

DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL STUDIES INFORMATION BOOKLET 2019 2020



### **Table of Contents**

VISITING FACULTY  LEGAL STUDIES ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2019/2020	
ACADEMIC YEAR	_
ACCREDITATION	_
THE MASTER'S PROGRAMS	.6
ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	
CONDITIONS OF AWARDING THE DEGREES	
POSTGRADUATE SPECIALISATION PROGRAMS (SZAKIRÁNYÚ TOVÁBBKÉPZÉSI SZAK)	
ATTENDANCE POLICY	
CREDITS	_
COURSE REGISTRATION	_
CROSS-LISTED COURSES1	
AUDITING CLASSES1	
UNIVERSITY-WIDE COURSES (UWC):1	
COURSES OFFERED BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS:1	
SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK AND FINAL EXAMS1	
MID-TERM AND END-TERM EXAMS1	
GRADING	
FEEDBACK1	
RETAKES1	
COURSE MATERIALS1	
COURSE AND THESIS SUPERVISION EVALUATION1	
FINAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE LL.M. AND M.A. DEGREES1	
Capstone Project1	
Capstone Thesis Deliverables1	
SHORT TERM RESEARCH GRANT AND INDEPENDENT RESEARCH1	
HUMAN RIGHTS INITIATIVE (HRSI)1	
CAREER SERVICES1	
ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	
Code of Ethics of the Central European University [Excerpts]1	
Central European University's Policy on Plagiarism2	
OTHER ACADEMIC REGULATIONS IN FORCE AT CEU2	
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR LLM and MA PROGRAMS:	
Master of Laws in International Business Law2	
Master of Laws in Comparative Constitutional Law2	
Master of Arts in Human Rights2	
Master of Laws in Human Rights2	
HOW TO READ THE SCHEDULE3	
COURSE OFFERINGS for AY 2019/20203	
Masters of Laws in International Business Law (IBL)	
Master of Laws in Comparative Constitutional Law (CCL)	
Master of Arts in Human Rights (HR MA)	
Master of Laws in Human Rights (HR LLM)	
APPENDIX I: CEU Department of Legal Studies Grading Scale4	14
APPENDIX II: Suggested Cover Sheet for Capstone Thesis	
APPENDIX II: Suggested Cover Sheet for Capstone Thesis	15
APPENDIX II: Suggested Cover Sheet for Capstone Thesis	<b>15</b> 15
APPENDIX II: Suggested Cover Sheet for Capstone Thesis	15 15 18

**Welcome** to the Department of Legal Studies of Central European University.

This Information Booklet provides information on the faculty and staff of the Department of Legal Studies, our degree and course requirements, the courses offered during the academic year, an overview of the examination and grading policy, and information about University facilities.

The website of the Department of Legal Studies is available at <a href="http://legal.ceu.edu/">http://legal.ceu.edu/</a>. Important information on departmental developments and individual courses is posted on the website throughout the year. Please check it regularly in order to be up-to-date as regards the latest events and requirements.

The E-learning site of the Department is available at <a href="http://ceulearning.ceu.edu">http://ceulearning.ceu.edu</a>.

Please do not hesitate to contact the administrative staff for further information.

We hope that the academic program of the Department of Legal Studies will meet your expectations and we wish you success in your studies.

### The Faculty & Staff of the Department of Legal Studies



### **DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL STUDIES**

1051 Budapest, Nádor u. 11., 5<sup>th</sup> floor Email: <u>legalst@ceu.edu</u> Web: <u>legal.ceu.edu</u> www.facebook.com/groups/ceu.legal

### **Central European University**

1051 Budapest, Nádor u. 9. 1100 Vienna, Quellenstrasse 51

The details in this Information Booklet are accurate at the time of printing.

### **FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION**

### **HEAD OF DEPARTMENT**

Renáta Uitz (Hungary)

Professor, Chair of the Comparative Constitutional Law Program

### **PERMANENT FACULTY**

Károly Bárd (Hungary)

Professor, Chair of the Human Rights Program

Markus Böckenförde (Germany)

**Associate Professor** 

Marie-Pierre Granger (France)

Associate Professor, School of Public Policy and Departments of International Relations and Legal Studies

(on leave in the Winter and Spring terms)

Csilla Kollonay-Lehoczky (Hungary)

**Professor Emerita** 

Jessica Lawrence (United States of America)

**Associate Professor** 

Mathias Möschel (Austria/Germany)

Associate Professor, Director of the Doctoral Program

Sejal Parmar (United Kingdom)

**Assistant Professor** 

Markus Petsche (Austria)

**Associate Professor** 

Eszter Polgári (Hungary)

**Assistant Professor** 

Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Ecuador)

**Assistant Professor** 

**András Sajó** (Hungary)

**Distinguished Visiting Professor** 

Judit Sándor (Hungary)

Professor, Departments of Political Science, Legal Studies and Gender Studies

Tibor Tajti (Serbia)

Professor, Chair of the International Business Law Program

**Tibor Várady** (Serbia) Professor Emeritus

### **ADMINISTRATION**

**Nóri Kovács** (Hungary) schedules, exams, grades

Program Coordinator Nádor St. 11, 5<sup>th</sup> floor 508; kovacsnora@ceu.edu

**Lilla Sugó** (Hungary) e-learning site, course registration, thesis, capstone, course evaluations

MA/LLM Coordinator Nádor St. 11, 5<sup>th</sup> floor 504; sugol@ceu.edu

**Tünde Szabó** (Hungary) general issues related to the operation of the Department, S.J.D. administration

Department Coordinator Nádor St. 11, 5<sup>th</sup> floor 508; szabot@ceu.edu

Andrea Völgyes (Hungary) short term research grants, organization of student field and research trips

Department Assistant Nádor St. 11, 5<sup>th</sup> floor 504; volgyesa@ceu.edu

### **VISITING FACULTY**

### **Babic, Davor**

(University of Zagreb, Croatia); Ph.D., University of Zagreb, Croatia

### Bárd, Petra

(Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Law; Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary); S.J.D., CEU, Hungary

### Behrens, Peter

(Professor Emeritus, University of Hamburg, Germany); Ph.D. (Habilitation), University of Hamburg, Germany

### Durham, W. Cole Jr.

(Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School, US); Harvard Law School, US

### Fleming, Clifton

(Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School, US); J. D. George Washington University, US

### Hamilton, Michael

(University of East Anglia, UK); Ph.D., University of Ulster, UK

### Hessebon, Gedion T.

(Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia); S.J.D., CEU, Hungary

### Hunter, Howard

(Professor Emeritus, Singapore Management University, Republic of Singapore; Emory University, School of Law, US); J.D., Yale University, US

### Husovec, Martin

(Tilburg Law School: Tilburg Institute for Law, Technology, and Society (TILT) and Tilburg Law and Economics Center)

### Mahlmann, Matthias

(University of Zurich, Switzerland); Dr. iur. (Habiliation), Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

### Mancini, Susanna

(University of Bologna School of Law, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Bologna, Italy); Ph.D., European University Institute, Italy

### McBride, Jeremy

(Barrister, Monckton Chambers, UK); LL.B., University of Birmingham; University of Cambridge, UK

### Minero Alejandre, Gemma

(Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain); PhD in Law and Politics, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain

### Nagy, Csongor István

(University of Szeged, Private International Law Department, Hungary); Ph.D., Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary; S.J.D., CEU, Hungary

### Pavic, Vladimir

(Belgrade University, Faculty of Law, Serbia); S.J.D., CEU, Hungary

### Petsche, Alexander

(Baker McKenzie - Diwok Hermann Petsche Rechtsanwälte LLP & Co KG); Dr., University of Economics and Business Administration, Austria; Dr. iur., University of Vienna, Austria

### Rosenfeld, Michel

(Yeshiva University, Benjamin Cardozo School of Law, US); Ph.D. in Philosophy, Columbia University, US

### Scharffs, Brett

(Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School, US); J.D., Yale University, US

### Smilov, Daniel

(Sofia University and Centre for Liberal Strategies, Bulgaria); Ph.D., Oxford University, UK; S.J.D., CEU, Hungary Whitehead. Charles K.

(Cornell University Law School, US); J.D., Columbia Law School, US

### **LEGAL STUDIES ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2019/2020**

2019

September 2-13 Pre-session for master's and first-year doctoral students, Budapest

September 9-13 Zero Week

September 9 Registration for Fall term begins

September 16 Fall term begins (until Friday, December 6)

September 29 Registration for Fall Term ends

October 23 Hungarian National Holiday, CEU is officially closed

October 28-31 Mid-term exam period

November 1 All Saints' Day, CEU is officially closed

December 2 Registration for Winter Term begins (until Sunday, January 12, 2020)

December 6 Fall term ends

December 9-13 End-term exam period

December 16-23 Offices with skeleton team, Library and Labs on weekend schedule

December 24 Christmas Eve, CEU is officially closed December 25-26 Christmas Day, CEU is officially closed

December 27-30 Offices with skeleton team, Library and Labs on weekend schedule

December 31 New Year's Eve, CEU is officially closed

2020

January 1 New Year's Day, CEU is officially closed

January 7 Winter Term begins (until Friday, March 27, 2020)

January 12 Registration for Winter Term ends

March 2-6 Exam period
March 9-27 Research period

March 15 Hungarian National Holiday, CEU is officially closed

March 16 Registration for Spring Term begins (until Sunday, April 5, 2020)

March 27 Winter Term ends

March 30 Spring Term begins (until Friday, June 12, 2020)

April 5 Registration for Spring Term ends

April 12-13 Easter Sunday and Easter Monday, CEU is officially closed

May 1 Labor day, CEU is officially closed

May 4-8 Mid-term exam period

May 21 Ascension Day, CEU Vienna is officially closed

May 31 – June 1 Pentecost Sunday and Pentecost Monday, CEU is officially closed

June 11 Corpus Christi Day, CEU Vienna is officially closed

June 8-12 End-term exam period
June 12 Spring Term ends
June 19 Commencement

### **ACADEMIC YEAR**

At the Department of Legal Studies, the academic year starts at the beginning of September and is 10 months long.

The academic year is divided into three terms. The Fall Term starts at the beginning of September and ends in the mid-December. The Winter Term starts in January and ends in mid-March. The Spring Term starts at the beginning of April and ends at the second half of June. Between the Winter and the Spring Terms a short period is allocated for research.

The planned program structure for the Master of Laws and Master of Arts in 2019/2020 is as follows:

Pre-session & Zero week in Budapest Fall term in Budapest Winter term in Budapest Spring term in Vienna

For further information on the calendar of the Academic Year, please refer to the Legal Studies Academic Calendar in this Booklet and Academic Calendar of CEU at https://www.ceu.edu/calendar.

### **ACCREDITATION**

The Department of Legal Studies was established in August 1991 in Budapest.

In the 2019/2020 Academic Year the Department offers the following Master's programs and degrees:

- Master of Laws in Comparative Constitutional Law (accredited in 1994) hereinafter referred to as 'CCL LL.M.' or the 'Comparative Constitutional Law Program';
- Master of Laws in International Business Law (accredited in 1994) hereinafter referred to as 'IBL LL.M.' or the 'International Business Law Program';
- Master of Arts in Human Rights (accredited in 1998) hereinafter referred to as 'HR M.A.' or the 'Human Rights Program';
- Master of Laws in Human Rights (accredited in 2001) hereinafter referred to as 'HR LL.M.' or the 'Human Rights Program'.

The Master's (LL.M. and M.A.) degrees offered by the Department of Legal Studies are conferred under the authority of the New York State Education Department. The Master's programs offered by the Department of Legal Studies are registered in Hungary as 1-year postgraduate specialist training courses.

### THE MASTER'S PROGRAMS

The curriculum of the Department of Legal Studies is divided into three programs: the **Comparative Constitutional Law Program**, the **International Business Law Program** and the **Human Rights Program**.

The **Comparative Constitutional Law Program** and the **International Business Law Program** examine the legal traditions of both civil law (continental) and common law systems. The **Human Rights Program** is an interdisciplinary program on the protection of human rights with an emphasis on the legal aspects of its theory and practice.

Students admitted to the International Business Law Program are eligible to earn an LL.M. in International Business Law. The Comparative Constitutional Law Program offers an LL.M. in Comparative Constitutional Law. Students admitted to the Human Rights Program are eligible to earn an M.A. or an LL.M. in Human Rights.

Studies in the **Comparative Constitutional Law Program** include courses on the main problems of constitutionalism, transition to and from democracy, constitution-making, fundamental rights and equal protection, and on issues that are relevant to the operation of constitutions in the international legal realm. For the degree of **Master of Laws in Comparative Constitutional Law** students have to complete a minimum of 30 US credits / 60 ECTS through coursework and capstone project.

The International Business Law Program focuses on the fundamental institutions of market economy with special reference to international business transactions. The program offers ample opportunities for in-depth study of the theoretical and practical aspects of numerous disciplines from contemporary methods of dispute resolution to advanced contracts and finance. For the degree of Master of Laws in International Business Law students have to complete a minimum of 30 US credits / 60 ECTS through coursework and capstone project.

The **Human Rights Program** provides theoretical and practical training for future scholars and professionals in human rights, with special emphasis on the legal aspects of human rights protection. The Human Rights Program benefits from close cooperation with the university community, civil society actors and other relevant stakeholders. The **Master of Laws in Human Rights** degree is designed for students holding a law degree who intend to focus on the constitutional, regional and international legal aspects of human rights protection and enforcement. The **Master of Arts in Human Rights** degree addresses the interests of those non-lawyers who are interested in the theoretical and policy implications of human rights protection and advocacy. For the degree of **Master of Laws in Human Rights** and **Master of Arts in Human Rights** students have to complete a minimum of 30 US credits / 60 ECTS through coursework and capstone project.

Whereas the majority of the courses are tailored to the requirements of their respective programs, some of the courses offered are common to several programs across the University. In each program the number of mandatory courses is limited and a considerable variety of mandatory elective and elective courses is offered allowing specialization in several directions.

For further details of the overall aims of the Master's Programs and their expected learning outcomes please see the program specific descriptions in this Booklet (pages 22, 24, 26, 28).

### **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

Students at the Department of Legal Studies must fulfill the General CEU Admissions and Language Requirements. In addition, they must meet the program-specific conditions. For further details please consult: <a href="http://www.ceu.edu/admissions">http://www.ceu.edu/admissions</a>.

### **CONDITIONS OF AWARDING THE DEGREES**

The minimum final grade point average (GPA) for the LL.M. and M.A. degrees should not be less than 2.66 which corresponds to a letter grade between C+ and B-. Please note that the GPA is based on course grades and the grade for the Capstone project. (For further reference on the general degree requirements please see Student Rights, Rules and Academic Regulations at: <a href="http://documents.ceu.edu/documents/p-1105-2v1503">http://documents.ceu.edu/documents/p-1105-2v1503</a>).

For the program-specific credit requirements applicable at the Department of Legal Studies please see the relevant sections (pages 23, 25, 27, 29) of this Booklet.

### POSTGRADUATE SPECIALISATION PROGRAMS (SZAKIRÁNYÚ TOVÁBBKÉPZÉSI SZAK)

In 2019 the Department of Legal Studies registered the following postgraduate specialization programs (*szakirányú továbbképzési szak*) in Hungary:

• Comparative Constitutional Studies Postgraduate Specialization Program (Összehasonlító alkotmánytan szakirányú továbbképzési szak)

Qualification: Comparative Constitutional Studies Specialist (összehasonlító alkotmánytani szakember)

 Corporate Social Responsibility Postgraduate Specialization Program (Társadalmi felelősségvállalás jogi alapjai szakirányú továbbképzési szak)

Qualification: Corporate Social Responsibility Specialist (társadalmi felelősségvállalás jogi tanácsadója)

 Foundations of Human Rights Protection in Constitutional and International Law Postgraduate Specialization Program (Az emberi jogvédelem alkotmányos és nemzetközi jogi alapjai szakirányú továbbképzési szak)

Qualification: International Human Rights Defender (nemzetközi emberi jogvédő)

The postgraduate specialization programs are postgraduate non-degree programs registered in Hungary. Enrolled students are expected to earn 30 US credits (60 ECTS). The length of study is 10 months. On completion, students will receive a Hungarian state certificate conferring on them the above mentioned titles (*qualification*).

Enrolled students must complete a combination of taught credits, thesis / capstone credits and final examination credits. The details of the curriculum are set forth in Appendix IV of this Booklet.

Enrolled students are required to take a final oral examination at the end of their studies. The final examination consists of two parts: an oral defense of the thesis and questions on the general field of study.

The benefits of enrolment include a Hungarian student ID card, easy credit transfer and credit recognition in the European Higher Education Area, possibility to participate in the European Union-sponsored Erasmus+ student exchange programs, travel discounts (cheaper monthly pass, discount on national bus and railroad transport fares), and discounts for movies, theaters, museums, etc.

### ATTENDANCE POLICY

Presence at CEU is required throughout the academic year regardless of the allocation of classes and exams in the schedule.

In justified cases permission for leave shall be requested in advance, in writing (via email) from the Program Chair. Leave requests for more than two working days are subject to approval by the Head of Department. A precondition for any leave request is that the student must obtain a make-up assignment from each professor for missed classes.

