Attachment B

RULES ON THE ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

(Exams, Papers and Critical Summaries, Internships)

Adopted at the AC Meeting in Trento, 20/09/2006

As amended at the AC Meeting in Trento, 20/09/2010

*** *** ***

SECTION I - General Provisions

Article 1 - Purpose

These Rules of Procedure for Exams implement and supplement the Regulation of the '*Joint European Master in Comparative Local Development* (CoDe)*'*, which forms the legal basis for this Master Programme jointly established by the Università degli Studi di Trento, the Universität Regensburg, the Corvinus University Budapest and the University of Ljubljana.

Article 2 - Exams

2.1 The Joint European Master exam system is based on three Papers (**Papers 1-2-3**) on subjects of the Pre-Programme, two papers (**Papers 4-5,** i.e. "critical summaries") on topics of the lectures, one written exam assessing the Pre-programme (**Exam 1**), two written exams (**Exams 2-3**) on the content of the single courses, one written exam (**Exam 4**) on the content of the whole programme two language exams (**Language 1-2**), an Internship and a **Project Work.** All these elements for the overall and final assessment are compulsory and need to be successfully passed in order to graduate from the Joint European Master Programme.

2.2 Three Papers have to be written during the Pre-programme; Exam 1 takes place after the conclusion of the Pre-programme. The exams take place, as far as possible, during the three terms.

2.3 The order of the papers and exams shall be the following:

Pre-Programme	**Papers 1-2-3** (one in each discipline) on a topic regarding the readings, assigned by the coordinators, up to 3500 words.
1st term	**Exam 1** (written exam) about the contents of the Pre-programme, to be held in the first two weeks of the 1st term. **Paper 4** (1st critical summary) based on a topic referring to a lecture and aspects relevant to the participant's own context; up to 3500 words and due three weeks after the end of the term. **1st language exam.** Anticipated second chance: first possibility to re-sit or sit for the first time Exam 1.
2nd term	**Exam 2** (written exam) about the contents of the courses of the 1st term, to be held in the first week of the 2nd term. **Paper 5** (2nd critical summary) based on a topic referring to a lecture and aspects relevant to the participant's own context; up to 3500 words and due three weeks after the end of the term. Anticipated second chance: first possibility to re-sit or sit for the first time Exam 2.
3rd term	**Exam 3** (written exam) about the contents of the courses of the 2nd term.

	2nd language exam
	Exam 4 (written exam) Final Exam about the contents of the whole programme.
	Anticipated second chance: first possibility to re-sit or sit for the first time Exam 3.
Second Sitting	
	Exam 1 Exam 2 Exam 3 Exam 4
	Language exam 1 Language exam 2
	will be held at the latest in **January/February** at a Partner University in the weeks before the Project Work discussion / interactive evaluation.

Article 3 - Disqualification

3.1 During the exams the participants are not allowed to contact each other or anybody else by whatever means.

3.2 Non-observance of this prohibition may lead to the student's immediate disqualification from the exam; in severe cases and upon decision by the Academic Committee having heard the student, the disqualified student might not receive the Joint Master degree. If repeated may lead to suspension of scholarship.

Article 4 - Authorized Documents

4.1 Participants will be informed ahead of exams about documents whose use is authorized.

4.2 The use of dictionaries is authorized for these written exams.

4.3 Participants will be informed two weeks ahead of Language Exams 1-2 about documents whose use is authorized. The use of dictionaries is not authorized for these written exams.

Article 5 - Questions to the Tutor

5.1 All written exams are monitored by a Tutor. Any kind of procedural questions can be addressed to the Tutor who will answer them.

5.2 The Tutor is not in a position to answer any substantial question. Any substantial question has to be dealt with by the participants.

5.3 The participants are required to respect the instructions of the Tutor.

Article 6 - Failure in and Missing (an) Exam(s)

6.1 The Participant is requested to take the exam again if one or more discipline area (economics, sociology or law) of the Exam is not sufficient (< 4.25). Participants who fail or miss one or more written exams (Exams 1-4) in the First chance which they were entitled to sit under the above

conditions (Article 2), may re-sit this/these exam/s in a Second Chance during the academic year. Participants who fail an Exam will not be granted the credits associated to that Exam.

6.2 Participants who do not succeed, for whatever reason, in the second sitting, who fail, miss or do not submit within the deadline one or more of the other exams/papers will receive a certificate of attendance rather than the Master Degree.

Article 7 – Attendance

7.1 According to art. 11 of the CoDe regulation, attendance of all components of the programme is compulsory; all absences must be justified. Attendance of at least 80 per cent of CoDe programme is required for graduation.

7.2 Absences amounting to more that 10 per cent of the total number of hours scheduled for course activities (lectures, laboratories, language course, internship) may entail the full or partial withdrawal of the scholarship, according to the criteria set out in the regulations. The decision is taken by the Academic Committee

7.3. Upon request, a dispensation from the attendance requirement can be granted for a minor part of the Programme, at discretion of the Academic Committee. Such requests for attendance dispensation shall be addressed to the Academic Director, who, after consultation with the Academic Committee can grant dispensation if the request is found to be motivated by a sufficiently important reason (e.g., unforeseen work-related commitments certified by the employer, health problems certified by a doctor or family problems, etc.). Except in the case of a medical emergency, which has arisen suddenly: 1) the request has to be made at least two weeks before the start of the Term for which dispensation is requested and 2) the student is requested to submit to the Executive Director evidence that she/he has actually taken part in the agreed activity and a short report.

