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1. Literature

Books:

Miscellaneous:
- Writing guidelines (distributed at introduction)
- More articles, texts, cases and materials are distributed as seminar material during the Course.
2. **Learning and examination**

As always when studying law, reading is essential and the written word a main source of information. Try to read as much as you can in the text book already from the start of the course. The following instructions are but recommendations for how to structure the self-studies. Please note that you also need to prepare the seminars by reading the material found online. The seminar material should be published on the course web site at least one week in advance.

**Weeks 13-14: Lectures**
- The first weeks you should read P. Eeckhout: *EU External Relations Law*, Chapters 1-4; 6-10 and 12 (approximately 500 pages) and reading materials distributed during the Course.

**Week 15 (April 6-9): Seminars**
- Seminar material (see web site)
- April 10 Easter holiday

**Week 16 (April 14-17): Seminars**
- April 13: Easter holiday
- Seminar material (see web site)

**Weeks 17-18: Lectures and seminars**
- Seminar material (see web site)
- April 30: Valborg (evening)
- May 1: Bank holiday

**Week 19: Exam week**
- Self-studies
- May 7: Written exam

**Weeks 20-22: Essay**
- May 11: How to write EU-law
- May 18: Submission of the first draft
- May 21: Individual feed-back on the first draft
- May 27: Submission of the final essay

**Week 22-23: Peer-review**
- May 27: Assignment peer-review
- June 3: Submission of the peer-review
3. **Learning activities**

The course consists of two basic learning activities; 1) lectures where the structure and scope of a field of law is explained 2) seminars where you are expected to take active part in the discussions.

**Lectures**

Preferably, you read the text and material indicated in the reading instructions prior to the lectures. You are welcome to ask for clarifications and to raise additional questions at the lectures.

**ILOs:** Acquisition of an overview of the topic, identification of core questions, and ability to use the information when reasoning on the topic in a broader EU law context.

**Seminars**

Assignments and materials will be issued at the course web at least one week before the seminar. You are expected to prepare the assignment together with the peers in you seminar group. The four seminar groups will be formed after the introduction to the Course on March 27.

**ILOs:** Acquisition of deeper knowledge in the particular area of law. Ability to connect the detailed information with the overarching objectives and principles of EU law. Ability to shape own arguments and a consistent line of reasoning. Ability to present the ideas in class. Ability to work in group and develop a common ground.

The essay and peer review are formative forms of examination as they also constitute learning activities.
4. **Assessment and grading**

There are three bases for assessment and grading of knowledge and skills at the Course; (i) The written examination (ii) The essay; (iii) The review of an essay written by a peer. The bases for assessment and grading are attributed different weights when establishing the final grade at the Course:

- The written examination: 50% (May 7)
- The essay: 30% (May 27)
- The peer-review: 20% (June 3)

The percentage corresponds to the maximum score that can be obtained for each ground for assessment. Hence, you can obtain 0-50 points at the written examination, 0-30 points for the written essay; and 0-20 for the review of an essay written by a peer. All in all you can obtain 0-100 points. See appendixes 1-4 for an overview of how the learning outcomes translate into scores.

The score obtained for each assessment ground translates into a grade (A, B, C, D, E, Fx, or F). The final grade is based on the sum of all the learning outcomes as quantified in the overall score. Example: Written exam 48/50 points (Grade A); the written essay: 21/30 points (Grade C); the peer review: 17/20 points (Grade B); Total sum 21 + 17 + 48 = 86/100 (= final grade B).

In order to obtain a final grade at the Course you need to pass all three grounds for assessment (A-E). In case the result on the written exam would be Fx or F it is necessary to make a re-exam. If the essay or the peer-review measures up to Fx you need to submit a complementary work. The complemented work is graded from A-F on basis of the same criteria as the first assessment. If the grade is F, a more comprehensive work or new work must be submitted to pass. If the result at the written exam equals the grade Fx or F, you need to do the re-exam in June.

An attendance requirement must be met in order to obtain a final grade. You need to attend **80% of all lectures and seminars** in addition to attending the written exam. Exemptions can be made only in exceptional cases e.g. when a medical certificate can justify an additional absence.
5. The written examination

The written exam lasts for **five hours** and you are required to answer five questions which might be divided into sub-questions. The questions may consist of either a given problem or invite you to write a shorter essay. Each question may give 0-10 points (maximum score is 50 points).