Students are not allowed to work during the academic year, except in special circumstances and solely upon the prior written approval of the Head of Department. For further information you may consult the Policy on Student Employment https://www.ceu.edu/studentlife/onlineorientation/student-policies.

Regular class attendance is a pre-condition for taking exams.

Students who miss more than one 100-minute class session per credit (*i.e.* one class meeting) without justification may be excluded from the course. Persistent violation of this rule may lead to exclusion from CEU. Explanation for all absences is to be submitted to the Program Coordinator at the earliest possible time, via telephone, email, or in person.

In case grave medical or personal circumstances force a student to miss more than one 100-minute class session per credit, upon a justified request the Program Chair – in consultation with the student and the affected Professors -- may approve an individual study plan.

### **CREDITS**

At CEU, 1 (one) course credit is obtained by attending a 12 x 50-minute (600-minute) course and complying with the assessment requirements of that course. The conversion ratio between US and ECTS credits is 1:2. For further details please see the Transfer of Credit Policy at: http://documents.ceu.edu/documents/p-1105-2v1405.

In order to successfully complete an LL.M. or an M.A. degree, students shall pass all mandatory courses and mandatory-elective courses as specified later in this Booklet. Credits earned in mandatory and mandatory-elective courses are included in the overall credit-load required for a degree.

The minimum and maximum number of credits students may earn in each term are listed below. The Program Chair may grant permission to take additional credits only in exceptional cases.

Fall term	Min. 10 US/20 ECTS - Max 12 US/24 ECTS credits
Winter term	Min. 8 US/16 ECTS - Max. 10 US/20 ECTS credits
Spring term	Min. 12 US/24 ECTS - Max. 14 US/ 28 ECTS credits

Students may take additional courses for audit with the permission of the Program Chair. In order to have the audit inserted in the transcript the student must satisfy standard class attendance requirements (see Auditing classes at page 10).

Mandatory courses and credits cannot be replaced by other courses.

Mandatory-elective credits earned in excess of the minimum requirement in a given cluster (*i.e.* groups of mandatory-elective courses) are automatically considered as elective credits. Mandatory-elective credits are not transferrable in between clusters.

In general, students studying for a degree at CEU may apply for a transfer of up to 8 US credits (16 ECTS credits) towards a CEU degree. For further information see the Transfer of Credit Policy - Annex 1. to the Student Rights, Rules, and Academic Regulations policy at <a href="https://www.ceu.edu/studentlife/onlineorientation/student-policies">https://www.ceu.edu/studentlife/onlineorientation/student-policies</a>.

As source languages are not required for mandatory or elective courses offered by the Department of Legal Studies, nor are required for the final thesis, credits from language courses cannot be substituted for course credits offered by the Department.

### **COURSE REGISTRATION**

Students are required to complete their course registration through the CEU e:Vision Portal during the registration period of each term, as indicated in the Academic Calendar, as well as in the Student Records Manual.

Students have an opportunity to review all syllabi for courses offered by the Department during the registration period at the following CEU E-learning site: <a href="https://ceulearning.ceu.edu/course/index.php?categoryid=1223">https://ceulearning.ceu.edu/course/index.php?categoryid=1223</a>.

Only those who registered in the registration period or at least 3 days before the first class meeting can participate in a course. Enrolling for a course through its e-learning site (Moodle) does not substitute registration via CEU e:Vision Portal.

A course may be dropped with an e-mail request to the MA/LLM Coordinator till the day of the second class-meeting of the respective course without any charge. In case of late registration and/or dropping a course a fee of 5,000 HUF applies.

The Department strongly discourages late registration for and/or late dropping of courses. However, in cases when this is necessary, please see the MA/LLM Coordinator. In justified cases the Program Chair may grant an exemption from the late registration fee.

The latest day for dropping a course or altering registration in any way is the Monday of the last teaching week before the respective mid-term and final term exam period. Students who neither take the final exam, nor drop the course or change it to audit will receive an Administrative Fail (AF).

Certain courses have pre-requisites, as indicated in this Booklet. Pre-requisite courses have to be completed for Grade. Where offered, successfully passing a pre-test qualifies as passing the pre-requisite course. A successfully completed pre-test does not yield credit, unless stated otherwise.

In order to meet the requirements of interactive post-graduate education, class enrollment is limited. As a general rule, classes offered by the Department of Legal Studies are limited to 20 students from the Department, plus an additional 5 students from outside the Department (including visiting and exchange students). However, Professors may prescribe further limitation on class size as indicated in the course offerings. Professors may, upon their professional consideration, allow enrollment for additional students provided that enrollment is not precluded by other relevant departmental considerations.

Students are strongly encouraged to prepare their study plan for the entire academic year during the first weeks. To do so, students are encouraged to consult with their Program Chair, faculty members as well as the MA/LLM Coordinator.

For more information on the registration scheme, please consult the Student Records Office (Registry@ceu.edu).

### **CROSS-LISTED COURSES**

CEU promotes interdisciplinarity and cross-unit collaboration. Besides the MA/LLM courses offered by the Department of Legal Studies, students can choose from several courses that are offered in collaboration with other Departments (cross-listed courses). These cross-listed courses are automatically included in the departmental schedules as well as they are listed in the course offerings of the Department. Class enrollment for cross-listed courses may be limited.

### **AUDITING CLASSES**

If a student wishes to register for a course without earning a letter grade or credit, the course may be registered for as Audit. Students auditing a course are required to attend all classes and participate fully in the course (including reading, oral and written assignments). Auditing students are only excused from taking the mid-term (if applicable) and the final examination (exam, essay or take-home paper).

A course taken for Audit appears on the student's transcript with the symbol AUD if attendance was regular, or W (withdraw) if attendance was unsatisfactory. In case of AUD, no credit is earned, nor is the Grade Point Average (GPA) affected.

Changing a course registration from Credit to Audit, or vice versa, is possible until the Monday of the last teaching week before the respective mid-term or final exam period. Registration change requests are to be reported to the MA/LLM Coordinator before the deadline.

**Auditing classes without taking the pre-requisite course is generally not allowed.** As an exception, justified cases are subject to prior permission from the Program Chair.

### **UNIVERSITY-WIDE COURSES (UWC):**

University-Wide Courses (UWC) aim to bring together faculty and students from across academic programs to explore a topic of common interest. Although the Department of Legal Studies is cross-listing those UWC it finds most suitable for its graduates, students are free to choose from the full range of the UWC offering (see Courses offered by other Departments, below). For more information on the initiative and on the course offerings please visit the website www.ceu.edu/iti.

### **COURSES OFFERED BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS:**

Students are allowed to earn up to 4 (four) US credits (8 ECTS) per academic year from courses offered by other academic units without any formal approval required by the Department of Legal Studies. This is a University-wide regulation endorsed by the CEU Senate. Every non-cross-listed course counts towards this limit. These courses are not included in the departmental schedule.

Students are responsible to make sure that courses offered by other departments/programs do not overlap with the courses required by their own program, so that regular class attendance is guaranteed. If a student misses more than one (1) class meeting of either course, the procedure stated under "Attendance Policy" applies (page 8). Note that the Department is not in a position to take into consideration the schedules of courses offered by other departments/programs when making occasional unavoidable revisions to the teaching schedule during a term.

### SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK AND FINAL EXAMS

All coursework (written assignment, essay and final paper) is to be submitted electronically (*e.g.* through the Elearning site of the course) and/or in hard copy as requested by the Professor of the respective course.

Unless indicated otherwise, all electronic submissions are due at midnight (23:59) on the day of the deadline.

Coursework submitted via email to the Program Coordinator or through the E-learning site will be automatically checked by a plagiarism-screening software (TurnItIn) without further notice.

Students shall submit all final coursework (final papers, take-home exams, or re-typed final exams) to the Program Coordinator in one electronic copy indicating **only** the student ID number, unless requested otherwise by the Instructor of the course.

Late submission of coursework, mid-term and final exam papers is not accepted, unless with the special permission of the Instructor. Late submission will result in an automatic grade reduction. For the scale please see under Grading (see page 12).

Students are responsible for archiving the printed and/or electronic version of their coursework. In the case of electronically submitted papers, responsibility for keeping an original and a proof of electronic transfer rests with the student.

### MID-TERM AND END-TERM EXAMS

The Department makes its best efforts to avoid scheduling more than one exam per day for the same Program during the exam period. Nonetheless, given the number of courses this cannot always be achieved. Weekend days may also be used for exams.

In-class exams are held in the computer laboratories where students can answer the exam questions in typed format. (See Appendix V for exam guidelines.) As an exception in Fall Term students may decide to handwrite their in-class exams in case they do not feel comfortable with typing. During the Fall Term students are requested to sign up (sign-up sheet posted by the Program Coordinator) in advance to seek such an exemption. To improve typing skills, a special typing tutor program is available to all students.

Handwritten in-class exams must be re-typed for grading right after the given exam.

If a student has two exams in one day, both exams have to be re-typed after the end of the second exam. Both the handwritten and the typed versions of the exam have to be submitted to the Program Coordinator for comparison. Only spelling corrections are permitted. Any other change or alteration amounts to academic dishonesty (for reference see also: CEU Code of Ethics and Appendix III of this Booklet).

From the Winter Term only typed exams are accepted. Students may handwrite their exams only on special permission from their Program Chair.

For closed-book exams, no auxiliary materials can be used.

For the open-book exams, the students may use the course reader, printouts of electronic course materials and their personal hard copies of written/printed notes. Note: during open-book exams students do not have access to internet (including the e-learning site), nor are they allowed to use USB flash drives, smart phones, tablets or similar electronic devices.

Late submission of final papers or take-home exams is not accepted, unless with the special permission of the course Instructor. Late submission will result in an automatic grade reduction. For the scale please see under Grading, below.

### **GRADING**

The final grade for a course may be based on in-class or take-home final examinations or a final paper, and additionally on oral and/or written assignments, class participation, or a combination thereof, as announced in the course syllabus.

The Department of Legal Studies follows a grading-on-the-curve policy. The lowest passing grade is C+ (corresponds to 50% of overall course performance). The Legal Studies grading scale can be found in Appendix I of this Booklet.

Grades for the late submission of take-home exams will be reduced as follows:

- Submission within 1 day after the deadline: the grade given by the Instructor will be automatically decreased by one level on the grade point scale (e.g. B+ becomes B)
- Submission within 2 days after the deadline: the grade given by the Instructor will be automatically decreased by two levels on the grade point scale (e.g. B+ becomes B-)
- If the examination is not submitted within 3 days after the deadline, a Fail will be entered into CEU
   e:Vision Portal as the final grade for the course.

### **FEEDBACK**

Students are entitled to receive reasonable and timely feedback on their performance in courses (not limited to written assignments) and exams.

Exams are deposited with the Program Coordinator after grading where students may review their own exams every Tuesday and Thursday afternoon from 1 to 4 PM, or by appointment requested via email.

Should there be need for further clarification, students may contact the Instructor of the course requesting an appointment for feedback on their exams. Students may contact visiting professors via email.

Graded exams cannot be copied or scanned. Students may only review their own exams.

### **RETAKES**

Students who fail to achieve the minimum passing grade during an examination or for course work are allowed one (1) retake per course. A retake failure means failing the course. No more than three (3) retakes are permitted per academic year.

The enrolment of a student who fails the retake exam of a mandatory course should be terminated, since the student will not be able to fulfil the degree requirements without the course in question.

A student who fails a mandatory-elective or an elective course may request a retake. Such request must be made to the Program Coordinator within one (1) week after the final grade was entered into e-Vision Portal. Should the student fail to request the retake by the deadline, the Fail for the course is final.

The form of retakes should be the same as, or similar to, the form of the original examination/assessment. A satisfactory retake means the demonstration of a passing performance. The maximum grade allocated in a retake assessment is Retake Pass "RP" (2.33 grade points).

For further rules on examinations and retakes please see CEU's Student Rights, Rules and Academic Regulations.

### **COURSE MATERIALS**

Course materials and course syllabi are available for each course on the CEU E-learning site (Moodle) at <a href="http://ceulearning.ceu.edu">http://ceulearning.ceu.edu</a>.

In order to respect copyright, students have access only to the E-learning sites of courses in which they are enrolled in CEU e:Vision Portal. Student access to copyrighted content terminates when the student has completed the course.

Course materials, such as required readings, course syllabus, recommended readings, videos and any materials shared during the course are available on the e-learning site of the given course.

For the mandatory courses, printed course readers are provided free of charge.

For mandatory elective and elective courses students may print their own course materials using their printing quota. Alternatively, students can arrange for printing and binding at their own cost, with the CopyCat Copyshop (alko.copy@copycat.hu), located at 1054 Budapest, Alkotmány street 18.

Students receive their printing quota in two installments, in the beginning of September and January. Additional credits for printing quota can be bought at the Cash Desk.

Pursuant to University rules, printing quotas are NOT transferable to another person, neither can be re-exchanged.

### **COURSE AND THESIS SUPERVISION EVALUATION**

During the last two weeks of each Term and in the exam periods, students are expected to complete a short online evaluation form through the CoursEval platform for each course they have registered for. Note that the exact periods when the online course evaluation is available may differ for courses.

**On-line evaluation forms are anonymous**. Student evaluations are made available to Instructor **after** the final grades for all courses of the Term have been submitted.

Personal login names and passwords for the CoursEval platform will be distributed via email by the system administrator along with the necessary instructions and deadlines.

Feedback gained through the evaluation forms is crucial in assessing and improving teaching, course and supervision quality of both resident and visiting faculty. The Program Chair or the Head of Department discusses the evaluations' outcome with the respective Instructor.

Twice in each academic year each program arranges a town hall meeting. At this forum students can give feedback on their academic program to their respective Program Chairs. During the meetings minutes are prepared and feedback will be included in the Department's annual report.

Following the submission of their capstone thesis students will be invited to take an online survey to assess their thesis supervisor.

### FINAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE LL.M. AND M.A. DEGREES

### **CAPSTONE PROJECT**

LLM and MA students in the Department of Legal Studies will fulfil their major writing requirement via the completion of a capstone project. Capstone projects are problem-driven, practice-oriented, comparative projects that draw on students' interests. Capstone projects have both a *practical* and a *written* component. Each project is supervised by a faculty member.

The *practical component* may take various forms, depending upon the subject and aims of the project. For example, it may draw on group work in a Clinical course or a Moot Court, an advocacy exercise, or an internship experience, or organizing a thematic workshop or an outreach activity.

The *written component* (Capstone Thesis) complements the practical component. The form of the capstone thesis depends on the nature of the project chosen by the student. It could include, for example, a research memorandum; a legal memorandum; an amicus brief in a pending case; etc.

Most students will produce a final Capstone Thesis of between **6000 – 8000 words in length** (including footnotes). Students who elect to pursue the Extended Research Project option will instead be required to produce a Capstone Thesis of between **8000 – 10,000 words in length** (including footnotes).

At the end of the academic year each student will be required to present their capstone project in an **oral presentation**.

For the assessment criteria of the Capstone Project (the capstone thesis as well as the oral presentation) please see Appendix III of this Booklet.

The written component counts with 70 % and the practical component (including the oral presentation) counts with 30 % towards the final grade of the Capstone Project.

### **CAPSTONE THESIS DELIVERABLES**

All submissions are to be made electronically to both the capstone supervisor and the e-learning site. The deadline for all electronic submissions is midnight (23:59) on the relevant day.

After submission all Capstone deliverables will be automatically screened by the plagiarism software (TurnItIn) before grading. Capstone deliverables not corresponding to the standards outlined in the guidelines (in Program specific handouts) will <u>not</u> be accepted.

Once submitted, the Capstone deliverables cannot be withdrawn and subsequently resubmitted, with or without corrections.

For detailed guidance on each deliverable as well as for interim deadlines please consult the Handout on Capstone Projects provided by your program at the Capstone Project Orientation.

### **Step1: Short Outline**

In a **Short Outline** (maximum 250 words) sets out the general topic and intended outcome (e.g. research memorandum, amicus brief etc.) of the Capstone Project.

### **Step 2: Capstone Project Proposal**

After a discussion on the Short Outline, students will prepare a **Capstone Project Proposal**, including an abstract of **maximum 500 words**, a proposed table of contents and a plan of action.

### **Step 3: Capstone Thesis Draft**

A rough draft of the entire capstone thesis is to be submitted at the end of March.

Students will receive comments from their supervisor. Preliminary findings will also be discussed in the Capstone Seminars.

Students will be required to revise their Capstone Thesis Draft on the basis of the comments they receive.

### **Step 4: Capstone Thesis**

The **Capstone Thesis** is a revised, edited, and finalized version of the Capstone Thesis Draft. The Capstone Thesis must follow a recognized legal citation style, such as *BlueBook* or *OSCOLA*. All references shall be in footnotes and not in-text citation / endnotes.

The final Capstone Thesis will be presented in a final oral presentation at the end of the academic year.

The oral presentation of the capstone project is coupled with the final oral examination required for the completion of the Hungarian postgraduate specialization programs.