Article 8 – Final Evaluation

8.1 The final evaluation issued by the Academic Committee at the end of the Course takes account of the student's proficiency not only in the exams, but in all activities.

8.2 The evaluation scheme for the final grade is as follows:[1]

- 20% based on papers (1-2-3, referred to Pre-Programme) and critical summaries (4-5);
- 30% based on examinations (Exams 2-3-4);
- 30% based on project work[2];
- 10% based on active participation, discussion groups (incl. Exam 1);
- 10% based on internship;

8.3 "Active participation" comprises regular and continuous attendance, punctuality, active intervention and correct behaviour in class. The evaluation of the "discussion groups" is based on the presentations given by the single participants as well as on their active intervention in the discussion, while the evaluation of "on-line activities" is based on the results of Exam 1.

8.4 At the end of each term, the Area Coordinators, following consultation with the lecturers and tutors who have collaborated on the respective course or activity, and considering the results of the language course, provide each participant, individually and with due respect for privacy, with an

---

[1] A standard "evaluation form" is kept for each participant.
[2] The PW evaluation is weighted as follows: 40% proposed grade by Supervisor; 40% proposed grade by Referee; 20% by PW defence commission.

interim assessment,[3] i.e. an evaluation and discussion of all results achieved so far, so that she or he may evaluate her/his progress.

8.5   The deferment of the graduation to the following year will be charged to the students. The deferment of one year will cost 10% of tuition fees. Students will not be granted more than 1 additional year for completing the programme.

SECTION II - Special Provisions

Article 9 - Special provisions for papers and critical summaries

9.1   Both papers and critical summaries, shall be of max. 3500 words (bibliography and notes not included) and shall treat in a presentable and readable manner topics which were presented during the pre-programme (Paper 1-2-3) or in a lecture (Papers 4-5, i.e. critical summaries), the latter discussing also aspects relevant to the student's context.

9.2   Both papers and critical summaries, are required to comply with general scientific standards and in particular as concerns the style, forms and layout with the Rules on Project Work (see Attachment C). Participants whose Preprogramme Paper (Papers 1-2-3) or Critical Summary is graded as "insufficient" must submit a new paper. If the paper is graded as "sufficient" participants will be granted the related ECTS credits.

9.3   Participants who have been found, for the first time, to plagiarize in their paper or critical summary or whose submissions are found to suffer from other severe irregularities will have to elaborate a new paper or critical summary, for which a penalty of a lower mark, up to one point, will apply. The respective decision is taken jointly by the Supervisor and the Academic Director. Further cases of plagiarism or other severe irregularities might lead to termination of the scholarship, disqualification and denial of the Joint Master degree upon decision by the Academic Committee, having heard also the student.

9.4   Papers or critical summaries which are not handed or sent in within the fixed deadlines - without justification and prior acceptance by Academic Director – will have the evaluation increased by 0.1 point for each day of delay.

Article 10 - Special provisions for written exams

10.1   All written exams (Exams 1-3) last 180 minutes each. Each exam will cover the contents of the Pre-programme (Exam 1) or issues related to the courses of the previous term (Exams 2, 3) or issues related to the whole programme (Exam 4). The methodology of each exam can vary and involve the following elements (or a combination thereof):

- Short questions
- A topic for a short essay
- Multiple choice
- A practical case

10.2   Short questions will verify the participants' ability to respond in a swift and concise way to questions which address central issues raised in the lectures.

---

[3] Thus, it is the sum of all marks for a term and a colloquium with the participant.

10.3 Questions can also be broader in nature or more specific and resemble a topic for an essay in order to test the capacity of the participants to treat a question/topic in a logical and critical manner within a limited time frame.

10.4 A number of questions with multiple choice-answers can cover a wide range of the contents of the lectures in order to test the participants' overall knowledge.

10.5 A practical case requires and tests the ability of the participants to analyse, critically assess and solve a given 'real' case, in the subject area of the exam.

10.6 Participants will be informed about the documents whose use is authorized during the exams.

Article 11 - Special provisions for internships

The student's active participation during his internship is evaluated on the basis of a short report written by the student (max. 2 pages) as well as by the standard evaluation form filled in by the tutor of the student in the organisation offering the internship.

SECTION III - Final provisions

Article 12- Marks/Grading

12.1 All exams will be graded on a scale ranging from "1 – excellent" to "5 – insufficient" (see table 1). The scale is as follows:

- **1 …** '**excellent**' (is reserved for work that reflects careful reading of and reflection on the assigned readings. It must be factually accurate, clearly written, and offer an original and persuasive argument. There is no place for mistakes of spelling, grammar and style)

- **2 …** '**good**' (for work that reflects a sound understanding of the assigned readings, and its factually accurate, generally well written – with only a modest number of grammatical errors – and persuasively argued)

- **3 …** '**fair**' (for good knowledge with some deficiencies, for work that reflects competent, if superficial reading of and reflection on the assigned readings, and/or is readable but lacks in clarity and/or contains numerous spelling, grammar, style errors, and/or makes a weak argument)

