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Starting in the Fall of 2020, the Commentary section of The Chicago Policy Review will provide an established lane for students to move from *describing* a problem towards *prescribing* a solution.

1. Guidelines That Define Us
   a. We believe it’s important to present a wide variety of opinions through the commentary section. However, we reserve the right to refrain from publishing any piece that does not meet our editorial standards.
   b. We request that any writer with a connection to the issue they write about disclose those connections before publication. Failing to do this will result in a retraction of the article and no further articles published in CPR by the writer.

2. What are the basic elements of a good commentary piece?
   a. Typically ~800 words (Maximum 1500 words).
   b. Clearly defined thesis and point of view.
   c. Good research is necessary: this isn’t an opportunity for people to publish baseless rants, and the same standards for high-quality information that we apply to articles in other sections of CPR are in effect in the commentary section.

3. Submission Protocols
   a. Any writer is required to submit their commentary piece online, either via email or through the submission page at chicagopolicyreview.org.
      i. Exception: Board members and Senior Contributors can use expedited op-ed submission protocols (emailing Executive Editor/Senior Editor in charge of Commentary)
b. Senior editor reviews the article first, approves based on guidelines. Sends to executive editor for approval, who then sends to EIC for approval.

4. Editorial Process

a. There is no rubric to judge approval or denial of commentary articles. However, the Executive Board should make their decisions mindful of the following:

   i. Would publishing the submission reflect CPR’s values (Equity, Accessibility, Integrity, Open Inquiry, and Impact - per the bylaws as of October 1, 2020)?

   ii. Is the submission written in good faith? Conversely, does it engage in strawmanning, ad hominem attacks, or deploying widely debunked reporting in service of its argument?

   iii. Is the submission likely to increase readers’ understanding of the central policy issue at hand?

   iv. Is the submission of interest to a general audience? Or is it so esoteric that only a handful of highly educated readers can understand it?

   v. Does the submission engage in stereotyping based on identity or political opinion?

   vi. Does the submission offer an original perspective or a new interpretation of the policy issue? Or does it feel like a retread of common commentary article tropes?

   vii. Does the submission advocate extralegal physical violence of any kind?