### SHORT TERM RESEARCH GRANT AND INDEPENDENT RESEARCH

Students of the Department of Legal Studies who are studying within a degree-granting program are eligible to apply for a Short Term Research Grant in order to carry out research abroad during the research period. As determined by the University's scholarship rules, calls for applications are issued via e-mail in the second half of the Fall Term. The selection is made by the Department on a competitive basis taking into consideration the student's academic performance, the relevance of the planned research for the thesis and the proved insufficiency of materials available in the CEU library.

This opportunity is only available to students within the research period, and must not interfere with the students' academic course work.

The supported research is to be conducted in a country other than Hungary and the applicant's country of origin/permanent residence.

Preconditions for both individually funded and grant-based research are the following:

- 1. Detailed study plan, explaining the research purpose including its relation to the thesis topic, indicating institutions the student will visit, persons s/he intends to consult with, resources to be used.
- 2. Submission of a travel itinerary indicating departure and arrival dates.
- 3. Written recommendation from the thesis advisor.
- 4. Approval from the Program Chair.
- 5. Approval from the host institution(s).

Upon return to Budapest, students have to submit a short academic report on the completion of the study plan as well as a financial report. For further information, please consult the Department Assistant.

Students may also carry out research abroad at their own expense or sponsored by external institutions during the research period.

### **HUMAN RIGHTS INITIATIVE (HRSI)**

The Human Rights Initiative (HRSI) was founded in 1999 by a group of Human Rights students from the Department of Legal Studies at CEU. The organization's mission is to build a progressive community through human rights awareness-raising, and empowerment for active citizenship.

Our target groups are CEU students and alumni, local and regional NGO staff and activists, as well as students and activists of the local universities.

We pursue the following goals:

- § to provide our target groups with training and practical experience in human rights and related issues;
- § to raise awareness of human rights;
- § to promote social responsibility and active citizenship;
- § to serve as a bridge for the community to channel their human rights related concerns and ideas;
- § to provide opportunities for networking among the local and regional community of human rights and NGO professionals.

To this end, HRSI offers opportunities for skills training, capacity building, networking etc. These opportunities are realized three program areas:

- 1) **The Capacity Building Program** provides all CEU students with opportunities to develop practical skills and to gain hands-on experience while studying at CEU. This includes 6 workshops throughout the year, on various NGO/human rights advocacy skills.
- 2) The Empowerment for Active Citizenship Program focuses on empowering community members to become active respondents to human rights challenges. It includes various events and trainings delivered by the HRSI staff, as well as initiatives done in cooperation with partner NGOs. It also includes the annual NGO Fair where students can meet NGO activists and professionals, network, and look for internship opportunities.
- 3) The Progressive Community Program includes activities such as awareness raising campaigns, film screenings, public lectures and roundtable discussions; photo exhibitions, theatrical performances (The Vagina Monologues). As part of this program, students are also very much encouraged to approach HRSI to develop and implement their own human rights related projects.

If you would like to gain more information about HRSI, its projects and activities as well as on how you can get involved, please visit the HRSI website, http://hrsi.ceu.edu/ or come to the HRSI office located in Nador 11, room 416/A. You can also contact HRSI through email, at <a href="https://www.facebook.com/HRSI.ceu">hrsi@ceu.edu</a> and like our Facebook page, https://www.facebook.com/HRSI.ceu.

For more information contact Shwetha Nair, nairs@ceu.edu.

### **CAREER SERVICES**

The CEU Career Services Office (<a href="https://careers.ceu.edu/">https://careers.ceu.edu/</a>) provides advice, support and information to students and alumni from all CEU departments and schools, partnering with them as they develop and pursue personal visions for impact and success.

Career Services team members advise students and alumni on all aspects of the career development process including:

- Conducting self-assessment and career-related research to expand and deepen their knowledge of possible professional futures and paths;
- Adopting a realistic and long-term approach towards their career development;
- Expanding and managing their personal professional networks;
- Crafting unique, tailored CVs and cover letters for job and internship searches;
- Crafting academic CVs to use in academic and research career development;
- Preparing for interviews and conducting salary negotiations.

There are many ways for students to engage with the office, including:

- Career development workshops, information sessions and the annual Career Camp;
- The annual *Careers in* ... series of career education events featuring employer representatives and practitioners (including alumni) working in specific fields;
- One-on-one career advising sessions with a dedicated career advisor (<a href="https://careers.ceu.edu/who-we-are/team">https://careers.ceu.edu/who-we-are/team</a>);
- The SPARK YOUR CAREER (<a href="https://careers.ceu.edu/sparkyourcareer">https://careers.ceu.edu/sparkyourcareer</a>) career development certificate (for Master's students);
- Support for experiential learning through the Internship Support Program (ISP)
   (<a href="https://careers.ceu.edu/students/internships">https://careers.ceu.edu/students/internships</a>);
- CEU's exclusive career>next (https://careernext.ceu.edu/) careers platform;
- The *Careers Newsletter* (<a href="https://careers.ceu.edu/careers-newsletter">https://careers.ceu.edu/careers-newsletter</a>), which arrives in student in-boxes once a month during the academic year;
- Employer events (in-person and virtual) thanks to the office's strong and expanding network of regional and global employer relationships.

Learn more about our work with *master's* (<a href="https://careers.ceu.edu/students/MA">https://careers.ceu.edu/students/MA</a>) and *doctoral* (<a href="https://careers.ceu.edu/students/phd">https://careers.ceu.edu/students/phd</a>) students.

### **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

### **CODE OF ETHICS OF THE CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY [EXCERPTS]**

The full text of the Code of Ethics of the Central European University is available at <a href="http://documents.ceu.edu/documents/p-1009-1v1402-0">http://documents.ceu.edu/documents/p-1009-1v1402-0</a>.

# Annex 4 MISCONDUCT ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Academic dishonesty involves acts which may subvert or compromise the integrity of the educational process at the CEU Group. Acts of academic dishonesty include, but are not limited to, accomplishing or attempting any of the following acts:

### Acts of forgery or fabrication, including:

- (a) Altering of grades or official records, falsifying or committing forgery on any university form or document;
- (b) Submitting altered or falsified data as experimental data from laboratory projects, survey research, or other field research.

### Acts of cheating, including:

- (c) Using any materials (e.g. textbooks, cheat-sheets, SMSs) that are not authorized by the instructor for use during an examination;
- (d) Copying from another student's paper during an examination;
- (e) Collaborating during an examination with any other person by giving or receiving information without the specific permission of the instructor;
- (f) Stealing, buying or otherwise obtaining restricted information about an examination to be administered;
- (g) Collaborating on laboratory work, take-home examinations, homework or other assigned work when instructed to work independently;
- (h) Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself in taking an examination.
- (i) Submitting of identical or in part identical assignments by two or more students;
- (j) Submitting work that has been previously offered for credit in another course, except with prior written permission of the instructors of both courses.
- (k) Submission of a thesis or dissertation that has been previously submitted at another university/program, in English or in another language.

### Acts of plagiarism, including:

- (I) Representation of the work of others as one's own, by offering of the words, ideas, or arguments of another person without appropriate attribution through quotation, reference or footnote, whether intentional or not;
- (j) Submitting as one's own any theme, report, term paper, essay, other written work, or speech, written or prepared totally or in part by another person;

Plagiarism occurs both when the words of another are reproduced without acknowledgment, and when the ideas or arguments of another are paraphrased in such a way as to lead the reader to believe that they originated with the writer. It is the responsibility of all students to understand the methods of proper attribution and to apply those principles in all materials submitted.

Specific recommendations for handling plagiarism are included in the CEU's Policy on Plagiarism. In cases of a disciplinary proceeding because of plagiarism, the body to act in the first instance is the academic unit's Committee

on Academic Dishonesty as spelled out in the CEU's Policy on Plagiarism. In plagiarism cases the present Code shall only be applicable in cases which cannot be clarified under the CEU's Policy on Plagiarism.

### Other acts of academic dishonesty:

- (a) Deliberate mis-shelving, hiding, damaging or theft of library materials;
- (b) Improper use of library facilities to advantage one's academic position, nuisance to other users, and undue delay in returning materials promptly when asked to do so;
- (c) Improper use of the computer facilities, including misappropriation of another user's data, password or software, illegal copying of computer programs and games at the expense of the University, disregard for the finite capacity of the system, unreasonable interference with the activity of other users, and any attempt to subvert or obstruct the operation of any computer or network system;
- (d) Sabotaging of another student's work;
- (e) Committing any willful act of dishonesty that interferes with the operation of the academic process;
- (f) Complicity, facilitation or aiding in the commission of any of the above-mentioned acts of academic dishonesty.

### Other acts of misconduct

- (a) Knowing disclosure of false information to or about the CEU Group or to other academic institutions or spreading of false allegations in general;
- (b) Deception, including falsification of letters of recommendation and misrepresentation of a person's academic accomplishments and deceptions;
- (c) Verbal or physical threat to a member of the University Community;
- (d) Conduct which threatens or damages the personal safety or health or assets of others;
- (e) Bullying or threatening conduct against others;
- (f) Abuse of another's property, including theft, vandalism or temporary or permanent appropriation of another's property, undue interference with CEU Group functions, and unauthorized use of CEU Group facilities or entry into or occupation of University Premises;
- (g) Discrimination and harassment based on race, color, religion, national origin, disability, age, gender, sexual orientation, or any other form of discrimination prohibited by law;
- (h) Sexual harassment as defined in the Sexual Harassment Policy;
- (i) Other types of harassment or discrimination as defined in other University policies;
- (j) Breaches of public or private law when the interests of the University Community or one of its members as defined in this Code are adversely affected;
- (k) Retaliatory conduct against any individual who has filed a complaint, who has reported witnessing an offense, or who has participated in a complaint procedure;
- (I) Failure of a member of the Disciplinary Committee to inform the chairperson of the Disciplinary Committee about a complaint lodged with him or her;
- (m) Disclosure of the confidential documents to any unauthorized person;
- (n) Complicity in the commission of any of the above-mentioned acts;
- (o) Other misconduct that in the judgment of the Disciplinary Committee seriously deviates from standards of the academic community.

### **Ongoing offences**

Ongoing offences are offences which are either repeatedly committed or where the "results" (such as a title or a mark) of a violation (such as plagiarism or cheating etc.,) are used or abused by the person who perpetrated the violation.

### CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY'S POLICY ON PLAGIARISM

The full text of the Policy on Plagiarism, including the Guidelines, is available at: http://documents.ceu.edu/documents/p-1405-1.

### Article 1 – What is Plagiarism?

Plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct. It is a practice that involves taking and using another person's work and claiming it, directly or indirectly, as one's own. Plagiarism occurs both when the words of another are reproduced without acknowledgment and when the ideas or arguments of another are paraphrased in such a way as to lead the reader to believe that they originated with the writer. Further clarification and examples can be found in the Guidelines (Annex 1). CEU's Code of Ethics also recognizes as academic dishonesty the submission of work previously submitted for credit to another course without the permission of the lecturer; and the submission of theses or dissertations that have been previously submitted to a university or program in any language. Such submissions will be treated in a similar way to plagiarism and be subject to the procedures and measures outlined in this Policy. Plagiarism, as a form of academic dishonesty, is in breach of Annex 4 of the CEU's Code of Ethics. [...]

### Article 2.1 – Responsibilities of Students

It is the responsibility of students:

- to ensure that work submitted for purposes of assessment is their own;
- to ensure that the words and arguments of others are appropriately cited and referenced using an accepted referencing system; and
- to ascertain if academic units allow the submission of work that has been previously submitted in whole or in part and, where it is allowed, to gain permission from the relevant faculty member prior to submission.

### Annex 1 - Guidelines

**Table 1: Offending Strategies in Writing** 

Severity of Offense	Example			
Serious Plagiarism	<ul> <li>Submitting as one's own work a text largely or wholly written by another person or persons.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Copying or paraphrasing substantial sections<sup>1</sup> from one or more works of other authors into one's own text, without attribution, that is, omitting any reference to the work(s) either in the body of the text, in footnotes, or in the bibliography/reference list</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Submitting a thesis as part of masters or doctoral requirements which has been previously submitted to another institution in English or in another language.</li> </ul>			
Less serious plagiarism	<ul> <li>Paraphrase of a substantial section or several smaller sections of another text or texts without any reference in the body text, but the work is included in the bibliography/reference list.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Copying verbatim two or three not necessarily consecutive phrases, or one or two not necessarily consecutive sentences, from the work of others without attribution.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Copying verbatim one substantial or several smaller sections from another text without quotation marks but with reference provided within the student's text.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>Submitting without permission one's own work that has been largely or wholly submitted for credit to another course.</li> </ul>			

-

The word 'section' is understood here to mean more than one consecutive sentence. A copied section that has had a small number of extra words inserted by the student may still be considered as copied.

# Copying verbatim one substantial or several smaller sections from another text without quotation marks but with reference provided within the student's text. Summarizing an author's ideas at length but only mentioning the author or the source at the end of the paragraph. Mentioning an author with appropriate citation in an early sentence but no attribution in subsequent sentences, so that it is unclear whether the author's ideas are continuing or the writer's own comments being offered. Including a correctly referenced short fragment from another text but without quotation marks. Using an author's work with incomplete reference (e.g. page number is missing, or the work appears only in a footnote/parenthesis and is missing

### Measures to be taken in cases confirmed as plagiarism

(1) In the case of a first offense classified as less serious plagiarism, the student should normally:

from the reference list).

- a. receive an oral or written reprimand,
- b. rewrite the assignment and receive a lowered grade.
- (2) In the case of a second, subsequent minor offense, or in the case of a first offense that in the department's opinion is more serious, the student should normally:
  - a. receive a written reprimand (not reflected on the transcript)
  - b. rewrite the assignment, receive a lowered grade or receive the lowest passing grade, with or without being given a fail grade.
- (3) In the case of continuing offences, or of a serious offence, students should normally receive a
  - a. written reprimand (that will usually appear on the student's transcript)
  - b. fail grade, with or without the possibility of retake (often depends on whether the course is compulsory or elective).
- (4) In very serious cases such as plagiarizing a major part of an assignment, or persistent plagiarism despite written warnings and other sanctions described above, the department should consider initiating formal procedures towards expelling the student from the University in accordance with the applicable policies.

In the case of multiple simultaneous minor offences, the department should decide whether these repetitions stem from ignorance (in which case they may be treated as a single offence) or the intent either to deceive or to avoid work, either of which may justify more severe action.

The offenses in the last category (Poor Scholarship) may often be attributable to poor ability, unclear thinking or carelessness. If so, they should not be considered academic dishonesty as such but should be penalized in the same way as other poor quality work, namely by a decrease in the final grade commensurate with the negative impact they have on the assignment as a whole. If such offenses are considered to be a deliberate attempt to achieve a higher grade, more serious action should be considered.

### OTHER ACADEMIC REGULATIONS IN FORCE AT CEU

For more information about policies and procedures at CEU we recommend that you read carefully the CEU Student Handbook, distributed by the CEU Office of Student Services, and the Student Records Manual, distributed by the CEU Student Records Office.

A selection of university regulations and policies is also available at: <a href="http://www.ceu.edu/administration/policies">http://www.ceu.edu/administration/policies</a>.

### PROGRAM-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR LLM AND MA PROGRAMS:

### MASTER OF LAWS IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS LAW

Program Chair: Professor Tibor Tajti Contact: <u>tajtit@ceu.edu</u>; 1-327-3275 Office: Nádor 11 building / Room 510

**Program level:** Graduate (Master's)

Degree awarded: LL.M.

Program registration: The Program was established in 1991. It was approved and registered by the New York

State Education Department in 1994.

Program length: 10 months

US credits: 30 ECTS credits: 60

**Program URL:** http://legal.ceu.edu/master-laws-international-business-law-program

E-learning site: http://ceulearning.ceu.edu

### Program level learning outcomes:

 Ability to benefit from a substantial knowledge of various fields of private, commercial and regulatory law, both international and national, in particular novel as well as such fields and areas of law that are normally left uncovered by national law school curricula

- Ability to apply the gained knowledge in practice especially in international law firms, various regulatory
  agencies (competition, consumer protection, banking and financial supervisory agencies), financial
  organizations, governmental and EU-level reform or research projects as well as in legal education
- Ability to communicate, negotiate, mediate or arbitrate as well as draft various legal documents in English language based on a multi-dimensional (i.e., more than from the perspective of a single jurisdiction) knowledge of English legal terminology
- Ability to understand and properly take into account the main differences among legal systems and their theoretical and practical impact when devising international and transnational legal solutions.
- Ability to conduct research, analyze, and critically evaluate a wide range of legal and regulatory topics, phenomena and problems in different national and supra-national legal systems from a comparative and inter-disciplinary perspective
- Ability to advise on policy issues, either as individual experts, expert & researcher, or as a member of a national or international teams

The focus of the LL.M. in International Business Law program is on the legal setting of business transactions in a transnational environment, on the players, and on the regulatory framework of international business. To address increasingly interdisciplinary and cross-border legal challenges, the curriculum of the Program rests on several building blocks, such as dispute resolution (e.g., international commercial arbitration, conflict of laws), international business law (e.g., GATT & WTO, EU law or drafting and negotiating contracts in the transnational context), regulation of business (e.g., capital market and securities regulation, antitrust/competition and consumer protection law) and comparative business law (e.g., comparative national company, bankruptcy and secured transaction laws). Additionally, the program constantly strives to offer courses that deal with contemporary global, regional and local challenges. Most courses are based on interactive teaching methods and are of a comparative nature, typically juxtaposing the laws of leading common law and civil law legal systems with those of emerging markets.