- **4 …** '**sufficient**' (for sufficient knowledge of the topic, with imprecise answers or presentation or with deficiencies, it's for work that reflects a minimal effort put into reading of assigned materials and/or writing of the assignment); very bad spelling, grammar and style errors would also cause this evaluation

- **5 …** '**insufficient**' (for insufficient knowledge with major deficiencies and errors, or work that fails completely to meet any required criteria, including that of a reasonably correct (understandable) use of the English language, is egregiously late and unexcused, or violates any rule of conduct of the Joint Master)

12.2 In order to pass an exam it is necessary to obtain at least a mark of 'sufficient' in each discipline area.

12.3 Participants who have passed all exams successfully will graduate with the mention according to the following table:

- Case $\geq 3,66$ = Not admitted

- Case 3,65 to 2,34 = Probatus

- Case 2,35 to 1,8 = Cum Laude

- Case 1,79 to 1,4 = Magna Cum Laude

- Case 1,39 to 1 = Summa Cum Laude

Article 13 - Incompatibility/Accusation

Lecturers who are nominated to correct exams/serve as tutors, co-readers or third readers whose complete impartiality is doubtful for whatever reason, shall recuse themselves and shall be replaced by a lecturer who will be nominated by the Academic Director.

Article 14 - Complaints

Complaints about the implementation of the exams as well as any decision taken in this context shall be addressed to the Academic Director.

Article 15 – Access to Documentation regarding Participants' Assessment

Upon written request, participants will have access to documentation regarding exams and Project Work. The documentation is archived at the University of Trento.

TABLE 1

1	**Excellent**
1.25	Excellent with minor deficiencies
1.5	Very good
1.75	Very good with minor deficiencies
2	**Good**
2.25	Good with minor deficiencies
2.5	Good with problems or lack/sufficient clarity on particular issues
2.75	Fair with some good hints or good contributions
3	**Fair**
3.25	Fair with minor deficiencies
3.5	More than sufficient with some good ideas or contributions
3.75	More than sufficient with some fair parts or contributions
4	**Sufficient**
4.25	Sufficient with minor deficiencies
4.5	**Insufficient** with some potentially interesting but undeveloped ideas
4.75	**Insufficient** with grossly drafted potentiality
5	**Insufficient**

ATTACHMENT C

RULES ON PROJECT WORK

*** *** ***

Article 1 – General Principles
1.1 The Project Work is required to comply with general scientific standards, written individually and independently by the participants and in compliance with the present Rules on Project Work.

Article 2 – Topic, Approach, Length, Joint Work
2.1 Each participant develops the Project Work on the topic presented in the application form, provided it is a part of the subjects of the Master programme. Changes in the topic have to be approved by the Academic Director upon prior consultation with the supervisor, and if necessary, by the Area Coordinators/Academic Committee.

2.2 The approach may be either theoretical or applied (or a combination of both).

2.3 The length of a Project Work should be approximately between 50 and 80 pages including footnotes (approximately 15,000-23,000 words), depending on the subject.

2.4 A Project Work can be elaborated and written jointly by (maximum) two participants. The text can be twice as long as for an individual work.

Article 3 –Supervisor and Co-reader

3.1 Each lecturer teaching in the program may serve as a supervisor who will advise participants and assess and grade the final version of the Project Work.

3.2 The nomination of supervisors is subject to approval by the Academic Committee.

3.3 Each Project Work will be evaluated by a second lecturer, usually from a different Partner University. This co-reader, who might be proposed by the supervisor, will be appointed by the Academic Director; his/her role is to assign a second grade on the Project Work.

Article 4 - Deadlines

4.1   The following deadlines are established for the elaboration of the Project Work. A precise timetable will be published every year in the Call for Application:

- The Academic Director will communicate the dates for Project Work Presentations (tentatively during the Pre-programme). Participants may want to use Power Point.

- **Mid March**: finalisation of the detailed synopsis of the Project Work as required by the supervisor and discuss it with the supervisor.

- **End of May:** writing of the first substantial draft of the Project Work and handing it in to the supervisor.

- **End of September**: handing in the elaborated version of the substantial draft to the supervisor. This version is to be considered the pre-final version.

- **End of December:** sending of the **final draft** of the Project Work to the supervisor and the Executive Director.

- **20th of February of the following year**: handing in of the re-elaborated or corrected version, according to the comments by the supervisor. This final version will be the basis for the evaluation as well as for a publication on the website and any presentation by the participant.

Project Works which are not submitted in within the above mentioned deadlines - without justification and prior acceptance by Academic Director – will have the evaluation increased by 0.1 point for each day of delay.

4.2   If indicated in the Call for Applications, participants have to defend their Project Work in a colloquium in front of a commission of at least three members. During the colloquium, the participant shall illustrate and discuss the essential hypotheses and findings of her/his Project Work. The evaluation of the colloquium is part of the Project Work final evaluation.

Article 5 - Submission

5.1   The draft and final versions of the Project Work must be sent in electronic form (in ".doc" format, as an attachment to an e-mail message) to the supervisor and the Master office (**master-code@unitn.it**) respectively by December 31st and February 20th.

5.2   The final version of the Project Work has to be accompanied by a declaration in which the participant states that he/she wrote it independently and in compliance with the present rules. In case of a Project Work elaborated and written jointly by (maximum) two participants, the exact contribution of each participant shall be clarified, declared and signed by the participants.

