2014 IAEM Global Student Council
Italy Essay Contest

In October 2012, seven Italian officials were convicted of manslaughter for “providing false reassurance” prior to the 2009 L’Aquila earthquake. The conviction, currently under appeal included sentences of six years in prison and fines of €7.8M. Reports of the convictions shocked the scientific and emergency management community and raises questions to whether this can happen elsewhere and what can be done to prevent or mitigate such convictions in the future.

In order to raise awareness of this event, the Global Student Council is launching an essay contest to see if this could potentially happen elsewhere. Refer to the Information and Requirements of the contest.

Both an undergraduate and graduate winner will be selected by a panel of academics, practitioners and a member of the IAEM Global Student Council. Each winner will be provided with a complimentary registration and cover hotel costs for the 2014 IAEM Annual Conference in San Antonio, Texas.

---

2014 IAEM Global Student Council Italy Essay Contest: Information and Requirements

In October 2012, seven Italian officials were convicted of manslaughter for “providing false reassurance” prior to the 2009 L’Aquila earthquake. The conviction, currently under appeal included sentences of six years in prison and fines of €7.8M. Reports of the convictions shocked the scientific and emergency management community and raises questions to whether this can happen elsewhere and what can be done to prevent or mitigate such convictions in the future.

To raise awareness of this event, the Global Student Council is launching an essay contest to assess what is the potential for a similar trial to occur in other countries.

ESSAY QUESTION
Write a comparative policy essay considering the implications of the convictions against current law and policy in your home council (or country(s) of your choosing). What are the lessons learned and what can be done to mitigate liability to the emergency manager? Could this type of conviction happen in other parts of the world?

SELECTION OF WINNERS AND PRIZE
Submissions will be read by a five member panel of both academic and practitioner experts as well as a member of the IAEM Global Student Council.

One undergraduate and one graduate paper will be selected as a winner. The prize for each will consist of complimentary registration and covering hotel costs for the 2014 IAEM Annual Conference in San Antonio, Texas. Additionally, both winning submissions will be published in the IAEM Bulletin.

ESSAY RULES AND REQUIREMENTS
1. Submissions are due February 28, 2014 DATE EXTENDED APRIL 30, 2014 at 16:59hrs UTC. Submissions are to be sent to iaemgsc@gmail.com. A notification that your submission has been accepted will be sent within 24hours of submission being received at this address.
2. Upon submission students must indicate whether they are enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program.
3. Complete APA formatting including use of proper referencing. Plagiarism will not be tolerated and is against the IAEM ethics code. Papers are subject to verification with turnitin.com or other plagiarism software.
4. Submissions should be between 1200-2000 words (in APA format).

---

5. Papers will be reviewed and “graded” on a scale of 0-10 based on the following criteria
   a. A clear thesis is presented and the paper takes a stance providing a logical and scholarly discourse on the subject.
   b. Provides an integration of current literature that supports a clear understanding of the issue/thesis.
   c. Exhibits a clear understanding of the subject and uses well reasoned arguments.
   d. Provides a clear and defensible conclusion and provides insight into further discussion/research
   e. Excellent writing style and flow, exhibits excellent organization and editing, uses APA appropriately in formatting, content, and referencing.

6. Final submissions are to be in English.

### ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>“Surface” Scholarly Discourse: Fails to meet requirements (Grade 0-3)</th>
<th>Meets Partial Requirements (Grade 4-6)</th>
<th>Scholarly Discourse: Meets Full Requirements (Grade 7-9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Thesis / Problem Statement | - Thesis statement is not stated explicitly early in the paper.  
   - A stance is not taken nor defended in this paper. | - The key thesis and inquiry question(s) can be identified early in the paper.  
   - An introduction provides a rationale for the direction and thesis being argued.  
   - A stance is taken and the writing demonstrates a reasonable argument for that stance. | - The key thesis and inquiry question(s) are clearly and explicitly stated in the introduction to the paper.  
   - A clear stance is taken and the writing demonstrates a reasonable, logical and scholarly argument for that stance. |
| Literature Review & Summary | - Limited or superficial integration and understanding of information from research literature. Does not draw upon sufficient or appropriate literature.  
   - This paper is about an opinion the writer has formed without building a rationale and a supported argument by using the scholarly literature. Is not a grad level paper. | Adequate integration and understanding of information from research literature. Draws upon up to 5 or more articles / chapters to inform their understanding of the assignment topic.  
   - Draws heavily on personal experience to interpret literature from the domain that demonstrates how others scholars’ have defined and conducted research related to the assignment topic.  
   - Provides weak to adequate support from the literature to support the author’s own perspectives. | - Exceptional integration and understanding of information from research literature. Draws upon assigned readings and 5 or more other articles / chapters to support and extend their understanding of the assignment topic.  
   - Builds from and goes beyond personal experience by summarizing and interpreting literature from the domain that demonstrates how others scholars’ have defined and conducted research in the domain.  
   - Draws directly from the literature to support the author’s own perspectives on the assignment topic. There is a scholarly argument to support the position. |

<p>| Exceeds all expectations | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis and reasoned argument</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Organization &amp; Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A <strong>superficial</strong> understanding of the topic. It is difficult to reconcile the conclusion or to understand how the author arrived at this position on the topic. The author offers experience without supporting the argument from the literature. Inadequate evidence of an ability to relate learning to future projects or problems.</td>
<td>This paper demonstrates a <strong>developing</strong> understanding of the topic. While the argument is reasonable, the logic is “fuzzy” at times and not very well supported by the literature. Adequate evidence of an ability to relate learning to future projects or problems.</td>
<td>This paper demonstrates an <strong>in-depth</strong> understanding of the topic. The argument is tight and the logic is clear. The author’s brief personal anecdotes support the argument well. Clear evidence of an ability to relate learning to future projects or problems. A reasoned and logical argument is presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thesis statement and arguments are not restated in the conclusion of the paper. Limited or superficial ability to form and justify conclusions; recommendations for research and practice not supported with appropriate evidence.</td>
<td>The thesis statement and arguments appear in a reasonable conclusion to the paper. Adequate recommendations for research and practice are provided. Evidence of an ability to form and justify conclusions that are supported with appropriate evidence.</td>
<td>The thesis statement and arguments are clearly restated in the conclusion of the paper. Clear and defensible recommendations for research and practice are provided. Evidence of an exceptional ability to form and justify conclusions with appropriate and compelling evidence. Author asks good questions at the end of the paper that demonstrate an ability to think beyond the present argument / position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor organization and editing. No headers, no table of contents. Weak writing style &amp; flow (i.e., sentence structure, syntax, and spelling) Lots of blah, blah, blah.</td>
<td>Adequate organization and editing. A table of contents and headers structure the paper. Correct APA style is used for most citations and the reference list. Adequate writing style &amp; flow (i.e., sentence structure, syntax, and spelling). Some filler.</td>
<td>Excellent organization and editing. A table of contents and headers serve to structure and organize key topics and ideas. APA style is used for all citations and a reference list. Excellent writing style &amp; flow (i.e., sentence structure, syntax, and spelling). Few wasted words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>