

Chicago Policy Review: Commentary Section

Developed by James Miotto and Jake Interrante, 09/30/20

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 reread of common commentary article tropes?
 - vii. Does the submission advocate extralegal physical violence of any kind?