5.3   Upon decision of the Academic Committee, a Project Work and/or the related abstract can be published on the website. In this case, the participant declares his/her agreement in written form.

Article 6 - Grading

6.1   Provided that both grades, supervisor and second supervisor, are positive (at least 'sufficient' as defined under 12 of Attachment B – Assessment of Participants) the average of the two will be the final grade for the Master Project Work.

6.2   If one of the two grades is negative, the Academic Director shall nominate a third lecturer (third reader) who will give a third grade. The average of the three will give the final grade.

Article 7 – Failure, Plagiarism, Respect of Deadlines

7.1 Participants whose Master Project Works fails approbation (does not receive a final grade of at least 'sufficient' as defined under Article 12 of Attachment B – Assessment of Participants) will have the chance to choose a new topic and to hand in their Project Works in the next academic year (in such a case all exam marks will be kept) or accept to receive only a certificate of attendance.

7.2 Participants who have been found to plagiarize in their Project Work or whose submissions are found to suffer from other irregularities will be subject to disqualification from the Master Programme with regard to the issuance of the Joint Master Degree.

7.3 Participants whose Master Project Work is not completed within the fixed deadlines will have the chance to complete it in the following months, prior agreement with the supervisor and the acceptance of the Academic Director. The defence of the Project Work – if foreseen – will be held in the following academic year, together with the participants of the following CoDe edition. Unjustified failure to respect the deadlines may lead to a lower mark as decided jointly by the Supervisor and the Academic Director, and, in severe cases and upon decision by the Academic Committee having heard also the student, to disqualification and denial of the Joint Master degree.

Article 8 - Guidelines for Papers and Critical Summaries

The Guidelines "How to write a Project Work" (Appendix 1) illustrate the details of elaboration of a Project Work. They also apply to the drafting of papers and critical summaries.

Trento, October 9th, 2008

The Academic Committee

APPENDIX 1

Guidelines "How to write a Project Work"

1. Steps and suggestions

- Since participants have already chosen a topic that fits into the framework of the Master program, they should gain, as early as possible, additional knowledge about the problem, its background and possible solutions by consulting experts, studying reports and other specialised literature, including theoretical literature. Students should also check the presentation of the Master Program (and the syllabus) to assess to what extent lectures can contribute to the solution of the problem.

- Participants should define their general aims, final goals and precise objectives concerning the particular topic of the choice (what they intend to say and/or find out and/or propose with the Project Work) and formulate their hypotheses as precisely as possible. Participants should not be afraid of being speculative.

- Participants should choose and describe the basic methods of research and analytical instruments (e.g., theoretical knowledge and references, statistical data, surveys, interviews, the results of other studies, different kinds of information) for studying and developing the topic. In any case, mentioning their sources of evidence in both the main text and in a final general list of references. Participants should do their best to show the plausibility of their hypotheses (both about the problem and the solutions) and provide evidence in a way that is comprehensible and convincing to their readers.

- In case the goal is to elaborate a project that could or should be implemented "in the field", participants should make sure to identify operational consequences or suggest possible operational implications of their study and conclusions. In case the project is purely theoretical, try to indicate operational conclusions where possible.

- Continuous consultation with the supervisor and fellow students who work on similar or complementary topics is of the utmost importance for the progress of the work. For an efficient and productive communication with the supervisor it is essential that the questions participants put to him/her are as specific and precise as possible. That means that participants have to prepare their questions carefully, using whatever knowledge they can gather, according to the principle that "a question well posed is half the answer".

- Participants should start writing at a very early stage. A written text, no matter how imperfect, provides a basis for discussion and improvement, whereas ideas that are not written down tend to remain vague.

2. Structure of the Project Work

The overall structure of the Project Work should be as follows:

- Front page including the name of the Master program, the academic year, your name, the title and subtitle, the name of your supervisor, up to five keywords and (optional) classification numbers according to a major international system (such as that of the Journal of Economic Literature for a Project Work in economics).

- Author's CV of up to 200 words.

- Table of contents.

- List of abbreviations and acronyms used.

- List of tables and figures (photographs, drawings, diagrams and charts).

- Abstract of up to 200 words summarising the main features and conclusions of your Project Work.

- Executive summary of 2-3 pages The executive summary should present in a concise, clear and precise way: the problem you treat, the hypotheses you consider, the methods and instruments of analysis you use, your main sources of information and data, your general conclusions and possible operational consequences. Please notice that we may decide to publish your executive summary on the Master web site.

- Preface (optional) including acknowledgements.

- Introduction.

- Main text (including boxes), divided into chapters and sections. Any notes should be in the form of footnotes, consecutively numbered throughout the whole of your text. The number of footnotes should be kept to a minimum. Draw conclusions at the end of each chapter.

- Conclusions.

- Operational outcomes, if any. Distinguish between implementations (a) under way, b) agreed upon, c) planned, d) probable, e) intended, f) hoped.

- Appendices, consecutively numbered and provided with a title each.

- Bibliography in alphabetical order.

In a separate/final chapter usually the **operational consequences or implementation** of the Project Work – if any – should be illustrated, distinguishing between implementations (a) in course, (b) agreed upon with a particular organisation, (c) planned, (d) likely to be carried out, (e) intended and (f) hoped. Appendices, each with its own number and title, should follow the conclusions. The last section consists of a bibliography according to the format described in Article 11.