The Program is highly attractive to applicants holding a law degree, who wish to continue an international career not only in legal practice (law firms, in-house counsels) but also in academia, the governmental sector and increasingly various areas of finance (e.g., financial regulatory agencies, investment companies, banks). The alumni of the IBL Program can now be found not just in offices of leading international and local law firms, as in-house

counsels of international corporations, but as well in the positions of university teachers, governmental officials, experts of regulatory bodies or even in the non-profit sector.

### Entry Requirements for the IBL LL.M. Program:

In addition to meeting the General CEU Admissions Requirements, applicants to the IBL LL.M. Program must also fulfill the Program-specific admission requirements (http://legal.ceu.edu/admissions).

### **Credit requirements**

Students studying for an LLM. degree in International Business Law shall obtain 30 credits consisting of 26 course credits and 4 credits for the capstone project.

The course credits shall be obtained according to the following rules:

### Mandatory courses (5 credits)

Anglo-American Legal Concepts/ Jessica Lawrence (Fall term, 1 credit)

Capstone Seminar / Jessica Lawrence, Markus Petsche, CAW instructors (Fall, Winter, Spring terms, 2 credits)

Comparative Legal Research Methodology / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 1 credit)

The Regulatory Environment of Business / Tibor Tajti (Fall term, 1 credit)

### **Mandatory-elective courses**

### Foundations of international business and economic law (3 credits must be obtained)

Comparative Antitrust Law / Csongor Nagy (Fall term, 1 credit)

Comparative Bankruptcy Law / Tibor Tajti (Fall term, 1 credit)

Law for Small and Mid-Scale Start Up Enterprises / Tibor Tajti (Winter term, 1 credit)

Comparative Private International Law – Choice of Law / Markus Petsche (Spring term, 2 credits)

Entrepreneurship and Innovation – Clinical Course / Faculty of Dept. of Economics and Business & Jessica Lawrence (Winter, Spring terms, 1 credit)

### Advanced international economic law: (6 credits must be obtained)

Dispute resolution (3 credits must be obtained)

International Commercial Arbitration / Markus Petsche, Davor Babic, Vladimir Pavic (Fall term, 3 credits)

International Civil Litigation / Csongor Nagy (Winter term, 1 credit)

International Investment Law and Regulation / Markus Petsche (Winter term, 3 credits)

Mediation / Markus Petsche (Spring term, 1 credit)

### Corporate finance and securities regulation (3 credits must be obtained)

US Corporations and Partnership Law / Jessica Lawrence (Fall term, 1 credit)

The Legal Aspects of Corporate Finance / (Winter term, 1 credit)

Capital Markets and Securities Regulation / Tibor Tajti (Spring term, 3 credits)

Corporate Governance: Acquisitions and Capital Structure / Charles Whitehead (Spring term, 1 credit)

### Foundations of human rights (4 credits must be obtained)

Environmental Law & Regulation/Jessica Lawrence (Fall term, 1 credit)

Business and Human Rights / Jessica Lawrence (Winter term, 2 credits)

International Economic Policy and Migration / Jessica Lawrence (Winter term, 1 credit)

Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe / Eszter Polgári / (Fall term, 2 credits)

### MASTER OF LAWS IN COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Program Chair: Professor Renáta Uitz Contact: <u>uitzren@ceu.edu</u>; 1-327-3201 Office: Nádor 11 building / Room 501

**Program level:** Graduate (Master's)

Degree awarded: LL.M.

Program registration: The Program was established in 1992. Program approved and registered by the New York

State Education Department in 1994.

Program length: 10 months

US credits: 30 ECTS credits: 60

Program URL: http://legal.ceu.edu/master-laws-comparative-constitutional-law-program

E-learning site: <a href="http://ceulearning.ceu.edu">http://ceulearning.ceu.edu</a>

### **Program level learning outcomes:**

• Ability to benefit from a substantial knowledge of constitutional law in major jurisdictions via a comparative perspective

- Ability to benefit from a substantial knowledge of the protection and enforcement of constitutional rights and human rights in major jurisdictions
- Ability to conduct research on a wide range of constitutional problems in different constitutional regimes across a changing constitutional and political landscape
- Ability to analyze constitutional problems in light of their historical context, from a comparative and interdisciplinary perspective
- Ability to analyze and critically assess constitutional problems in their regional, international and global context
- Ability to provide policy-relevant solutions to constitutional problems as an individual researcher and as a member of an international team

The LL.M. program in Comparative Constitutional Law aims to provide theoretical and practical insight into the making and operation of constitutional government, examining the legal traditions of both civil law (continental) and common law systems. Through its commitment to deeply contextualized, problem-oriented comparative constitutional analysis, the curriculum covers the making of constitutions, classic and contemporary challenges in horizontal and vertical separation of powers, the protection of fundamental (human) rights and various aspects of multi-layered constitutionalism. Threats to constitutionalism and constitutional democracy, the rule of law and open society, and the rise of illiberalism are explored with a truly global geographic coverage.

Our highly qualified and diverse faculty prepares students to engage in comparative and inter-disciplinary analysis of complex constitutional problems. Individual research skills are developed and furthered through comparative problem papers and group work. Students are encouraged to lace theoretical insights with concerns and lessons from practice. The curriculum remains conversant with current debates through an annual workshop series that brings leading scholars to the classroom. Our graduates are thus able to respond to challenging constitutional and fundamental rights problems with advanced analytical skills, offering comparative insight and policy-relevant responses.

Over the years the Comparative Constitutional Law Program has educated many high-ranking civil servants, successful NGO and IGO professionals and academics. We are proud that our academic community is chosen by many visiting and exchange students from all parts of the world. With their diverse background, rich academic and professional experience they contribute greatly to the success of our educational mission.

### **Entry Requirements for the CCL LL.M. Program:**

In addition to meeting the General CEU Admissions, applicants to the Comparative Constitutional Law Program must also fulfill the Program-specific admission requirements (<a href="http://legal.ceu.edu/admissions">http://legal.ceu.edu/admissions</a>).

### **Credit requirements**

Students studying for an LL.M. degree in Comparative Constitutional Law shall obtain **30 credits** consisting of 26 course credits and 4 credits for the capstone project.

The course credits shall be obtained according to the following rules:

### Mandatory courses (4 credits)

Capstone Seminar / Renáta Uitz (Winter, Spring terms, 2 credits)

Introduction to U.S. Constitutional Law / Renáta Uitz (Fall term, 2 credits)

Constitutions at Work: Comparative Perspectives / Renáta Uitz (Fall term, 2 credits)

Comparative Legal Research Methodology / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 1 credit)

### **Mandatory-elective courses**

### Foundations of Comparative Constitutional Studies (4 credits must be obtained)

Overview of Constitutional Systems (2 credits must be obtained)

French Constitutional Law and Its Influence Abroad / Mathias Möschel (Fall term, 2 credits)

German Constitutional Law and Its Historical and Political Context / Markus Böckenförde (Fall term, 2 credits)

Comparative Federalism: A Critical Perspective / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 2 credits)

Constitutionalism and Rights in South and South East Asia / Arun Thiruvengadam (Spring term, 1 credit)

Global Rule of Law (2 credits must be obtained)

Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe / Eszter Polgári (Fall term, 2 credits)

Constitution-Building in Africa / Markus Böckenförde, Gedion Hessebon (Fall, Winter terms, 2 credits)

Constitutional Adjudication and the Rule of Law/ Renáta Uitz (Fall term, 2 credits)

International Rule of Law Assistance: Law and Development / Markus Böckenförde (Spring term, 2 credits)

### **Protection of Fundamental Rights** (6 credits must be obtained)

Civil and Political Rights (4 credits must be obtained)

Freedom of Expression / András Sajó (Fall term, 2 credits)

Political Rights in Comparative Perspective / Daniel Smilov (Winter term, 1 credit)

Comparative Freedom of Religion / Cole Durham, Brett Scharffs (Spring term, 2 credits)

Freedom of Religion – Advanced / Cole Durham (Spring term, 1 credit)

Freedom of Assembly / Michael Hamilton (Spring term, 1 credit)

Justice and Equality (2 credits must be obtained)

Comparative Equality / Michel Rosenfeld (Spring term, 1 credit)

European Anti-Discrimination Law / Mathias Möschel (Spring term, 2 credits)

Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe / Mathias Möschel, Angéla Kóczé (Spring term, 2 credits)

Socio-Economic Rights / András Sajó (Spring term, 2 credits)

### Theoretical Dimensions of Comparative Constitutional Studies (4 credits must be obtained)

Illiberal Democracy / András Sajó (Winter term, 2 credits)

Workshop on Illiberal Democracy: The Rule of Law as Fake / András Sajó (Winter term, 1 credit)

Europe: Transnational Constitutional Identity / Susanna Mancini (Spring term, 1 credit)

Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept / Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 1 credit)

### **MASTER OF ARTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS**

Program Chair: Professor Károly Bárd Contact: <a href="mailto:bardk@ceu.edu">bardk@ceu.edu</a>; 1-327-3294 Office: Nádor 11 building / Room 502

**Program level:** Graduate (Master's)

Degree awarded: M.A.

Program registration: The Program was approved and registered by the New York State Education Department in

1998.

Program length: 10 months

US credits: 30 ECTS credits: 60

Program URL: http://legal.ceu.edu/master-arts-human-rights

E-learning site: http://ceulearning.ceu.edu

### Program level learning outcomes:

• Ability to benefit from a substantial understanding of the institutional and procedural frameworks of human rights enforcement in major jurisdictions

- Ability to benefit from a substantial knowledge of the protection of particular human rights on national and supranational levels
- Appreciate critically the nature, efficacy and theoretical foundations of the international human rights regime
- Ability to generate new ideas and advocacy strategies that provide genuine solutions to complex human rights problems using comparative arguments and interdisciplinary insight
- Ability to analyze human rights issues in a policy-relevant manner
- Ability to envision a human rights-based approach to addressing diverse legal, regulatory and policy problems

The MA in Human Rights Program offers graduate education in international and regional human rights law. The program recruits applicants from all disciplines, who wish to understand the theoretical and policy implications of defending human rights and acquire the skills for successful human rights protection and advocacy. The curriculum primarily caters to the needs of future human rights practitioners wishing to pursue a carrier in domestic/international human rights institutions or civil society organizations.

The interdisciplinary MA in Human Rights degree combines social science, policy-based approach with legal science, thus non-lawyers are given an opportunity to benefit from a curriculum with a legal focus. Teaching is designed to incorporate both theoretical perspectives and concrete empirical analyses of the most important questions in human rights. The program offers practical instruction in the specific legal mechanisms and institutional processes which may be used by national human rights organizations to effectively approach human rights issues that transitional and also established democracies might confront. Areas of research and teaching cover – among others – international mechanisms for the protection of human rights in all international and regional human rights regimes, freedom of expression and freedom of religion, human rights and criminal justice, political rights, non-discrimination, minority protection, human rights and development politics, human rights in Africa, and the constitutional protection of rights on a basic level. Rigorous and closely monitored coursework provides the tools of analysis, critical reading and writing skills to enable students to make a significant and lasting contribution both to the protection of rights in their home countries and to the enforcement of human rights at large.

The program benefits from a close cooperation with leading NGOs which offer internship opportunities to selected students.

### **Entry Requirements for the HR M.A. Program:**

In addition to meeting the General CEU Admissions Requirements, applicants to the HR MA program must also fulfill the Program-specific admission requirements (<a href="http://legal.ceu.edu/admissions">http://legal.ceu.edu/admissions</a>).

### **Credit requirements**

Students studying for an M.A. degree in Human Rights shall obtain 30 credits consisting of 26 course credits and 4 credits for the capstone project.

The course credits shall be obtained according to the following rules:

### Mandatory courses (8 credits)

Introduction to the Protection of Human Rights / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga, Sejal Parmar, Eszter Polgári (Fall term, 3 credits)

Introduction to Law / Eszter Polgári (Fall term, 2 credits)

Capstone Seminar / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga, Sejal Parmar, Eszter Polgári (Winter, Spring terms, 2 credits) Comparative Legal Research Methodology / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 1 credit)

### **Mandatory-elective courses**

Civil and Political Rights (4 credits must be obtained)

Freedom of Expression / András Sajó (Fall term, 2 credits)

Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards / Eszter Polgári (Fall, Winter terms, 3 credits)

Political Rights in Comparative Perspective / Daniel Smilov (Winter term, 1 credit)

Comparative Freedom of Religion / Cole Durham, Brett Scharffs (Spring term, 2 credits)

Freedom of Assembly / Michael Hamilton (Spring term, 1 credit)

Freedom of Religion – Advanced / Cole Durham (Spring term, 1 credit)

Global Rule of Law (3 credits must be obtained)

The UN Human Rights System / Sejal Parmar (Fall term, 2 credits)

Human Rights Remedies / Jeremy McBride (Fall term, 1 credit)

International Human Rights Advocacy / Sejal Parmar (Fall term, 2 credits)

Illiberal Democracy / András Sajó (Winter term, 2 credits)

International Rule of Law Assistance: Law and Development / Markus Böckenförde (Spring term, 2 credits)

Justice and Equality (4 credits must be obtained)

Human Rights and Criminal Justice / Károly Bárd (Fall term, 2 credits)

Archives, Evidence and Human Rights / Iván Székely, Csaba Szilágyi, András Mink (Fall, Winter terms, 3 credits)

The Law and Politics of Combating Violence against Women / Mathias Möschel, Andrea Krizsán (Winter term, 3 credits)

Socio-Economic Rights / András Sajó (Spring term, 2 credits)

Theoretical Perspectives (3 credits must be obtained)

Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept / Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 1 credit)

Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe / Mathias Möschel, Angéla Kóczé (Spring term, 2 credits)

Theory of Fundamental Rights/ Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 1 credit)

Theories of Human Rights: Intercultural Perspectives/ Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Spring term, 2 credits)

The Morality of Criminal Justice / Károly Bárd (Winter term, 2 credits)

### **MASTER OF LAWS IN HUMAN RIGHTS**

Program Chair: Professor Károly Bárd Contact: <a href="mailto:bardk@ceu.edu">bardk@ceu.edu</a>; 1-327-3294 Office: Nádor 11 building / Room 502

Program level: Graduate (Master's)

Degree awarded: LL.M.

Program registration: The Program was approved and registered by the New York State Education Department in

2001

Program length: 10 months

Type of degree: CEU US credits: 30 ECTS credits: 60

Program URL: http://legal.ceu.edu/master-laws-human-rights

E-learning site: http://ceulearning.ceu.edu

### **Program level learning outcomes:**

• Ability to benefit from a substantial understanding of the institutional and procedural frameworks of human rights enforcement in major jurisdictions

- Ability to benefit from a substantial knowledge of the protection of particular human rights on national and supranational levels
- Appreciate critically the nature, efficacy and theoretical foundations of the international human rights regime
- Ability to generate new ideas and advocacy strategies that provide genuine solutions to complex human rights problems using comparative arguments and interdisciplinary insight
- Ability to analyze human rights issues in a policy-relevant manner
- Ability to envision a human rights-based approach to addressing diverse legal, regulatory and policy problems

The LL.M. in Human Rights degree is designed for students holding a law degree. The program aims at training future legal scholars and practitioners in human rights and also serves the already established professionals who wish to add a human rights perspective to their work.

The main goal of the LL.M. in Human Rights program is to provide theoretical and practical training for future scholars and professionals in human rights, with special emphasis on the legal aspects of human rights protection. While the program is interdisciplinary in nature, it is strongly focused on comparative legal analysis. Teaching is designed to incorporate both theoretical perspectives and concrete empirical analyses of the most important questions in human rights. The program offers practical instruction in the specific legal mechanisms and institutional processes which may be used by national human rights organizations to effectively approach human rights issues that transitional and also established democracies might confront. Rigorous and closely monitored coursework provides the tools of analysis, critical reading and writing necessary to enable students to make a significant and lasting contribution both to the rights protection in their home countries and to the enforcement of human rights at large. Areas of research and teaching cover – among others – mechanisms for the protection of human rights in all international and regional human rights regimes, freedom of expression and freedom of religion, human rights and criminal justice, political rights, non-discrimination, minority protection, human rights in Africa, politics and theories of European integration from a human rights perspective.

The program benefits from a close cooperation with leading NGOs which offer internship opportunities to selected students.

### **Entry Requirements for the HR LL.M. Program:**

In addition to meeting the General CEU Admissions Requirements, applicants to the HR LLM program must also fulfill the Program-specific admission requirements (<a href="http://legal.ceu.edu/admissions">http://legal.ceu.edu/admissions</a>).

### **Credit requirements**

Students studying for an LL.M. degree in Human Rights shall obtain 30 credits consisting of 26 course credits and 4 credits for the capstone project.