The written examination is based on all text and materials indicated in the reading instructions and distributed online or at the learning activities throughout the Course. It is a digital exam and you will use your own lap top in accordance with further instructions. It is also an open book exam and you are allowed to use all material included in the list of literature, the material distributed during the course, dictionaries and your own notes from lectures and seminars. Don’t forget to bring the Treaties and statutory law distributed at seminars. Also bring a dictionary! Those who have written notes on their computers are allowed to bring printouts of these notes. No reference material is allowed in a digital form! No online activities are allowed.
6. **The essay**

In the course of eight weeks, from March 26 to May 7, you are expected to write an individual essay. The topic for the essay will be assigned to you at the introduction seminar and it is not freely chosen. However, exemptions can be made upon approval of your supervisor. The supervisor will be indicated in the Athena portal under “assignments”. You are encouraged to contact him as soon as possible. It is important that you get started with the essay already at the beginning of the Course. Your legal training changes gear from learning what others have said to research and develop an independent legal analysis. In the process, you will learn how to write law, including methodology, sources, and structures. Your supervisor will provide feedback.

There will be a seminar on how to write EU law. A **first draft** of the essay shall be submitted in the Athena portal under “assignments” **no later than on Monday May 18, 17.00**. The supervisor will provide feedback at an individual meeting (tutorial) preliminary scheduled for May 21 or by appointment. In case the draft is not submitted on time you are not entitled to any feedback at all. The **final essay** should be submitted in the Athena portal under “assignments” **no later than Wednesday May 27, 17.00**. In case it is not submitted on time, one point will be detracted from the score for the essay each new hour until the requirement for E is no longer met. The paper should be written in font Times New Roman, size 12; with 1½ space; and 2,5 cm margins. The text shall be based on valid legal sources in EU law and clearly stated in footnotes. As a formal requirement, the text with footnotes shall neither be shorter than 10 pages, nor exceed 15 pages. Moreover, the paper should have a front page indicating the name of the author, the title of the assignment, and the name of the supervisor. Finally, a separate bibliography where all legal sources used in the paper are clearly stated shall be added to the text. Neither the front page nor the bibliography is counted towards the page limit (10-15 pages). For further information, see writing guidelines and attend the seminar on how to write EU law.

ILOs: Knowledge in the field of writing; understanding of the applied method; analytical skills; writing skills; skills to search for materials and to use sources of law; and skills to organise an independent work in terms of time frames and labour.
7. **Peer review**

From the day of submission of the essay, you will have one week to read and comment on the essay written by a peer. The peer-review should be submitted in the Athena portal under “assignments” **no later than Wednesday June 3, 17.00**. The comments should be written in font Times New Roman, size 12; with 1½ space; and 2,5 cm margins. The peer review shall neither be shorter than two pages, nor exceed five pages. Moreover, the comments should have a front page indicating the title of the commented essay, and the names of the author and of the commentator.

The peer review shall address five aspects of the written essay: 1) Knowledge in the field of writing; 2) understanding of the applied method; 3) analytical skills; 4) writing skills; and 5) formalities. When it comes to “1) knowledge in the field of writing”, the commentator is welcome to criticise the analysis of the author and to question the conclusions drawn in the work.

The assessment and grading of the commenting on the peer’s essay is based on the following criteria: Knowledge in the field concerned, relevance, accuracy, clarity, style, cogency, and consistency.
Appendix 1: The written Exam

The criteria are weighted but not absolute. Even if it is e.g. more important to show knowledge than to master the language, the text must be comprehensible for an initiated reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Additional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 44-50</td>
<td>In all, a set of very well-structured and exclusively relevant answers with a clear focus on the central aspects of the questions; extensive references to legal sources and correct use of all relevant facts; revealing great ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent assessment of problems, including critical reflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 40-44,5</td>
<td>In all, a set of well-structured and highly relevant answers with a clear focus on central aspects of the questions; convincing references to legal sources and correct use of relevant facts; revealing a high ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent assessment of problems, including critical reflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 35-39,5</td>
<td>In all, a set of well-structured and mainly relevant answers addressing most central aspects of the questions; convincing references to legal sources and correct use of relevant facts; revealing an ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent and balanced assessment of problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 30-34,5</td>
<td>In all, a set of structured and relevant answers addressing several central aspects of the questions; adequate reference to legal sources and correct use of relevant facts; revealing signs of ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent assessment of problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 25-29,5</td>
<td>In all, a set of transparent answers addressing some central aspects of the questions; some reference to legal sources and use of some relevant facts; revealing signs of ability to make an independent assessment of problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx 12-24,5</td>
<td>In all, a set of answers which observe some aspects of the questions; insufficient use of legal sources and relevant facts and/or revealing no signs of ability to make an independent assessment of problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0-11,5</td>
<td>Blank to a reproduction of disjointed facts with insufficient reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: The essay