Participants should properly organise the elaboration of the Project Work, avoiding unclear statements and repetitions: each particular topic should be exhaustively treated in one place only, there where it fits in best. If there are references to a particular topic in a different part of the Project Work, participants should do so by mentioning the page or paragraph.

3. Length and page layout

- The length of the Project Work should be between 40 and 60 pages including footnotes (approximately 15,000-23,000 words), depending on the subject. In general, an applied and operational subject that makes extensive use of statistics or includes lengthy description requires more pages than a purely analytic or theoretical subject.

- If participants use statistics, documents, qualitative information, surveys or interviews, they should limit their use to what is actually required by the analysis and should present their data precisely and unambiguously, including a proper quotations of sources.

- All the material (statistics, documents, etc.) that are not central to the analysis but yet important for the comprehension and explanation of the subject should be put in separate text box(es) or appendix(es).

- Layout
    1. Font: Times New Roman; font size: point 12 and line spacing 1.5 for text
    2. Font size 11 and line spacing 1.2 for longer quotations
    3. Font size 10 and line spacing 1.0 for footnotes
    4. Margins:
        - 2. 54 cm top and bottom
        - 3.17 cm left and right;
        - Indent long quotations by 1 cm from the left and right margins.
- All pages should be numbered consecutively.

4. Spelling

The Project Work should be written in clear, concise, and grammatically correct English. participants are free to choose the American or the British spelling.

5. Quotations (in the text)

Quotation should be correctly and precisely done in the relevant place(s) the literature, documents, statistics and any other sources are used, listing them at the end of the Project Work.

Quotations shall always be clearly discernible and hence clearly distinguishable from personal opinion. Quotations shall be used in a logical and conclusive way, namely in order to support own arguments. Citations for quotations must always be given, by use of an appropriate footnote, as detailed in Article 12. Only use quotations in order to support, or highlight contrasts with, your own arguments.

- Use double marks for quotations, single marks for quotations within quotations.
- Quotations of more than **three** lines should be indented 1 cm from the left margin, using a smaller font.
- Omission of words or sentences in quotations should be indicated by three dots with a single space on either side of the three dots (…)..
- Please note that there is a space on either side of the three dots.
- For insertions of own text into the quotation authors should use brackets: []. These should also be used to indicate a change of lower case to upper case or *vice versa*, should the sentence structure require this:

    The Court continued by stating that "... [t]here is no suggestion in the present case that he [the father] is in any way unfit ... ."

6. References and citations

References in the text should follow the author-date format without comma. Where there are more than two authors, the name of the first author should be used, followed by et al. Publications by the same author(s) in the same year should be listed as e.g. 2004a, 2004b.

Participants should list the references in chronological order in the text and in alphabetical order at the end of the Project Work. References to publications should be as follows: Smith (1992) reported that "[t]his problem has been studied previously (e.g., Smith et al., 1969)".

Participants should make sure of the strict one-to-one correspondence between the names and years in the text and those on the list. The list of references should appear at the end of the main text (after any appendices, but before tables and legends for figures). It should be listed in alphabetical order by author's name.

Each footnote should have a full stop at the end. If more than one source is cited in a footnote, these should be separated by semicolon. References should be cited in the following form

References should appear as follows:

- **For monographs**:

  Hawawini, G. and I. Swary (1990), *Mergers and acquisitions in the U.S. banking industry: Evidence from the capital markets*, Amsterdam : North-Holland.
  Zacher, M. (1996): *Evolution and revolution in industrial economics*, 2nd ed., Budapest: Közgazdasági Könyvkiadó.

- **For contributions to collective works:**

  Brunner, K. and A.H. Meltzer (1990), Money supply. In: B.M. Friedman and F.H. Hahn, eds., Handbook of monetary economics, Vol. 1, Amsterdam: North-Holland, pp. 357-396.
  Smith, B.G. (1998): Financial problems and their solutions in the transition countries. In: Gordon, M. and Ratherford, R.K. (eds), *Approaching to the EU*. London: Macmillan, pp. 234–245.

- **For periodicals:**

  Griffiths, W. and G. Judge (1992), Testing and estimating location vectors when the error covariance matrix is unknown, Journal of Econometrics, Vol. 54, pp. 121-138.
  Hámori, J.R., B.J. Kovács and G. Szabó (1998): Felzárkózás és előretörés (Catching up and go ahead), *Közgazdasági Szemle*, No. 10, pp. 45–53.

- **Journal titles** should not be abbreviated.
  For Articles the structure of the citation is:

  Author's name, "Title of the article", Volume Number Title (Year), First Page-End Page, at Page.

  Gillespie, A. "Ideas of Human Rights in Antiquity", 17 *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* (1999), 233-58, at 244.
  William Korey, "The Unanticipated Consequences of Helsinki", 3(3) *OSCE ODIHR Bulletin* (1995), 7-14, at 14.

- **For Unpublished Theses, Reports and Papers, etc:**

Smith, J. "War Crimes in International Law", LL.M. thesis on file at the George Washington University School of Law (2000).

Norris, P. "Designing Democracies: Institutional Arrangements and System Support", paper presented at the Workshop on Confidence in Democratic Institutions in Comparative Perspective, 25-27 August 1997, Washington DC.