The course credits shall be obtained according to the following rules:

### Mandatory courses (8 credits)

Legal Terminology / Matthew DeCloedt (SJD candidate) (Fall term, 1 credit)

Introduction to the Protection of Human Rights / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga, Sejal Parmar, Eszter Polgári (Fall term, 3 credits)

Introduction to Public International Law / Markus Böckenförde (Fall term, 1 credit)

Capstone Seminar / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga, Sejal Parmar, Eszter Polgári (Winter, Spring terms, 2 credits)

Comparative Legal Research Methodology / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 1 credit)

### **Mandatory-elective courses**

Civil and Political Rights (4 credits must be obtained)

Freedom of Expression / András Sajó (Fall term, 2 credits)

Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards / Eszter Polgári (Fall, Winter terms, 3 credits)

Political Rights in Comparative Perspective / Daniel Smilov (Winter term, 1 credit)

Comparative Freedom of Religion / Cole Durham, Brett Scharffs (Spring term, 2 credits)

Freedom of Assembly / Michael Hamilton (Spring term, 1 credit)

Freedom of Religion – Advanced / Cole Durham (Spring term, 1 credit)

Global Rule of Law (3 credits must be obtained)

The UN Human Rights System / Sejal Parmar (Fall term, 2 credits)

Human Rights Remedies / Jeremy McBride (Fall term, 1 credit)

International Human Rights Advocacy / Sejal Parmar (Fall term, 2 credits)

Illiberal Democracy / András Sajó (Winter term, 2 credits)

Human Rights Protection in the Americas – Advanced / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Fall term, 2 credits)

*Justice and Equality* (4 credits must be obtained)

Human Rights and Criminal Justice / Károly Bárd (Fall term, 2 credits)

Indigenous Peoples' Rights under International Law / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Fall term, 2 credits)

Prosecuting Radical Evil / Károly Bárd (Winter term, 2 credits)

European Anti-Discrimination Law / Mathias Möschel (Spring term, 2 credits)

Socio-Economic Rights / András Sajó (Spring term, 2 credits)

Theoretical Perspectives (3 credits must be obtained)

Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept / Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 1 credit)

Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe / Mathias Möschel, Angéla Kóczé (Spring term, 2 credits)

Theory of Fundamental Rights/ Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 1 credit)

Theories of Human Rights: Intercultural Perspectives/ Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Spring term, 2 credits)

The Morality of Criminal Justice / Károly Bárd (Winter term, 2 credits)

### **HOW TO READ THE SCHEDULE**

Week 2	Wed 5 Sep
9.00 - 10.40	Capstone Seminar Group 2 Jessica Lawrence 5-6 N11/616
11.00 - 12.40	The UN Human Rights System Sejal Parmar 5-6 MB 203

### COURSE DATA IS LISTED AS FOLLOWS (TOP TO BOTTOM):

- 1. Title of course
- 2. Group (if applicable)
- 3. Name of instructor
- 4. Number of class hour (7-8).
- 5. Name of building/room number, e.g. FT/309 (Faculty Tower, room 309)

Frequently used abbreviations:

- FT Faculty Tower
- MB Monument Building
- N11 Nador 11 building
- N13 Nador 13 building

### **COURSE OFFERINGS FOR AY 2019/2020**

### MASTERS OF LAWS IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS LAW (IBL)

### **FALL TERM**

Teaching period: September 16 - December 6, 2019; Mid-term exams: October 28-31, 2019; End-term exams: December 9-13, 2019

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATOR	Y COURSES		
Anglo-American Legal Concepts	Jessica Lawrence	1	2
Capstone Seminar (Groups 1,2) <sup>1</sup>	Jessica Lawrence/Markus Petsche / Andrea Kirchknopf (CAW)/David Ridout (CAW)	(2)	(4)
The Regulatory Environment of Business	Tibor Tajti	1	2
MANDATORY-ELE	ECTIVE COURSES		
Comparative Antitrust Law	Csongor Nagy	1	2
Comparative Bankruptcy Law <sup>2</sup>	Tibor Tajti	1	2
Environmental Law and Regulation	Jessica Lawrence	1	2
Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe 3	Eszter Polgári	2	4
International Commercial Arbitration	Markus Petsche / Davor Babic / Vladimir Pavic	3	6
US Corporations and Partnership Law	Jessica Lawrence	1	2
ELECTIVE	COURSES		
Comparative Law of Sales	Howard Hunter	1	2
Comparative Secured Transactions Law <sup>4</sup>	Tibor Tajti	3	6
EU Law I <sup>5</sup>	Petra Bárd	1	2
European Company Law	Peter Behrens	2	4
Fundamentals of Documentary Filmmaking (UWC)	Jeremy Braverman /Oksana Sarkisova/ Maria Stanisheva	2	4
International Business Transactions	Markus Petsche	2	4

31

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1}$  Continued in the Winter and Spring terms.

 $<sup>^{2}\,\</sup>mbox{Cross-listed}$  with the MS Finance Program of the Department of Economics and Business.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prerequisite for Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards.

 $<sup>^4</sup>$  Students taking this course are strongly encouraged to take also Professor Tajti's Comparative Bankruptcy Law course.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 5}$  Optional non-credited pre-test is offered. Prerequisite for EU Law II.

# Master of Laws in International Business Law (IBL) WINTER TERM

Teaching period: January 7 - February 28, 2020

Exams: March 2-6, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATORY COURSES			
Capstone Seminar (Groups 1,2) <sup>1</sup>	Jessica Lawrence/Markus Petsche / Andrea Kirchknopf (CAW)/David Ridout (CAW)	(2)	(4)
Comparative Legal Research Methodology <sup>2</sup>	Markus Böckenförde	1	2
MANDATORY-E	LECTIVE COURSES		
Business and Human Rights	Jessica Lawrence	2	4
Entrepreneurship and Innovation – Clinical Course <sup>3</sup>	Faculty of Dept. of Economics and Business & Jessica Lawrence	(1)	(2)
International Civil Litigation	Csongor Nagy	1	2
International Economic Policy and Migration	Jessica Lawrence	1	2
International Investment Law and Regulation <sup>4</sup>	Markus Petsche	3	6
Law for Small and Mid-Scale Start Up Enterprises <sup>5</sup>	Tibor Tajti	1	2
The Legal Aspects of Corporate Finance <sup>6</sup>	Tibor Tajti	1	2
ELECTIVE	COURSES		
Drafting and Negotiating International Contracts	Csongor Nagy	1	2
EU Law II <sup>7</sup>	Jessica Lawrence	1	2
International and Comparative Intellectual Property Law	Gemma Minero Alejandre	1	2
Willem C. Vis International Commercial Arbitration Moot	Markus Petsche	2	4

 $^{\rm 4}$  Cross-listed with the MS Finance Program of the Department of Economics and Business.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Continued in the Spring term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Mandatory for selected students. Selection criteria will be announced separately.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 3}$  Continued in the Spring term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Prerequisite for the Clinical Course. Cross-listed with MS in Finance and MS in Technology Management and Innovation Programs of the Department of Economics and Business.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Cross-listed with the MS Finance Program of the Department of Economics and Business. Strongly recommended for those taking Capital Markets and Securities Regulation and Corporate Governance: Acquisitions and Capital Structure in the Spring term.

Only for those who passed EU Law I or the pre-test

# Master of Laws in International Business Law (IBL) SPRING TERM

Teaching period: March 30 - June 5, 2020; Mid-term exams: May 4-8, 2020; End-term exams: June 8-12, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATORY	COURSES		
Capstone Seminar (Groups 1,2)	Jessica Lawrence/Markus Petsche / Andrea Kirchknopf (CAW)/David Ridout (CAW)	2	4
MANDATORY-ELE	CTIVE COURSES		
Capital Markets and Securities Regulation 1	Tibor Tajti	3	6
Comparative Private International Law – Choice of Law	Markus Petsche	2	4
Corporate Governance: Acquisitions and Capital Structure <sup>2</sup>	Charles Whitehead	1	2
Entrepreneurship and Innovation – Clinical Course	Faculty of Dept. of Economics and Business & Jessica Lawrence	1	2
Mediation	Markus Petsche	1	2
ELECTIVE C	OURSES		
Compliance	Alexander Petsche	1	2
International Economic Law	Jessica Lawrence	3	6
International Tax Law	Clifton Fleming	1	2
Legal Essentials of the Digital Economy	Martin Husovec	1	2

 $^{\rm 1}$  Cross-listed with the MS Finance Program of the Department of Economics and Business.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cross-listed with the MS Finance Program of the Department of Economics and Business.

### MASTER OF LAWS IN COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW (CCL)

### **FALL TERM**

Teaching period: September 16 - December 6, 2019

Mid-term exams: October 28-31, 2019; End-term exams: December 9-13, 2019

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATO	RY COURSES		
Constitutions at Work: Comparative Perspectives	Renáta Uitz	2	4
Introduction to US Constitutional Law	Renáta Uitz	2	4
MANDATORY-EI	ECTIVE COURSES	•	
Constitutional Adjudication and the Rule of Law	Renáta Uitz	2	4
Constitution-Building in Africa <sup>1</sup>	Gedion Hessebon/Markus Böckenförde	(2)	(4)
Freedom of Expression <sup>2</sup>	András Sajó	2	4
French Constitutional Law and Its Influence Abroad	Mathias Möschel	2	4
German Constitutional Law and Its Historical and Political Context	Markus Böckenförde	2	4
Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe <sup>3</sup>	Eszter Polgári	2	4
	COURSES	•	
Academic Writing	Éva Ajkay-Nagy (CAW)	1	2
Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards <sup>4</sup>	Eszter Polgári	(3)	(6)
Clinical Course <sup>5</sup>	Károly Bárd	(3)	(6)
EU Law I <sup>6</sup>	Petra Bárd	1	2
Fundamentals of Documentary Filmmaking (UWC)	Jeremy Braverman /Oksana Sarkisova/ Maria Stanisheva	2	4
Human Rights and Criminal Justice	Károly Bárd	2	4
Jean Monnet Module on European Integration <sup>7</sup>	Marie-Pierre Granger	4	8

<sup>2</sup> Prerequisite for Freedom of Assembly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Continued in the Winter term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prerequisite for Courts in Dialogue and Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards.

 $<sup>^{4}</sup>$  Prerequisites: Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe. Continued in Winter Term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Prerequisites: Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe. Only for selected students; call for application and selection criteria will be announced separately. Continued in the Winter term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Optional non-credited pre-test is offered. Prerequisite for all EU courses (Jean Monnet Module, EU Criminal Justice and EU Law II).

Only for those who took EU Law I or passed the pre-test.

# Master of Laws in Comparative Constitutional Law (CCL) WINTER TERM

Teaching period: January 7 - February 28, 2020

Exams: March 2-6, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATO	RY COURSES		
Capstone Seminar <sup>1</sup>	Renáta Uitz	(2)	(4)
Comparative Legal Research Methodology <sup>2</sup>	Markus Böckenförde	1	2
MANDATORY-EL	ECTIVE COURSES		
Comparative Federalism: A Critical Perspective	Markus Böckenförde	2	4
Constitution-Building in Africa	Gedion Hessebon/Markus Böckenförde	2	4
Illiberal Democracy	András Sajó	2	4
Political Rights in Comparative Perspective	Daniel Smilov	1	2
Workshop on Illiberal Democracy: The Rule of Law as Fake	András Sajó	1	2
ELECTIVE	COURSES		
Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards	Eszter Polgári	3	6
Clinical Course	Károly Bárd	3	6
Courts in Dialogue <sup>3</sup>	András Sajó	1	2
EU Criminal Justice <sup>4</sup>	Petra Bárd	1	2
EU Law II <sup>5</sup>	Jessica Lawrence	1	2
Philosophy of Law	Katalin Farkas	2	4

Continued in the Spring term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Mandatory for selected students. Selection criteria will be announced separately.

Restricted to 10 students from the Human Rights and Comparative Constitutional Law Programs. Selection is competitive, selection criteria will be announced separately. Prerequisite: Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 4}$  Only for those who passed EU Law I or the pre-test.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 5}$  Only for those who passed EU Law I or the pre-test.

# Master of Laws in Comparative Constitutional Law (CCL) SPRING TERM

Teaching period: March 30 - June 5, 2020 Mid-term exams: May 4-8, 2020; End-term exams: June 8-12, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATO	RY COURSES	o. cuito	0.00.00
Capstone Seminar	Renáta Uitz	2	4
MANDATORY-EL	ECTIVE COURSES		
Comparative Equality	Michel Rosenfeld	1	2
Comparative Freedom of Religion <sup>1</sup>	Brett Scharffs / W. Cole Durham	2	4
Constitutionalism and Rights in South and South East Asia	Arun Thiruvengadam	1	2
Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe <sup>2</sup>	Mathias Möschel / Angéla Kóczé	2	4
European Anti-Discrimination Law	Mathias Möschel	2	4
Europe: Transnational Constitutional Identity	Susanna Mancini	1	2
Freedom of Religion – Advanced <sup>3</sup>	W. Cole Durham	1	2
Freedom of Assembly <sup>4</sup>	Michael Hamilton	1	2
International Rule of Law Assistance: Law and Development	Markus Böckenförde	2	4
Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept	Matthias Mahlmann	1	2
Socio-Economic Rights	András Sajó	2	4
ELECTIVE	COURSES		
Theory of Fundamental Rights	Matthias Mahlmann	1	2

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  Prerequisite for Freedom of Religion  $-\,\mbox{Advanced}.$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cross-listed with the Department of Gender Studies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prerequisite: Comparative Freedom of Religion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Prerequisite: Freedom of Expression.

# MASTER OF ARTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS (HR MA)

# **FALL TERM**

Teaching period: September 16 - December 6, 2019;

Mid-term exams: October 28-31, 2019; End-term exams: December 9-13, 2019

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATOR	RY COURSES		
Introduction to Law	Eszter Polgári	2	4
Introduction to the Protection of Human Rights	Sejal Parmar / Eszter Polgári / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	3	6
MANDATORY-EL	ECTIVE COURSES		
Archives, Evidence and Human Rights <sup>1</sup>	Iván Székely / Csaba Szilágyi / András Mink	(3)	(6)
Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards <sup>2</sup>	Eszter Polgári	(3)	(6)
Freedom of Expression <sup>3</sup>	András Sajó	2	4
Human Rights and Criminal Justice	Károly Bárd	2	4
Human Rights Remedies	Jeremy McBride	1	2
International Human Rights Advocacy	Sejal Parmar	2	4
The UN Human Rights System	Sejal Parmar	2	4
ELECTIVE	COURSES		
Academic Writing	Éva Ajkay-Nagy (CAW)	1	2
Constitution-Building in Africa <sup>4</sup>	Markus Böckenförde / Gedion Hessebon	(2)	(4)
Equality Policy in Comparative Perspective 5	Andrea Krizsán / Violetta Zentai	2	4
Fundamentals of Documentary Filmmaking (UWC)	Jeremy Braverman /Oksana Sarkisova/ Maria Stanisheva	2	4
Indigenous Peoples' Rights under International Law	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	2	4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Continued in the Winter term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Continued in the Winter term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prerequisite for Freedom of Expression in Practice and Freedom of Assembly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Continued in the Winter term.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 5}$  Cross-listed from the School of Public Policy.

# Master of Arts in Human Rights (HR MA) WINTER TERM

Teaching period: January 7 - February 28, 2020

Exams: March 2-6, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATOR	Y COURSES		•
Capstone Seminar (Groups 1, 2, 3) <sup>1</sup>	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga / Eszter Polgári	(2)	(4)
Comparative Legal Research Methodology <sup>2</sup>	Markus Böckenförde	1	2
MANDATORY-ELECTIV	E/ELECTIVE COURSES		·
Archives, Evidence and Human Rights	lván Székely / Csaba Szilágyi / András Mink	3	6
Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards	Eszter Polgári	3	6
Illiberal Democracy András Sajó		2	4
Political Rights in Comparative Perspective	Daniel Smilov	1	2
The Law and Politics of Combating Violence Against Women <sup>3</sup>	Mathias Möschel / Andrea Krizsán	3	6
The Morality of Criminal Justice	Károly Bárd	2	4
ELECTIVE	COURSES		
Business and Human Rights	Jessica Lawrence	2	4
Constitution-Building in Africa	Gedion Hessebon / Markus Böckenförde	2	4
Courts in Dialogue <sup>4</sup>	András Sajó	1	2
Human Rights in Africa with Special Focus on Gender Issues	Victoria Nwogu	1	2
Human Rights Internship (at least 3 weeks) <sup>5</sup>	Eszter Polgári	1	2
International and European Refugee Law and Policy <sup>6</sup>	Boldizsár Nagy	4	8
Workshop on Illiberal Democracy: The Rule of Law as Fake	András Sajó	1	2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Continued in the Spring term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Mandatory for selected students. Selection criteria will be announced separately.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Jointly offered with the School of Public Policy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Restricted to 10 students from the Human Rights and Comparative Constitutional Law Programs. Selection is competitive, selection criteria will be announced separately.

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$  Restricted to 8 students from the Human Rights Programs. Call for application will be announced separately.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 6}$  Cross-listed from the Department of International Relations.