The criteria are weighted but not absolute. Even if it is e.g. more important to show knowledge than to master the language, the text must be comprehensible for an initiated reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Additional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Great knowledge in the field of writing and clear focus on central aspects; Complete understanding of the applied method; Great ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent assessment of problems; Excellent presentation in terms of structure, stringency, systematics, and language; Extensive references to legal sources and correct use of relevant facts; Keeps time frames and constructive use of feedback from supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Much knowledge in the field of writing and clear focus on central aspects; Comprehensive understanding of the applied method; Good ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent assessment of problems; Good presentation in terms of structure, stringency, systematics, and language; Much reference to legal sources and correct use of relevant facts; Keeps time frames and uses most of the relevant feedback from supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Convincing knowledge in the field of writing and focus on central aspects; Convincing understanding of the applied method; Adequate ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent assessment of problems; Good presentation in terms of structure, stringency, systematics, and language; Convincing references to legal sources and correct use of relevant facts; Keeps time frames and uses most of the relevant feedback from supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Adequate knowledge in the field of writing and focus on some central aspects; Signs of understanding of the applied method; Signs of ability to engage in abstract reasoning and to make an independent assessment of problems; Adequate presentation in terms of structure, stringency, systematics, and language; Adequate reference to legal sources and correct use of relevant facts; Keeps time frames and uses some relevant feedback from supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>A transparent reasoning which observes some aspects that are relevant; Signs of understanding of the applied method; Some reference to legal sources and relevant facts; signs of ability to make an independent assessment of problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx</td>
<td>A reasoning which observes aspects that are relevant to the questions posed but insufficient reference to legal sources and relevant facts and/or no signs of ability to make an independent assessment of problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nothing to a reproduction of disjointed facts with insufficient reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: The peer review

The criteria are weighted but not absolute. Moreover there is a minimum level of quality for each element of the examination. If e.g. the presentation is outstanding the overall grade may still be Fx or F in the absence of intelligible comments even if the attendance requirements are met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Additional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 18-20</td>
<td>Great knowledge in the field concerned; focus on all central aspects and an entirely accurate criticism or approval of the analysis on basis of very clear, cogent and consistent comments presented in an accessible and independent way without being rude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 16-17,5</td>
<td>Significant knowledge in the field concerned; focus on most central aspects and an accurate criticism or approval of the analysis on basis of very clear, cogent and consistent comments presented in an accessible and independent way without being rude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 14-15,5</td>
<td>Convincing knowledge in the field concerned; focus on most central aspects and a legitimate criticism or approval of the analysis on basis of clear, cogent and consistent comments presented in an accessible and independent way without being rude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 12-13,5</td>
<td>Adequate knowledge in the field concerned; focus on some central aspects and a mainly legitimate criticism or approval of the analysis on basis of fairly clear, cogent and consistent comments presented in an intelligible and independent way without being rude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 10-11,5</td>
<td>A transparent reasoning which observes some aspects that are relevant; criticism or approval of the analysis revealing signs of understanding of the analysis in the essay, by means of some fairly clear and cogent arguments which do not contradict one another, presented in an intelligible way in own words without being rude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx 5-9,5</td>
<td>A reasoning which observes aspects that are relevant to the comments; significant gaps in the criticism or approval of the analysis; on basis of unclear or scattered comments presented in a way that does not reveal an ability to make an independent assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 0-4,5</td>
<td>Nothing to a reproduction of disjointed facts with insufficient reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4: Final grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Additional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>Passes all grounds for assessment and grading with excellent praise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>80-89,5</td>
<td>Passes all grounds for assessment and grading with praise, or passes some grounds for assessment and grading with excellent praise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70-79,5</td>
<td>Willingly accepted results not without praise at all examinations, or passes some grounds for assessment and grading with praise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60-69,5</td>
<td>Willingly accepted results at all examinations, or willingly accepted results not without praise at some of the examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50-59,5</td>
<td>Accepted results at all examinations, or willingly accepted results at some of the examinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx</td>
<td>25-49,5</td>
<td>Not accepted result at any or some of the examinations but meets nevertheless the requirements for Fx indicated in appendix 1-3 with respect to the relevant ground(s) for assessment and grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0-24,5</td>
<td>Not accepted result at any or some of the examinations and does not meet the requirements for Fx indicated in appendix 1-3 with respect to the relevant ground(s) for assessment and grading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good luck!