grade Policies" in the VMI Academic Regulations and a full statement of the established departmental policies regarding work for grade, plus any approved course-specific policies.

Furthermore, all faculty members are responsible for discussing with all of their students the details, definitions, and implications of (1) the entire section of the Academic Regulations entitled "Work for Grade Policies"; (2) the relevant sections on quotations, paraphrasing, and documentation in the current VMI- authorized handbook; and (3) the departmental and any approved course- specific policies regarding Work for Grade. This discussion must take place before any work is submitted for grade, and it should be treated with the gravity and level of

detail that it merits.

Faculty must also review the Institute policy regarding the discussion of quizzes and exams with their classes. Specifically, faculty must remind cadets that they are prohibited from discussing the contents of a quiz/exam with anyone except the professor until it is returned to them or final course grades are posted.

If a member of the faculty believes that a cadet has violated one or more of VMI's, the department's, or the instructor's work for grade policies, he or she should report the evidence to the head of the department. The department head will decide whether the collected evidence justifies referral to the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty. If the department head decides that the evidence does not justify referral, then he or she will conclude the investigation. Otherwise, the department head will submit a written report to the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty. The report must contain both a recommendation for action and all relevant documents, including a statement signed by the faculty member who reported the violation.

The instructor will assign a grade of "I" following a formal charge of an Honor Court academic violation in his or her course until the issue is resolved.

\*Departmental policies must include a statement on whether tutors and peers may offer cadets **critical comments** on their papers. Offering **critical comments** means giving general advice on such matters as organization, thesis development, support for assertions, and patterns of errors. It does not include proofreading or editing.

**Proofreading** means correcting errors (e.g., in spelling, grammar, punctuation). It is the last step taken by the writer in the **editing** process. In addition to the corrections made in proofreading, **editing** includes making such changes as the addition, deletion, or reordering of paragraphs, sentences, phrases, or words. **A cadet may not have his or her work proofread or edited by someone other than the instructor. [Instructors may grant exceptions to this rule only if they have received written permission from the department head for a particular assignment.]**

## **Department of International Studies & Political Science Work for Grade Policy**

Work for Grade in this department is generally of the following types.

1. Written quizzes, tests, or examinations
2. Book reviews
3. Research Papers, policy memoranda, briefing papers, and discourse analysis-- identification and analysis of the critical differences in the findings and opinions of scholars on issues of interest to the discipline.

Cadets are permitted and encouraged to study with their peers to prepare for quizzes, tests and exams. However, when a cadet takes either written or oral quizzes, tests, and examinations, answers must be his/her own work without help from any other source including notes or consultation with others.

In the case of book reviews, research and other papers, as described in “2” and “3” above, research and composing of such works must be done by the cadet alone. Cadets are permitted to use spell and grammar-checking facilities.

IS cadets are encouraged to make use of all VMI tutoring services to receive critical comments (defined above). Cadets who do so and mark "Help Received" will not receive a lower grade on an assignment. Cadets are also permitted to seek critical comments on their written work from their peers. However, proof-reading and editing (**defined above**) of a cadet's written work is not permitted.

Any exceptions to these rules, including the use of tutors, collaboration among cadets, and the use of computer style, spell and grammar checkers; must be explained in writing by the course instructor. Instructors are at liberty to stipulate exceptions only with the written approval of their department head.

**If you have any questions about the application of these rules, consult your instructor. Do not leave anything to chance.**

**Colonel Dennis M. Foster  
Professor and Head**