- **For Papers Published on Internet Sites:**

Amato G. and Judy Batt, "Minority Rights and EU Enlargement to the East, Report of the First Meeting of the Reflection Group on the Long-Term Implications of EU Enlargement: The Nature of the New Border", European University Institute, RSC Policy Paper No 98/5, September 1998, at http://www.iue.it/RSC/Amato98-PP.htm.

- For citation of **Legal Documents and Texts:**

Quotations of the law (including case-law) shall always be accompanied by references (preferably in footnotes) which shall be made according to the following guidelines. As a general rule, citations should be as precise and comprehensive as possible. Examples:

International Convention against Apartheid in Sports, adopted by General Assembly resolution 40/64 of 10 December 1985, entered into force on 3 April 1988, 1500 UNTS 161.

Convention on Cybercrime, adopted on 23 November 2001, not yet in force, ETS No. 185.

Council Directive 77/486/EEC of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers: Dir. 77/486, OJ 1977 L 199, 32-33.

HRC, Communication No. 167/1984, *Chief Bernard Ominayak and the Lubicon Lake Band v. Canada,* views of 26 March 1990, [1990] Annual Report 1, 5, para. 10.1.

HRC, Communication No. 172/1984, *S.W.M. Broeks v. the Netherlands,* views of 9 April 1987, II Selected Decisions 196, 199, para. 10.1.

ECommHR, Appl. 1270/61, *Ilse Koch v. Germany,* decision of 8 March 1962, 126.

ECtHR, *Ireland v. the United Kingdom,* judgment of 18 January 1978, para. 122.

ECJ, case C-281/98, *Angonese v. Cassa di Risparmio di Bolzano SpA,* judgment of 6 June 2000, [2000] ECR 4139.

- **Tables**. Each table, bearing a title, should be self-explanatory. They should be mentioned in the text, numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals and have a title and its source should be given.

- **Figures** should be submitted electronically in CDR files (drawings) and TIFF or PCX file (photographs). All figures (photographs, drawings, diagrams and charts) should be numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals. Each figure should have a title and its source should be given.

1. Pre-programme main aims and steps

1.1 The main aim of the pre-programme is to elaborate a common ground regarding local development.

1.2 The pre-programme focuses on three areas, one per each month from October to December: law, sociology and economics. Taking into account the different backgrounds of the participants at the Master CoDe, three sets of readings will be offered in order to introduce fundamental issues and the basics of the legal, sociological and economic approaches to local development. Thus local development is analysed from legal, economic and sociological perspectives, in order to highlight some critical issues of an interdisciplinary approach.

1.3 The activities of the pre-programme are:

- methodological seminars: approx. 15-20 hours for each thematic area;

- guided-distance learning, personal studying on mandatory reading list and contacts with a tutor (note that the tutors are available for extra explanations and clarifications about problems or issues or ideas risen from the set of readings. Students are invited to contact tutors for any doubt or problem by e-mail or through the *on-line* forum. It is also possible to arrange meetings face-to-face with the tutors);

- in-class activities with a tutor (see paragraph 1.4).

1.4 Each pre-programme session will analyse 3 main issues (1 per week).

Each week, students will be required to analyse the readings and, in addition, they will be asked to prepare a presentation. In order to fulfil this task, students will be divided into groups of 5-6 persons. Each group will get one topic, which will be presented and discussed in class. The quality of the presentations and the participation in the discussion will be evaluated by the tutor.

The aim of this activity is to give the students the opportunity to reach a common level of knowledge in all thematic areas (law, sociology, economics) and to understand all subjects covered during the pre-programme, in order to facilitate the preparation of the final essay of each session (see paragraph 1.5) and of the pre-programme exam (see paragraph 1.6).

1.5 At the end of each pre-programme session a paper will have to be delivered. The last week of each session will be dedicated to the preparation of the essay according to the guidelines (see Chapter 2). During this week there will be no in-class activities and methodological seminars.

1.6 At the end of the pre-programme (approximately mid January) there will be an exam (Pre-programme Exam) based on the readings provided for the in-class activities.

2. How to write and present a pre-programme essay (Paper 1, 2 and 3)

2.1 Aims of the three pre-programme essays

The purpose of each essay is to let students recall and arrange their knowledge in a logic way so as to clarify key concepts, ideas and personal insights. At the same time each essay will guide students to understand and discuss the assessment provided by the area coordinators and the tutors.

In particular, each essay will be evaluated and assessed within the steps below:

- the knowledge of the central concepts on which the provided set of readings are based;

- the understanding of the assignments and the capability of fully and correctly answering them;

- the capability of structuring an essay in a coherent and consistent way;

- the capability of synthesizing concepts and respecting the due length;

- the capability of linking the concepts from different readings and developing an original and logical point of view;

- the capability of using specific vocabulary;

- the capability of quoting properly;

- the capability of respecting the deadlines.

2.2 Deadlines

The essays must be submitted before the following deadlines:

1. **24th of October 2010: first pre-programme essay**;

2. **21st of November 2010: second pre-programme essay;**

3. **19th of December 2010**: **third pre-programme essay.**

2.3 Submission

The three essays should be sent in ".doc" format and submitted in electronic form (as an attachment to an e-mail message) to Master CoDe (master-code@unitn.it) by the given deadlines.