# Master of Arts in Human Rights (HR MA) SPRING TERM

Teaching period: March 30 - June 5, 2020 Mid-term exams: May 4-8, 2020; End-term exams: June 8-12, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATOR	COURSES	•	1
Capstone Seminar (Groups 1, 2, 3)	Sejal Parmar / Sejal Parmar / Eszter Polgári	2	4
MANDATORY-ELE	CTIVE COURSES		
Comparative Freedom of Religion <sup>1</sup>	Brett Scharffs / W. Cole Durham	2	4
Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe <sup>2</sup>	Mathias Möschel / Angéla Kóczé	2	4
Freedom of Assembly <sup>3</sup>	Michael Hamilton	1	2
Freedom of Religion – Advanced <sup>4</sup>	W. Cole Durham	1	2
International Rule of Law Assistance: Law and Development	Markus Böckenförde	2	4
Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept	Matthias Mahlmann	1	2
Socio-Economic Rights	András Sajó	2	4
Theories of Human Rights: Intercultural Perspectives	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	2	4
Theory of Fundamental Rights	Matthias Mahlmann	1	2
ELECTIVE C	COURSES		
Europe: Transnational Constitutional Identity	Susanna Mancini	1	2
Freedom of Expression in Practice <sup>5</sup>	Sejal Parmar	2	4
Vienna Human Rights Model United Nations <sup>6</sup>	Sejal Parmar	1	2

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1}$  Prerequisite for Freedom of Religion – Advanced.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cross-listed with the Department of Gender Studies

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prerequisite: Freedom of Expression.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Prerequisite: Comparative Freedom of Religion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Prerequisite: Freedom of Expression.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Restricted to 10 students from the Human Rights Programs. Selection is competitive, selection criteria will be announced separately.

# MASTER OF LAWS IN HUMAN RIGHTS (HR LLM)

# **FALL TERM**

Teaching period: September 16 - December 6, 2019;

Mid-term exams: October 28-31, 2019; End-term exams: December 9-13, 2019

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits	
MANDATORY COURSES				
Introduction to the Protection of Human Rights	Sejal Parmar / Eszter Polgári / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	3	6	
Introduction to Public International Law	Markus Böckenförde	1	2	
Legal Terminology	Matthew DeCloedt (SJD candidate)	1	2	
MANDATORY-ELE	CTIVE COURSES			
Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standards <sup>1</sup>	Eszter Polgári	(3)	(6)	
Freedom of Expression <sup>2</sup>	András Sajó	2	4	
Human Rights and Criminal Justice	Károly Bárd	2	4	
Human Rights Protection in the Americas - Advanced	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	2	4	
Human Rights Remedies	Jeremy McBride	1	2	
Indigenous Peoples' Rights Under International Law	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	2	4	
International Human Rights Advocacy	Sejal Parmar	2	4	
The UN Human Rights System	Sejal Parmar	2	4	
ELECTIVE (	COURSES			
Academic Writing	Éva Ajkay-Nagy (CAW)	1	2	
Clinical Course <sup>3</sup>	Károly Bárd	(3)	(6)	
EU Law I <sup>4</sup>	Petra Bárd	1	2	
Fundamentals of Documentary Filmmaking (UWC)	Jeremy Braverman / Oksana Sarkisova / Maria Stanisheva	2	4	
The Protection of Children and Victims' Rights in International and Regional Law	Károly Bárd/ Oswaldo Ruiz- Chiriboga	2	4	

 $^{\rm 2}$  Prerequisite for Freedom of Expression in Practice and Freedom of Assembly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Continued in the Winter term.

Only for selected students; call for application and selection criteria will be announced separately. Continued in the Winter Term.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 4}$  Optional non-credited pre-test is offered. Prerequisite for EU Criminal Justice.

# Master of Laws in Human Rights (HR LLM) WINTER TERM

Teaching period: January 7 - February 28, 2020

Exams: March 2-6, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATO	RY COURSES		•
Comparative Legal Research Methodology <sup>1</sup>	Markus Böckenförde	1	2
Capstone Seminar (Groups 1, 2, 3) <sup>2</sup>	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga / Eszter Polgári	(2)	(4)
MANDATORY-EI	ECTIVE COURSES		•
Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR standards	Eszter Polgári	3	6
Illiberal Democracy	András Sajó	2	4
Political Rights in Comparative Perspective	Daniel Smilov	1	2
Prosecuting Radical Evil	Károly Bárd	2	4
The Morality of Criminal Justice	Károly Bárd	2	4
ELECTIVE	COURSES		•
Clinical Course	Károly Bárd	3	6
Courts in Dialogue <sup>3</sup>	András Sajó	1	2
EU Criminal Justice <sup>4</sup>	Petra Bárd	1	2
Human Rights in Africa with Special Focus on Gender Issues	Victoria Nwogu	1	2
Human Rights Internship (at least 3 weeks)⁵	Eszter Polgári	1	2
International and European Refugee Law and Policy <sup>6</sup>	Boldizsár Nagy	4	8
Law and Bioethics	Judit Sándor	2	4
Litigation Before the Inter-American System (Moot Court Exercise) <sup>7</sup>	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	1	2
Persuasive Argumentation Exercise (ECHR Moot Court) <sup>8</sup>	Eszter Polgári	1	2
The Law and Politics of Combating Violence Against Women <sup>9</sup>	Mathias Möschel / Andrea Krizsán	3	6
Workshop on Illiberal Democracy: The Rule of Law as Fake	András Sajó	1	2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mandatory for selected students. Selection criteria will be announced separately.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Continued in the Spring Term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Restricted to 10 students from the Human Rights and Comparative Constitutional Law Programs. Selection is competitive, selection criteria will be announced separately.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 4}$  Only for those who passed EU Law I or the pre-test.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Restricted to 8 students from the Human Rights Programs. Call for application will be announced separately.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 6}$  Cross-listed from the Department of International Relations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Restricted to 10 students.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Restricted to 10 students.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 9}$  Jointly offered with the School of Public Policy.

# Master of Laws in Human Rights (HR LLM) SPRING TERM

Teaching period: March 30 - June 5, 2020 Mid-term exams: May 4-8, 2020; End-term exams: June 8-12, 2020

Name of the Course	Instructor	No. of US Credits	No. of ECTS Credits
MANDATOR	Y COURSES		•
Capstone Seminar (Groups 1, 2, 3)	Sejal Parmar / Sejal Parmar / Eszter Polgári	2	4
MANDATORY-ELE	CTIVE COURSES		
Comparative Freedom of Religion <sup>1</sup>	Brett Scharffs / W. Cole Durham	2	4
Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe <sup>2</sup>	Mathias Möschel / Angéla Kóczé	2	4
European Anti-Discrimination Law	Mathias Möschel	2	4
Freedom of Assembly <sup>3</sup>	Michael Hamilton	1	2
Freedom of Religion – Advanced <sup>4</sup>	W. Cole Durham	1	2
Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept	Matthias Mahlmann	1	2
Socio-Economic Rights	András Sajó	2	4
Theories of Human Rights: Intercultural Perspectives	Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga	2	4
Theory of Fundamental Rights	Matthias Mahlmann	1	2
ELECTIVE (	COURSES		•
Comparative Equality	Michel Rosenfeld	1	2
Constitutionalism and Rights in South and South East Asia	Arun Thiruvengadam	1	2
Freedom of Expression in Practice <sup>5</sup>	Sejal Parmar	2	4
Vienna Human Rights Model United Nations <sup>6</sup>	Sejal Parmar	1	2

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1}$  Prerequisite for Freedom of Religion – Advanced.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cross-listed with the Department of Gender Studies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prerequisite: Freedom of Expression.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Prerequisite: Comparative Freedom of Religion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Prerequisite: Freedom of Expression.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Restricted to 10 students from the Human Rights Programs. Selection is competitive, selection criteria will be announced separately.

#### APPENDIX I: CEU DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL STUDIES GRADING SCALE

The CEU Department of Legal Studies grading scale is the following:

Letter Grade	Grade Point
Α	4.00
A-	3.67
B+	3.33
В	3.00
B-	2.67
C+	2.33
F	0.00 (no credit)

The lowest passing grade is C+. Students receiving a failing grade (F) for mandatory and mandatory-elective courses must retake those courses for Pass/Fail provided that in case of a mandatory-elective course retake is permitted. A "Retake Pass" for such a retake exam is worth 2.33 (C+) grade points.

For other courses graded Pass/Fail, a "Pass" grade is calculated into the cumulative GPA of that student at the end of the academic year at the same grade point as the cumulative GPA.

The CEU Department of Legal Studies requests its professors to use the following grading curve when calculating final course grades:

15 percent of the class A or A-		
25 percent of the class B+		
30 percent of the class	В	
20 percent of the class	B-	
10 percent of the class	C+	

F does not count on the grade curve.

The curve is applied to classes with more than 12 students.

# APPENDIX II: SUGGESTED COVER SHEET FOR CAPSTONE THESIS



# THE TITLE GOES HERE

by John Smith

LLM/MA Capstone Thesis SUPERVISOR: [Professor's name] Central European University

© Central European University

[DATE]

# APPENDIX III: FINAL SUBMISSION EVALUATION CRITERIA

# **CAPSTONE THESIS**

Grade		
Α	Research	Well-defined and well-reasoned question/problem;
	design:	Genuinely original/innovative question/problem;
		<ul> <li>Clearly set out aims and assumptions, as well as limitations;</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Explanation and expressly justified choice of methodology;</li> </ul>
		Excellent choice of comparative case studies for addressing question
	Theoretical	Highly germane theories reflected upon and deep knowledge shown;
	framework:	• Excellent comprehension of relevant concepts demonstrated;
		Assured presentation of spectrum of relevant theories;
		Sophisticated theoretical framework applied in relation to problem at issue.
	Material	Thorough and systematic approach to primary and secondary literature;
	covered:	Critical use of a broad range of relevant legal sources, secondary literature and
		interdisciplinary sources (most current and comprehensive scope of research);
		• Consistent referencing system.
	Analysis:	Thorough and strong critical engagement with material covered;
	,	Clear and deep connection between analysis of primary sources and theoretical
		framework;
		A problem-driven structure and layout;
		<ul> <li>Argument is well-focused, clearly reflects student's own independent point of view;</li> </ul>
		A confidently and maturely written text in idiomatic English, a pleasure to read
	Findings:	• Conclusions are clear, fully meet objectives set in research question / problem;
		• Strongly relevant findings and conclusions for policy and practice, or further research;
		<ul> <li>New, innovative or exciting perspectives advanced.</li> </ul>
A-	Research	Reasonably well-defined research question/problem;
	design:	• Intellectually challenging research question/problem;
		• Clear limitations set;
		Convincing explanation of methodology;
		Well-chosen comparative case studies.
	Theoretical	Relevant theories reflected and drawn upon;
	framework:	<ul> <li>Very good understanding of concepts shown;</li> </ul>
		• Confident presentation and skillful use/application of relevant theories.
	Material	Clear and consistent approach to primary and secondary sources;
	covered:	Credible use of a range of relevant legal sources, secondary literature and some
		interdisciplinary sources (going beyond core titles and theories, up to date on recent
		developments);
		Consistent referencing system.
	Analysis:	Strong critical engagement with material covered;
		• Clear connection between analysis of primary sources and theoretical framework;
		Coherent linkages drawn with existing research;
		A clear structure, supporting a well-focused argument;
		• A very well written text, with minor grammatical errors.
	Findings:	Conclusions are clear, justified and meet research objectives;
		Relevant conclusions for policy and practice or further research;
		Clear evidence of creative and independent thinking.
B+	Research	Reasonably well-defined research question/problem;
	design:	Interesting research question/problem;
		• Appropriate limitations set;
		- Appropriate initiations set,

	Material	Reliance on some legal sources and secondary literature, though not comprehensive
	covered:	(with marked gaps in scope or currency);
		Referencing at times with significant inconsistencies.
	Analysis:	<ul> <li>An acknowledgement of existing research, but unbalanced in approach, analysis or</li> </ul>
		interpretation;
		Several gaps or errors in the analysis
		<ul> <li>Noticeable inconsistency and ambiguity in structure;</li> </ul>
		• Language is difficult to follow at times due to grave or recurring errors.
	Findings:	Some conclusions meet objectives;
		<ul> <li>A satisfactory attempt to advance a conventional argument.</li> </ul>
C+	Research	<ul> <li>Conventional research question/problem defined in unclear or confusing terms;</li> </ul>
	design:	<ul> <li>Some confusion/ambiguity as to scope of thesis;</li> </ul>
		• Formalistic explanation for methodology and selection of comparative case studies.
	Theoretical	• Presentation of theories with major flaws (major relevant theories or concepts missing
	framework:	or misappropriated);
		Problems with identifying essential concepts;
		• Theoretical framework does not affect the analysis or argument of the work.
	Material	• Reliance on a limited set of legal sources and secondary sources (with serious gaps in
	covered:	scope and currency);
		Referencing with significant inconsistencies and ambiguities.
	Analysis:	<ul> <li>A minimal level of critical analysis with regular and significant errors;</li> </ul>
		Noticeable inconsistency and ambiguity in structure;
		• Language is difficult to follow, with longer parts that are challenging for a reader to follow.
	Findings:	Some conclusions meet objectives
		<ul> <li>A lack of identifiable findings for policy and practice offered;</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>A minimally adequate attempt to advance a conventional argument.</li> </ul>
F	Research	<ul> <li>Failure to demonstrate any effort in setting research question and methodology;</li> </ul>
	design:	Failure to understand purpose of thesis.
	Theoretical	• Fundamental errors in/failure to present any theoretical framework.
	framework:	
	Material	• Fundamental errors in choice of and quality of sources/case-studies;
	covered:	Serious violations of rules of academic honesty.
	Analysis:	Fundamental errors in analysis, evaluation and interpretation;
		• A poorly written, or unreadable text.
	Findings:	• Absence of any identifiable findings or conclusions or arguments; fundamental flaws in
		logic of arguments presented.

# **ORAL PRESENTATION OF CAPSTONE PROJECT**

Grade		
Grade A	Organization and structure:  Content and academic merit:	<ul> <li>Introduction captures attention, it defines the background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in an outstanding manner.</li> <li>Introduction establishes a strong framework for the entire presentation, it identifies relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives in an outstanding manner;</li> <li>Information is presented in a clear and logical manner throughout the presentation, without gaps and repetitions;</li> <li>Technical terms are well-defined in language appropriate for the target audience;</li> <li>Points made very well reflect their relative importance for the project as a whole.</li> <li>Presentation includes a compelling justification for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, as well as for the selected methodology and it is application for the project as a whole;</li> <li>Presentation provides compelling justification for the comparative case studies used;</li> <li>Presentation includes an excellent overview of relevant accounts from the literature;</li> <li>Primary and secondary sources covered are of high relevance to the overall project;</li> <li>Presentation contains accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, and provides original, critical analysis of sources used;</li> </ul>
	Conclusions and results:	<ul> <li>Presentation demonstrates an excellent knowledge of the broader field.</li> <li>The main conclusions of the presentation clearly follow from the material presented and fully meet objectives set for the capstone project;</li> <li>The presenter provides the audience with a clear "take-away" message;</li> <li>The presenter makes very relevant, original (new) and innovative recommendations for the problem explored in the project.</li> </ul>
	Presentation skills:	<ul> <li>Presentation is clear and easy to follow even for a non-specialist;</li> <li>If slides are used, slides are highly relevant to oral presentation, presenter relies on them as visual aids, and does not read them out;</li> <li>Excellent language skills; idiomatic and grammatically correct professional English usage with hardly any filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities.</li> <li>Speaker maintains eye contact with audience.</li> <li>Length of presentation is within the assigned time limits; presentation is not rushed, excellent time management across major parts / themes.</li> </ul>
	Interaction:	<ul> <li>The presenter is able to respond to questions in an excellent, highly relevant and focused manner, providing further original and informed insight on issues raised in the presentation, thereby demonstrating profound knowledge of the wider subject area;</li> <li>Responses are highly informed, up-to-date, accurate, convincing and confident;</li> <li>Disagreement is expressed in a highly professional and respectful manner.</li> </ul>
A-	Organization and structure:	<ul> <li>Introduction captures attention, it defines the background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis), establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives very well, with only occasional vagueness or hesitation.</li> <li>Information is presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with only minor gaps and repetitions;</li> <li>Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience:</li> <li>Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project;</li> <li>Points made reflect well their relative importance for the project as a whole.</li> </ul>
	Content and academic merit:	<ul> <li>Presentation includes a convincing justification for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, as well as for the selected methodology and it is application for the project as a whole;</li> </ul>

		<ul> <li>Presentation includes a very sound overview of relevant accounts from the literature;</li> <li>Primary and secondary sources covered are of high relevance to the overall project;</li> </ul>
		Primary and secondary sources covered are of high relevance to the overall project;
		Presentation contains accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, and
		provides a credible analysis thereof with only occasional minor errors.
		Presentation demonstrates a very good overall knowledge of the field.
	Conclusions	• The main conclusions of the presentation follow from the material presented.
	and results:	• The presenter provides the audience with a well-formulated "take-away" message.
		• The presenter makes relevant recommendations for the problem explored in the
		project, providing clear evidence of creative and independent thinking.
	Presentation	Presentation is clear and easy to follow;
	skills:	• If slides are used, slides are relevant to oral presentation, presenter relies on them
		mostly as visual aids, but rarely reads them out;
		Very good language skills; grammatically correct professional English usage with
		occasional filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities.
		Speaker maintains eye contact with audience.
		• Length of presentation is within or almost within the assigned time limits, very good
		time management across major parts / themes.
	Interaction:	• The presenter is able to respond to questions in a convincing and focused manner,
		providing further insight on issues raised in the presentation, thereby demonstrating
		well-grounded knowledge of the wider subject area.
		Responses are well informed, up-to-date and confident, displaying creative and
		independent thinking, with only occasional minor errors or inconsistencies;
		Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.;
B+	Organization	• Introduction outlines the background and importance of the capstone project (not
	and structure:	limited to the capstone thesis) reasonably well, with some vagueness;
		• Introduction establishes a good framework for the presentation, it identifies most of
		the relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with some vagueness or
		uncertainty;
		• Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with
		some gaps, errors and repetitions;
		Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with only minor
		gaps or errors;
		Primary and secondary sources covered are mostly relevant to the overall project;      Points made reflect adequately their relative importance for the project as a whole
	Content and	Points made reflect adequately their relative importance for the project as a whole      Property the project as a whole
	academic	Presentation includes an acceptable justification for the choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, as well as for the selected methodology and it is
	merit:	application for the project as a whole;
	mene.	<ul> <li>Presentation provides adequate justification for the comparative case studies;</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Presentation provides adequate justification for the comparative case studies,</li> <li>Presentation includes adequate overview of relevant accounts from the literature;</li> </ul>
		Primary and secondary sources covered are mostly relevant to the overall project;
		Presentation contains accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, along a
		consistent line of argument, with occasional gaps or errors.
		<ul> <li>Presentation demonstrates a solid overall knowledge of the field.</li> </ul>
	Conclusions	
	and results:	
		conclusion.
		explored in the project and display some independent thinking.
		• The presenter makes recommendations, most of which are relevant for the problem

Presentation is clear and easy to follow for the most part;  skills:    fisides are used, presenter relies on them with often reading them out, or presentation departs from the slides on key points;   Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with occasional errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities.   Speaker only sporadically maintains eye contact with audience.   Length of presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 15%, or speaker manages to observe time limit with dropping a substantial part of the presentation.   Interaction:   The presenter is able to respond to questions in a good, though not always focused manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;   Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;   Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.   Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,   Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,   Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;   Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;   Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;   Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;   Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.   Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selec		T	
presentation departs from the slides on key points; Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with occasional errors, filter words ("mmm," "like," etc.) or informalities. Speaker only sporadically maintains eye contact with audience. Length of presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 15%, or speaker manages to observe time limit with dropping a substantial part of the presentation.  Interaction:  The presenter is able to respond to questions in a good, though not always focused manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project; Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking; Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner. Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms, Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points; Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions; Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors; Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project.  Content and academic merit:  **Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project.  **Presentation dem		Presentation	Presentation is clear and easy to follow for the most part;
Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with occasional errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities.   Speaker only sporadically maintains eye contact with audience.   Length of presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 15%, or speaker manages to observe time limit with dropping a substantial part of the presentation. The presenter is able to respond to questions in a good, though not always focused manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;   Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;   Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.		skills:	-
occasional errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities.  • Speaker only sporadically maintains eye contact with audience.  • Length of presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 15%, or speaker manages to observe time limit with dropping a substantial part of the presentation manages to observe time limit with dropping as substantial part of the presentation well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;  • Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;  • Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.  • Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,  • Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  • Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  • Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  • Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  • Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Content and  • Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  • Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  • Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  • Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or deg			
Speaker only sporadically maintains eye contact with audience.  Interaction:  Interaction:  The presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 15%, or speaker manages to observe time limit with dropping a substantial part of the presentation was a conventional manages. The presentation is a good, though not always focused manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;  Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;  Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.  Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,  Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  Ferminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Information explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by the capston			
Length of presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 15%, or spaker manages to observe time limit with dropping a substantial part of the presentation or 17th presentation is all to respond to questions in a good, though not always focused manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;   Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;   Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.   Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,   Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;   Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;   Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;   Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project.   Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project;   Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;   Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;   Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.   Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.    Conclusions and results:   Presentation   Pre			occasional errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities.
Interaction:  Interaction:  The presenter is able to respond to questions in a good, though not always focused manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;  Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;  Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.  Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,  Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  All the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Though not explicitl			Speaker only sporadically maintains eye contact with audience.
manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;  • Responses are informed and up-to-date, with occasional errors, gaps or inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;  • Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.  • Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,  • Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,  • Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  • Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  • Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  • Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  • Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  • Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  • Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  • Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  • Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  • Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gap			
inconsistencies that display a certain degree of independent thinking;  Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.  Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,  Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  Ferminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Content and academic academ		Interaction:	manner, explaining the approach chosen in the presentation, thereby demonstrating well-grounded knowledge of the narrower subject area covered by the project;
Disagreement is expressed in a professional and respectful manner.			
Introduction addresses background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms,			
imited to the capstone thesis) in fairly conventional terms, Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points; Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions; Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors; Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points; Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Content and academic merit: Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project; Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete; Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree; Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree; Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors. Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Conclusions And results:  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation Skills:  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand; If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides; Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional E	В	Organization	
Introduction addresses the problem, it establishes a solid framework for the presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Content and academic merit:  Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Conclusions and results:  Presentation and results are an every message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation are sultant of the capstone project as a whole.  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;		_	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
presentation, it identifies many relevant questions resulting from the stated objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Content and academic project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Not all the conclusions by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  skills:  Presentation  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regulary departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
objectives, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on secondary points;  Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions  and results:  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regulary departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "li			' '
<ul> <li>Information is mostly presented in a logical manner throughout the presentation, with notable gaps, errors and repetitions;</li> <li>Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;</li> <li>Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;</li> <li>Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.</li> <li>Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;</li> <li>Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;</li> <li>Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;</li> <li>Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;</li> <li>Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.</li> <li>Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.</li> <li>Conclusions and results:</li> <li>Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.</li> <li>Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.</li> <li>Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.</li> <li>Presentation</li> <li>Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slide</li></ul>			1 '
notable gaps, errors and repetitions;  • Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  • Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  • Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Content and academic merit:  • Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  • Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  • Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  • Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  • Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  • Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  • Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  • Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  • Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  • Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  • If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  • Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps or errors;  Primary and secondary sources covered are relevant to the overall project on key points;  Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.  Content and academic merit:  Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
Content and academic Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project;  Description of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  skills:  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			Terminology is defined in terms appropriate for the target audience with notable gaps
<ul> <li>Content and academic merit:         <ul> <li>Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;</li> <li>Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;</li> <li>Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;</li> <li>Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;</li> <li>Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.</li> <li>Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Conclusions and results:         <ul> <li>Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.</li> <li>Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.</li> <li>Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Presentation         <ul> <li>Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul> </li></ul>			
project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  skills:  I slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			Points made do not always reflect their relative importance to the overall project.
terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  skills:  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;		Content and	Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone
project;  Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;  Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;  Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  skills:  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;		academic	project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic
<ul> <li>Presentation identifies major relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;</li> <li>Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;</li> <li>Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.</li> <li>Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.</li> <li>Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.</li> <li>Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.</li> <li>Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.</li> <li>Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul>		merit:	
them to a sufficient depth or degree;  • Some relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;  • Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  • Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  • Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  • Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  • Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation  skills:  • Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  • If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  • Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			Justification of comparative case studies is generic or otherwise incomplete;
depth or degree; Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors. Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented. Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties. Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation skills:  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand; If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides; Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.  • Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.  Conclusions and results:  • Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.  • Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  • Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation skills:  • Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;  • If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  • Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
<ul> <li>Presentation demonstrates a good knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project.</li> <li>Conclusions and results:         <ul> <li>Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.</li> <li>Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.</li> <li>Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Presentation skills:         <ul> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			• Presentation contains mostly accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information,
<ul> <li>capstone project.</li> <li>Conclusions and results:         <ul> <li>Not all the conclusions presented follow from or are related to the material presented.</li> <li>Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.</li> <li>Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Presentation skills:         <ul> <li>Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			making a fair attempt at independent analysis, with regular gaps or errors.
presented.  • Though not explicitly articulated, a "take-away" message can be identified from the conclusion with some difficulties.  • Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation skills:  • Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand; • If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides; • Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
conclusion with some difficulties.  Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.  Presentation skills:  Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand; If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides; Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
<ul> <li>Recommendations by the presenter pursue a conventional approach fairly well, yet are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.</li> <li>Presentation skills:</li> <li>Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>are only partly relevant to the capstone project as a whole.</li> <li>Presentation skills:         <ul> <li>Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>Speaker is sometimes unclear and not always easy to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>skills:</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;</li> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul>		Presentation	
presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides;  • Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;			
<ul> <li>Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities;</li> </ul>			
			Good language skills, mostly grammatically correct professional English usage with

		• Length of presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 25%, or speaker
	lata and stines.	manages to observe time limit with dropping substantial parts of the presentation
	Interaction:	• The presenter is able to respond to questions, but the answers are not always clear
		and to point, thereby demonstrating solid knowledge of the narrower subject covered
		by the project;
		• Responses are informed and conventional, and may sometimes contain errors, gaps or
		inconsistencies that affect the audience's appreciation of the project;
		• On minor points speaker finds it challenging to express disagreement in a professional
-	0	manner due to lack of access to relevant, up-to-date or accurate information.
B-	Organization and structure:	• Introduction addresses the background and importance of the capstone project (not
	una structure.	limited to the capstone thesis) in a satisfactory manner terms;
		• Introduction states the central problem and sets out the framework for the
		presentation in satisfactory manner, with notable vagueness, gaps or uncertainty on
		one or more key points;
		• Key information presented in an accessible manner throughout the presentation, with
		notable gaps, errors and repetitions interfering with the overall logic of the
		presentation;
		• Terminology is presented, yet it remains unclear even on some key points;
		Primary and secondary sources covered are often not relevant to the points made;      Paints and the ground of the primary and the ground of the ground o
		Points made frequently do not reflect their relative importance to the overall project.
	Content and	Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone
	academic	project, for the selected methodology and its application only in part, or in generic
	merit:	terms that do not address the unique aspects of the problem covered by capstone
		project, prompting follow up questions;
		Justification of comparative case studies is generic, inconsistent or contradictory;      Description identifies a great relevant associated in the literature, but does not expense.
		• Presentation identifies some relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;
		• Several relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;
		• Presentation contains accurate, up-to-date and relevant data and information, with ambiguity, or regular gaps or errors that effect the overall conclusions of the project
		negatively;
		Presentation demonstrates some good knowledge of the specific issues covered by
		the capstone project, with notable gaps and errors.
	Conclusions	Not all the conclusions of the presentation are related to the material presented.
	and results:	• A "take-away" message can only be identified with major difficulties
		Recommendations are generic, often not relevant to the overall project or are
		inconsistent on a few points.
	Presentation	Speaker is often unclear or difficult to understand;
	skills:	• If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with often reading them out, or
		presentation regularly departs from the slides or easily loses track of slides to the
		point where slides get in the way of getting the speaker's message across;
		• Mostly good language skills, with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or
		informalities that make it difficult to follow the speaker at times;
		Little or no eye contact with audience.
		• Length of presentation exceeds the assigned time limits by more than 25%, or speaker
		manages to observe time limit with significantly departing from the presentation.
	Interaction:	The presenter is not able to respond to questions adequately on minor points, .
		Responses are informed, though sometimes generic, or contain errors, gaps or
		inconsistencies that affect the audience's appreciation of the project;
		and the state of t

		On at least one key point the speaker finds it challenging to express disagreement in a professional manner due to lack of access to relevant, up-to-date or accurate information.
C+	Organization and structure:	<ul> <li>Introduction addresses the background and importance of the capstone project (not limited to the capstone thesis) in minimally adequate manner;</li> <li>Introduction states the central problem and sets out the framework for the presentation, yet it lacks an overview of overall structure or has other significant ambiguities, gaps or inconsistencies on several key points;</li> <li>Information presented is hard to follow due to inconsistency, ambiguity, or significant</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>gaps or errors;</li> <li>Terminology used is poorly explained, or has occasional inconsistencies or ambiguities;</li> <li>Primary and secondary sources covered are often not relevant to the points made;</li> <li>Points made are minimally adequate and frequently do not reflect their relative importance to the overall project.</li> </ul>
	Content and academic merit:	<ul> <li>Presentation explains reasons for choosing the problem selected for the capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application only in very generic terms prompting follow up questions;</li> <li>Justification of comparative case studies is inconsistent or contradictory on several points;</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Presentation identifies only a few relevant accounts in the literature, but does not cover them to a sufficient depth or degree;</li> <li>Several relevant primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;</li> <li>Presentation contains basic and relevant data and information, with regular and significant gaps or errors that effect the overall conclusions of the project negatively;</li> <li>Presentation demonstrates basic minimal knowledge of the specific issues covered by the capstone project, with notable gaps and errors.</li> </ul>
	Conclusions and results:	<ul> <li>Conclusions of the presentation are mostly not related to the material presented.</li> <li>Hardly any "take-away" message can be identified.</li> <li>Recommendations made by the presenter are overly generic, not relevant to the overall project, or inconsistent on multiple points.</li> </ul>
	Presentation skills:	<ul> <li>Speaker is often unclear or very difficult to understand;</li> <li>If slides are used, presenter relies on them heavily, with reading them out, or presentation significantly departs from the slides or slides get in the way of getting the speaker's message across;</li> <li>Language used is marked by limited vocabulary, heavy with regular errors, filler words ("umm," "like," etc.) or informalities that make it difficult to follow the speaker at times; skills often prevent presenter from bringing messages across.</li> <li>Little or no eye contact with audience.</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Presentation had to be interrupted due to an excess of more 25% of the time limit, or speaker manages to observe time limit with cutting the presentation short without reaching a conclusion.</li> </ul>
	Interaction:	<ul> <li>The presenter is not able to respond to questions adequately on several minor points or on a few key points,</li> <li>Responses are often basic, or contain errors, gaps or inconsistencies that affect the audience's appreciation of the project;</li> <li>On several key points the speaker finds it challenging to express disagreement in a professional manner due to lack of access to relevant, up-to-date or accurate information.</li> </ul>

F	Organization	• Introduction does not address the background and importance of the capstone
	and structure:	project (not limited to the capstone thesis);
		• Introduction fails to state the central problem, does not set out the framework for the
		presentation, lacks an overview of overall structure or has other fundamental errors,
		gaps or uncertainties on several key points;
		<ul> <li>Information presented is incoherent to the point that the presentation cannot be followed;</li> </ul>
		• Terminology used is not explained, or has fundamental flaws or inconsistencies;
		• Primary and secondary sources covered are mostly not relevant to the points made;
		- Points made do not reflect their relative importance to the overall project.
	Content and	Presentation fails to explain reasons for choosing the problem selected for the
	academic	capstone project, for the selected methodology and its application in a meaningful
	merit:	way;
		• Justification of comparative case studies is fundamentally inconsistent or completely
		lacking;
		• Even if presentation identifies a few relevant accounts in the literature, it fails to cover
		them to a meaningful depth or degree;
		Key primary or secondary sources are missing or not treated to adequate depth or degree;
		Presentation contains basic data and information, with fundamental gaps or errors;
		- Presentation does not demonstrate basic knowledge of the specific issues covered by
		the capstone project.
	Conclusions	No meaningful conclusion is offered or can be discerned.
	and results:	Recommendations made by the presenter are overly generic, not relevant to the
		overall project or fundamentally flawed,
	Presentation	Speaker is incoherent for extended stretches of the presentation;
	skills:	• If slides are used, presenter has difficulty keeping track or even reading them out;
		• Language used is marked by limited vocabulary, heavy with regular errors, to the point
		of being impossible to follow or understand;
		• Little or no eye contact with audience.
		Presentation had to be interrupted as audience could not follow or comprehend
		speaker
	Interaction:	The presenter is unable to respond to questions in an intelligible manner

# **Further explanation:**

# Criteria on theoretical framework for final submissions:

- top grade: relevant theories reflected upon and deep knowledge shown
- middle grade: major relevant theories reflected upon (with minor flaws or gaps in presentation), plus good understanding of essential concepts shown (with occasional or minor gaps of errors) [compared to the top grade in the middle grade you find occasional flaws and gaps, but a thesis on this level will still discuss all theoretical components which are relevant to the analysis]
- bottom grade: satisfactory / adequate presentation of theories, some of which are relevant, plus an
  indication of essential concepts [compared to the middle grade a thesis on this level presents essential
  theories and concepts but not all the relevant ones, plus it does not go beyond the description of these
  concepts and does not apply these concepts for the analysis
- failed thesis: fundamental errors in / failure to present any theoretical framework [a thesis like this does not even attempt to present an adequate theoretical framework, or does not present one at all just jumps to describing national or regional situations]