2.4 Layout of the pre-programme essay

The layout of your essay should be as follows:

- Front page including the name of the Master program, the academic year, the student's name, the title, the names of the Area coordinator and of the tutor;

- Table of contents;

- List of abbreviations and acronyms used;

- List of tables and figures, if any (photographs, drawings, diagrams and charts);

- Introduction;

- Body of the text;

- Conclusion;

- Appendices, if any;

- Bibliography.

2.5 Structure of the pre-programme essay

The length of pre-programme essay should be up to 3500 words. All pages should be numbered consecutively. Font size should be 12 and line spacing 1.5 for text; font size 11 and line spacing 1.2 for longer quotations; font size 10 and line spacing 1.0 for footnotes.

As written before, the main aim of the pre-programme is to elaborate a common ground before the first term lectures. Therefore students do not need to structure the essays as a research project (hypotheses, methodology and steps of the research and objectives).

The structure of the essay should be as follows:

- Introduction to the essay;

- Body of the text (including boxes). Divide the body of your text into chapters and sections; divide each session into paragraphs; develop one concept in each paragraph;

- Any notes should be in the form of footnotes, consecutively numbered throughout the whole of your text. The number of footnotes should be kept to minimum;

- Conclusion;

- Appendices, if any, consecutively numbered and provided with a title each;

- Bibliography in alphabetical order.

2.6 Writing skills

- A correct use of written English (grammar and syntax) is particularly important for a formal paper. An essay should be written in clear, concise, and grammatically correct English. Students are free to choose American or British spelling;

- Specific vocabulary should be used;

- As written above, the essay should be divided in three main parts: the introduction, the body of the text and the conclusion.

- The introduction is a paragraph or a section in which students present in brief the key concepts and the structure of your essay. A good introduction provides a brief but challenging overview of the essay, letting the reader understand the topic, the logic and the organization of the essay.

- In the main text students should present ideas, concepts and statements in a coherent and consistent way with the assignment, letting the reader easily understand the development of the text. Every concept in the introduction should be developed in the body of the text and, conversely, each concept developed in the text should be mentioned in the introduction. Supportive arguments to students ideas, pros and cons should be included.

- The conclusion should summarize the key concepts developed in the text and it should make the student's personal concluding statements, demonstrating that the essay is consistent with the assignment and that the purpose of the writing is achieved;

- Every section should be divided into paragraphs. Each paragraph should deal with one topic, which should be introduced by a topic sentence and then developed in a coherent and logic way.

2.7 Quotations and references

Quotations are important in academic writing for a variety of reasons. Quotations should be used to:

- providing arguments for and against students' statements
- make the reader aware of the state of the art
- demonstrate the quality of students' analysis

Plagiarism is an academic crime and consequently students must keep the greatest attention in providing all the references and in quoting properly, precisely and correctly.

Quotations should always be clearly discernible and hence clearly distinguishable from student personal opinions or conclusions. Only use quotations in order to support, or highlight contrasts with, your own arguments. Use double quotation marks for quotations, single quotation marks for quotations within quotations. Quotations of more than five lines should be indented 1 cm from the left margin, using a smaller font (set off quotations). Omission of words or sentences in quotations should be indicated by three dots with a single space on either side of the three dots (…). For insertions of own text – including a change of lower case to upper case or vice versa - within the quotation use brackets: [ ].

References in the text should follow the author-date format without comma. Where there are more than two authors, the name of the first author should be used, followed by et al. Publications by the same author(s) in the same year should be listed as e.g. 2004a, 2004b. List the references in chronological order in the text and in alphabetical order at the end of the Essay. References to publications should be as follows: Smith (1992) reported that "[t]his problem has been studied previously (e.g., Smith et al., 1969)".

There must be a strict one-to-one correspondence between the names and years in the text and those on the list. The list of references should appear at the end of the main text (after any appendices, but before tables and legends for figures). It should be listed in alphabetical order by author's name. References should appear as follows:

For **monographs**:

Hawawini, G. and I. Swary (1990), Mergers and acquisitions in the U.S. banking industry: Evidence from the capital markets, Amsterdam : North-Holland.

Zacher, M. (1996): Evolution and revolution in industrial economics, 2nd ed., Budapest: Közgazdasági Könyvkiadó.

For contributions to collective works:

Brunner, K. and A.H. Meltzer (1990), Money supply. In: B.M. Friedman and F.H. Hahn, eds., Handbook of monetary economics, Vol. 1, Amsterdam: North-Holland, pp. 357-396.

Smith, B.G. (1998): Financial problems and their solutions in the transition countries. In: Gordon, M. and Ratherford, R.K. (eds), Approaching to the EU. London: Macmillan, pp. 234–245.

For **periodicals**:

Griffiths, W. and G. Judge (1992), Testing and estimating location vectors when the error covariance matrix is unknown, Journal of Econometrics, Vol. 54, pp. 121-138.

Hámori, J.R., B.J. Kovács and G. Szabó (1998): Felzárkózás és előretörés (Catching up and go ahead), Közgazdasági Szemle, No. 10, pp. 45–53.

Journal titles should not be abbreviated.

Tables, if any. Each table, bearing a title, should be self-explanatory. They should be mentioned in the text, numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals and have a title.

Figures, if any. Figures should be submitted electronically in CDR files (drawings) and TIFF or PCX file (photographs). All figures (photographs, drawings, diagrams and charts) should be numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals. Each figure should have a title.