# Criteria for language in the box on analysis for final submissions:

- top grade: confidently and maturely written text [text written in fluent or close to fluent, idiomatic English with only minor grammar mistakes, if any at all]
- middle grade: well written text [compared to the top grade, a thesis of this kind will be written in good quality English, with some grammar mistakes typical of non-native speakers (missing articles, at times mismatched tenses, a few sentences which are difficult to follow. To put differently: mistakes in the text will not prevent the reader from following the author's line of thought, despite some grammar mistakes.]
- bottom grade: adequate written text [compared to the middle grade, this is a text with heavy grammar mistakes which reach a level where at many times it is difficult to follow the author's train of thought. Text like this will have more than a few sentences without verbs, or long sentences where the subject disappears by the end. In text like this sometimes it is difficult to reconstruct the chronology of events in a case, or tell dissenting and majority opinions on a court apart. Please note that something less than adequate would be difficult to accept as a successful thesis.]
- failed thesis: a poorly written, unreadable text [compared to the bottom grade, a failed thesis is written in a manner where the reader cannot make sense of the text most of the time]

# APPENDIX IV: DEGREE REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTGRADUATE SPECIALIZATION PROGRAMS REGISTERED IN HUNGARY

## **Comparative Constitutional Studies Postgraduate Program**

(1 year, 60 ECTS credits)

# Foundations of comparative constitutional studies: 20-28 credits

#### Mandatory courses

- Introduction to U.S. Constitutional Law / Renáta Uitz (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Individual Research Project Foundations of Comparative Constitutional Studies / Faculty (Fall term, 20 credits)

# Mandatory-elective courses

- French Constitutional Law and Its Influence Abroad / Mathias Möschel (Fall term, 4 credits)
- German Constitutional Law and Its Historic and Political Context / Markus Böckenförde (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Comparative Federalism: A Critical Perspective / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 4 credits)
- Constitutionalism and Rights in South and South East Asia / Arun Thiruvengadam (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe / Eszter Polgári (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Constitution-Building in Africa / Markus Böckenförde, Gedion Hessebon (Fall, Winter terms, 4 credits)
- Constitutional Adjudication and the Rule of Law/ Renáta Uitz (Fall term, 4 credits)
- International Rule of Law Assistance: Law and Development / Markus Böckenförde (Spring term, 4 credits)

### Elective courses

- EU Law I / Petra Bárd (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Jean Monnet Module on European Integration / Marie-Pierre Granger (Fall Term, 8 credits)
- EU Law II / Jessica Lawrence (Winter term, 2 credits)

# Protection of Fundamental Rights: 12 – 20 credits

# **Mandatory courses**

Great Books Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 8 credits)

#### Mandatory-elective courses

- Freedom of Expression / András Sajó (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Political Rights in Comparative Perspective / Daniel Smilov (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Comparative Freedom of Religion / Cole Durham, Brett Scharffs (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Freedom of Religion Advanced / Cole Durham (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Freedom of Assembly / Michael Hamilton (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Comparative Equality / Michel Rosenfeld (Spring term, 2 credits)
- European Anti-Discrimination Law / Mathias Möschel (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe / Mathias Möschel, Angéla Kóczé (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Socio-Economic Rights / András Sajó (Spring term, 4 credits)

#### Elective courses

Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR Standard / Eszter Polgári (Fall, Winter terms, 6 credits)

- Clinical Course / Károly Bárd (Fall Winter terms, 6 credits)
- Courts in Dialogue / András Sajó (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Human Rights and Criminal Justice / Károly Bárd (Fall term, 4 credits)
- EU Criminal Justice / Petra Bárd (Winter term, 2 credits)

## Theoretical dimensions of comparative constitutional studies: 8-12 credits

#### Mandatory courses

- Reading Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 6 credits)
- Visiting Professors' Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 4 credits)

# Mandatory-elective courses

- Illiberal Democracy / András Sajó (Winter term, 4 credits)
- Workshop on Illiberal Democracy: The Rule of Law as Fake / András Sajó (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Europe: Transnational Constitutional Identity / Susanna Mancini (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept / Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 2 credits)

# Elective courses

- Theory of Fundamental Rights / Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Philosophy of Law / Katalin Farkas (Winter term, 4 credits)

# Comparative constitutional methods: 4-8 credits

### Mandatory courses

- Comparative Legal Research Methodology / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Constitutions at Work: Comparative Perspectives / Renáta Uitz (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Social Science Research Methods / Mathias Möschel (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Thesis Writing / CAW instructors (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Work in Progress Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 2 credits)

#### Elective courses

 Fundamentals of Documentary Filmmaking / Jeremy Braverman, Oksana Sarkisova, Maria Stanisheva (Fall term, 4 credits)

### Thesis: 8 - 12 credits

#### Mandatory courses

- Capstone Seminar / Renáta Uitz (Winter, Spring terms, 4 credits)
- Capstone Project Consultation / Faculty (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Capstone Project / Faculty (Spring term, 0 credit)
- Individual Research Project Protection of Fundamental Rights / Faculty (Spring term, 10 credits)

# Elective courses

Academic Legal Writing / CAW (2 credits)

# **Corporate Social Responsibility Postgraduate Program**

(1 year, 60 ECTS credits)

#### Foundations of international business and economic law: 20-28 credits

#### Mandatory courses

- Individual Research Project Foundations of International Business and Economic law / Faculty (Fall term, 20 credits)
- The Regulatory Environment of Business / Tibor Tajti (Fall term, 2 credits)

#### Mandatory-elective courses

- Comparative Antitrust Law / Csongor Nagy (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Comparative Bankruptcy Law / Tibor Tajti (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Comparative Private International Law Choice of Law / Markus Petsche (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Law for Small and Mid-Scale Start Up Enterprises / Tibor Tajti (Winter term, 2 credits)

# Elective courses

- Comparative Law of Sales / Howard Hunter (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Drafting and Negotiating International Contracts / Csongor Nagy (Winter term, 2 credits)
- EU Law I / Petra Bárd (Fall term, 2 credits)
- EU Law II / Jessica Lawrence (Winter term, 2 credits)
- International Economic Law /Jessica Lawrence (Spring term, 6 credits)
- Legal Essentials of the Digital Economy / Martin Husovec (Spring term, 2 credits)

#### Advanced international economic law: 12-20 credits

# **Mandatory courses**

- Reading Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 6 credits)
- Visiting Professors' Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 4 credits)

# Mandatory-elective courses

- Capital Markets and Securities Regulation / Tibor Tajti (Spring term, 6 credits)
- Corporate Governance: Acquisitions and Capital Structure / Charles Whitehead (Spring term, 2 credits)
- International Commercial Arbitration / Markus Petsche, Davor Babic, Vladimir Pavic (Fall term, 6 credits)
- International Civil Litigation / Csongor Nagy (Winter term, 2 credits)
- International Investment Law and Regulation / Markus Petsche (Winter term, 6 credits)
- Mediation / Markus Petsche (Spring term, 2 credits)
- The Legal Aspects of Corporate Finance / Tibor Tajti (Winter term, 2 credits)
- US Corporations and Partnership Law / Jessica Lawrence (Fall term, 2 credits)

#### Elective courses

- Comparative Secured Transactions / Tajti Tibor (Fall term, 6 credits)
- Compliance / Alexander Petsche (Spring term, 1 credit)
- European Company Law / Peter Behrens (Fall term, 4 credits)
- International Business Transactions / Markus Petsche (Fall term, 4 credits)
- International Tax Law / Clifton Fleming (Spring term, 2 credits)

Willem C. Vis International Commercial Arbitration Moot / Markus Petsche (Winter term, 4 credits)

# Foundations of human rights: 8-12 credits

#### Mandatory courses

Great Books Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 8 credits)

### Mandatory-elective courses

- Business and Human Rights / Jessica Lawrence (Winter term, 4 credits)
- Environmental Law and Regulation/ Jessica Lawrence (Fall term, 2 credits)
- International Economic Policy and Migration / Jessica Lawrence (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Council of Europe / Eszter Polgári / (Fall term, 4 credits)

### Elective courses

International and Comparative Intellectual Property Law / Gemma Minero Alejandre (Winter term, 2 credits)

# Methodology: 4-8 credits

#### Mandatory courses

- Anglo-American Legal Concepts/ Jessica Lawrence (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Comparative Legal Research Methodology / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Social Science Research Methods / Mathias Möschel (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Thesis Writing / CAW instructors (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Work in Progress Seminar / Faculty (Spring term, 2 credits)

#### Mandatory-elective courses

- Entrepreneurship and Innovation Clinical course / Faculty of Dept. of Economics and Business & Jessica Lawrence (Winter, Spring terms, 2 credits)
- Fundamentals of Documentary Filmmaking / Jeremy Braverman, Oksana Sarkisova, Maria Stanisheva (Fall term, 4 credits)

### Thesis: 8-12 credits

#### Mandatory courses

- Capstone Seminar / Jessica Lawrence, Markus Petsche, CAW instructors (Fall, Winter, Spring terms, 4 credits)
- Capstone Project Consultation / (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Capstone Project / (Spring term, 0 credit)
- Individual Research Project Advanced International Economic Law / Faculty (Spring term, 10 credits)

# Foundations of Human Rights Protection in Constitutional and International Law

(1 year, 60 ECTS credits)

## Foundations of human rights: 16-28 credits

# Mandatory courses

- Introduction to the Protection of Human Rights / Sejal Parmar, Eszter Polgári, Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Fall term, 6 credits)
- Introduction to Law / Eszter Polgári (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Introduction to Public International Law / Markus Böckenförde (Fall term, 2 credits)

### Mandatory-elective courses

- The UN Human Rights System / Sejal Parmar (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Human Rights Protection in the Americas Advanced/ Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Morality of Criminal Justice / Károly Bárd (Winter term, 4 credits)
- Critical Race Theory: Race and Law from the United States to Europe / Mathias Möschel, Angéla Kóczé (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Perspectives and Problematic of Human Dignity as a Legal Concept / Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Theories of Human Rights: Intercultural Perspectives / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Theory of Fundamental Rights / Matthias Mahlmann (Spring term, 2 credits)

### Elective courses

- Constitution-Building in Africa / Markus Böckenförde, Gedion Hessebon (Fall-Winter terms, 4 credits)
- Human Rights in Africa with Special Focus on Gender Issues / Victoria Nwogu (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Litigation before the Inter-American System (Moot Court Exercise) / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Persuasive Argumentation Exercise (ECHR Moot Court) / Eszter Polgári (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Europe: Transnational Constitutional Identity / Susanna Mancini (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Constitutionalism and Rights in South and South East Asia / Arun Thiruvengadam (Spring term, 2 credits)

# International and comparative analysis of select human rights: 16-24 credits

#### Mandatory-elective courses

- Bodily Integrity, Personal Autonomy and Private Life: ECHR standards / Eszter Polgári (Fall, Winter terms, 6 credits)
- Freedom of Expression / András Sajó (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Human Rights and Criminal Justice / Károly Bárd (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Indigenous Peoples' Rights under International Law / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Political Rights in Comparative Perspective / Daniel Smilov (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Comparative Freedom of Religion / Brett Scharffs, W. Cole Durham (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Freedom of Assembly/ Michael Hamilton (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Freedom of Religion Advanced / W. Cole Durham (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Socio-Economic Rights / András Sajó (Spring term, 4 credits)

# Elective courses

- International and European Refugee Law and Policy / Boldizsár Nagy (Winter term, 8 credits)
- Comparative Equality / Michel Rosenfeld (Spring term, 2 credits)
- Freedom of Expression in Practice / Sejal Parmar (Spring term, 4 credits)

### Institutional and procedural issues of enforcing human rights: 12-16 credits

## Mandatory-elective courses

- Human Rights Remedies / Jeremy McBride (Fall term, 2 credits)
- International Human Rights Advocacy / Sejal Parmar (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Illiberal Democracy / András Sajó (Winter term, 4 credits)
- The Law and Politics of Combating Violence against Women / Mathias Möschel / Andrea Krizsán (Winter term, 6 credits)
- Prosecuting Radical Evil / Károly Bárd (Winter term, 4 credits)
- European Anti-Discrimination Law / Mathias Möschel (Spring term, 4 credits)
- International Rule of Law Assistance: Law and Development / Markus Böckenförde (Spring term, 4 credits)

### Elective courses

- Equality Policies in Comparative Perspective / Andrea Krizsán, Violetta Zentai (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Clinical Course / Károly Bárd (Fall, Winter terms, 6 credits)
- EU Law I / Petra Bárd (Fall term, 2 credits)
- The Protection of Children and Victims' Rights in International and Regional Law / Károly Bárd, Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga (Fall term, 4 credits)
- Courts in Dialogue / András Sajó (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Workshop on Illiberal Democracy: The Rule of Law as Fake / András Sajó (Winter term, 2 credits)
- EU Criminal Justice / Petra Bárd (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Business and Human Rights / Jessica Lawrence (Winter term, 4 credits)
- Human Rights Internship (at least 3 weeks) / Eszter Polgári (Winter term, 2 credits)
- Law and Bioethics / Judit Sándor (Winter term, 4 credits)
- Vienna Human Rights Model United Nations / Sejal Parmar (Spring term, 2 credits)

# Methodology: 4-8 credits

#### Mandatory course

- Legal Terminology / SJD candidate (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Comparative Legal Research Methodology / Markus Böckenförde (Winter term, 2 credits)

### Mandatory-elective courses

• Archives, Evidence and Human Rights / Iván Székely, Csaba Szilágyi, András Mink (Fall, Winter terms, 6 credits)

# Elective courses

- Academic Legal Writing and Research / CAW (Fall term, 2 credits)
- Fundamentals of Documentary Filmmaking / Jeremy Braverman, Oksana Sarkisova, Maria Stanisheva (Fall term, 4 credits)

Thesis: 8-12 credits

# **Mandatory courses**

- Capstone Seminar / Oswaldo Ruiz-Chiriboga, Sejal Parmar, Eszter Polgári (Winter-Spring terms, 4 credits)
- Capstone Project Consultation / Faculty (Spring term, 4 credits)
- Capstone Project (Spring term, 0 credits)

#### **APPENDIX V: GUIDELINES ON FINAL WRITTEN EXAMS**

#### Guidelines for computer-based, in-class exams

#### **Student Responsibilities**

- There is only one scheduled time-slot for the exam, therefore it is mandatory to attend.
- It is the responsibility of the student to be on time (as announced in the exam schedule) for the exam. It is advised to arrive 10-15 minutes earlier before the exam starts. If a student is late, the delay will be counted against total test time.
- Bring your exam login name and password.
- Review carefully exam guidelines.
- Be aware of time limits on your exams and keep track of the time.
- Bring any irregularities to the attention of the proctor immediately.
- Students are responsible to have their computers ready by the start of the exam in compliance with the following guidelines.

#### **Guidelines for in-class exams**

- In-class exams take place at one of the CEU Computer Labs; exam schedule is available one week before the exam week at the departmental website and the notice board
- Login with your login name (such as: legalexam01) and password (such as: asdfg). (Login names and passwords will be sent by the Program Coordinator.
- Open the word document from the Start menu at the bottom of the screen and go to *File/Save as...* save your work to the **P** drive (the name of the P drive is the login name, in this case LEGALEXAM01...) The exam should be saved under the student's **ID number**!!)
- Insert a header row containing <u>only</u> **ID number** and the **name of the course** as well as **page numbers** in the footer (**INSERT/ Header**) & (**INSERT/ Page numbers**).
- The proctor is going to distribute the exam questions and indicate when the exam can be started.
- Save your work in regular time intervals and also set *File/ Options/Save/Save Auto Recover Information* every: 1 minute
- When the exam is over save your exam and close the document. After that go the proctor and sign the attendance sheet.
- Closed-book exams: During the exam you are not allowed to use any auxiliary document.
- Open/restricted open-book exams: During the exam you can use the course materials/readers/your notes taken in class. Please make sure to print out - before the exam - all the materials you might need in case of an open-book exam.

Please note that there is no internet access during the exam and the use of electronic devices such as smart phones, laptops, flash drives, hard disk, soft disk etc. are NOT allowed, either.

#### **Guidelines for hand-written exams**

Handwritten in-class exams must be retyped right after the given exam. If a student has two exams in one day, both exams have to be retyped right after the end of the second exam. Both the handwritten and the typed versions are submitted to the Department for comparison. Only spelling corrections are permitted. Any other change amounts to academic dishonesty (for reference see also: CEU Code of Ethics). After the exam the Proctor will make a copy of the exam, keeps the original and hands the copy to the student for retyping.

Here's what you should observe when **retyping the exam**:

- Insert a header line where you write your ID number (no names please) and the name of the course and also insert page numbers.

- Retyping means writing down the exact same text that can be found on your handwritten exam paper. The **ONLY adjustments you can make** is correction of spelling mistakes as well as write words in full length whenever you use abbreviations in the handwritten text. Do not change word order and do not exchange words (not even slight modifications like "however" instead of "but"). Of course you need not to retype words/sentences which you crossed out on the handwritten version, and things that you inserted later and wrote at the bottom of the page can be inserted where they belong.

Please note: The authenticity of the typed version will be certified before grading. Any discrepancies between the handwritten original and the retyped version beyond the correction of spelling mistakes will result in an automatic fail.

# **Guidelines for take home exams:**

In case of the take home exams, if it is not instructed otherwise by the course Instructor, the submitted document shall contain the student's ID number only. The take home exams have to be submitted to the relevant assignment folder of the course's e-learning site.