2.8 Suggestions

- It is crucial to have a clear understanding of what is being asked in your assignment and therefore keep the essay focused on that topic. Coherence and consistency will constitute a relevant part of your writing;

- at the beginning of your essay define the concepts you are going to analyse. Not only a definition is a way of letting the reader understand what you are writing about, but it is also important to clarify your own ideas and consequently to avoid confusion and misunderstandings;

- respect the deadlines and the length requested.

- Consultation with the area tutor and other students is of the utmost importance for the improving of your writing skills.

- Start writing at a very early stage of the pre-programme. A written text needs time and rielaborations. The overlapping between the beginning of a pre-programme and the deadline for the submission of the essay is an opportunity to make profit of and should not interfere with the incoming pre-programmes;

- In case you make use of statistics, documents, qualitative information, surveys or interviews, present the data precisely and unambiguously and include a proper quotations of sources. Put all the material (statistics, documents, etc.) that are not central to your analysis but yet important for the comprehension and explanation of the subject in separate text box(es) or appendix(es);

- Quote correctly and precisely in the relevant place(s) the literature, documents, statistics and any other sources you use and list them at the end of the essay;

- Avoid unclear statements and repetitions: each particular topic should be exhaustively treated in one place only, there where it fits in best. If you refer to a particular topic in a different part of you essay, do so by mentioning the page or paragraph. Write clearly and in correct English.

APPENDIX 3

Guidelines "How to write a Critical Summary"

Critical summaries are short papers that students have to write at the end of the first and the second terms.

The subject of a critical summary is the topic of a lecture, laboratory, guest lecture or workshop. Critical summary is not exactly about what the lecturer said *verbatim*. Rather, it is an elaboration of the student's own ideas on the subject. The main aim of the critical summary is to consider the content of a lecture as a starting point for:

- developing further analysis and critical review of the literature;
- highlighting the multifaceted and interdisciplinary aspects of the concepts taken into consideration.

Students are welcome to try to connect different lectures.

The effort to approach the topics discussed in class from a different and/or critical perspective will be highly appreciated.

There are no restrictions in the choice of the topics of the critical summaries.

The length of a critical summary should be up to 3500 words. The format to be used for the critical summaries is the same as for the pre-programme essays. On the first page students should clearly indicate the lecture(s), laboratory, guest lecture or workshop the CS refers to (ID number and title of the lecture, name of lecturer).

Students who are not satisfied with their performance in one of the two critical summaries have the opportunity to submit a third critical summary. In case students submit three critical summaries, only the ones with the best score will be taken into consideration in the final evaluation.

APPENDIX 4

Guidelines for students

PREPROGRAMME

1. Readings
   a. The readings of each session[4] (disciplinary area) are structured in three blocks (one for each week);
   b. The readings of each session will be submitted to the students at the beginning of the session;

2. Presentations on Friday
   a. GROUPS. Students are divided into 4/5 groups. The composition of the groups is defined by the tutor in collaboration with the executive director and the area coordinator. At the beginning of each session the composition of the groups change. Within each session (3 presentations), the composition of each group remains the same.

   b. TOPIC. The tutor assigns a topics to each group at the latest on Friday (7 days before the presentation is due). The topics can focus either on a specific article or on a specific subject.

   c. SUBMISSION OF THE MATERIAL that will be used during the presentations. Any material (i.e. slides, …) must be submitted by email to the tutor the day before the presentation at 5.00 pm.

   d. TIME MANAGEMENT. Each presentation should last 20 minutes; the discussion will involve all groups and it will not last more than 20 minutes.

   e. SPEAKERS. Each group must identify 2 members who will present the group work. Within each pre-programme session, the speakers must change each week so that every member of the group presents at least once in each session.

   f. DISCUSSION – QUESTIONS. The questions during the discussion must be answered by those members of the group who have not presented.

   g. GRADING. At the end of each presentation (after the discussion) the tutor gives a preliminary feed-back to the group (based, among others, on the following criteria: focus of the presentation on the given topic, correctness of the information, time management, behaviour of the presenters, clarity of the presentation, slide lay-out). The official grade of each group is communicated to all students on Monday (3 days after the presentation), together with a comment for each group. The grade is given to the group, not to the individual student.

3. MEETINGS with students. During each pre-programme session the tutor organizes meetings with students. The area-coordinator may attend these meetings. The tutor is available for additional meetings with student(s) who wish to have ad-hoc support.

---

[4] The three sessions are: Economics (September - October), Sociology (October - November), Law (November - December).

4. PRE-PROGRAMME PAPERS. The title of the paper is communicated to the students 7 days before the deadline (the day of the last presentation of each session).

LECTURES

5. BEHAVIOUR DURING CLASSES. The use of laptop computers during any lecture is not allowed. If a student uses a laptop during class, the tutor will kindly ask him/her to turn it off.

6. ABSENCES. Students' absences during the lectures are calculated based on the following criteria:
    a. If a student arrives late but within 15 minutes after the beginning of the class no action is taken.
    b. If a student arrives from 15 to 30 minutes after the class has started, 1 hour of absence is counted.
    c. If a student arrives 30 minutes after the class has started, 2 hours of absence are calculated.
    d. In case of a 4-hour class, the above mentioned rules apply for the II part of the lecture.