



Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy

Departmental Student Handbook



Masters programs

Academic Year 2016 - 2017

Central European University
Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy
Nádor utca 13, 1051 Budapest, HUNGARY
phone: +36 1 327 3021
fax: +36 1 327 3031
e-mail: envsci@ceu.edu
URL: [http:// envsci.ceu.edu/](http://envsci.ceu.edu/)

Table of Contents

Departmental Staff and Contact Details	3
Course Details	4
<u><i>MS Course Data</i></u>	4
<u><i>MESPOM Course data</i></u>	4
<u><i>Timing, structure, credit requirements</i></u>	5
Program Structure	5
Credit Requirements, Course Structure	5
<u><i>Evaluation and Assessment</i></u>	5
Assignments	5
Examinations	5
Departmental grading scheme	6
Examination and Assignment Re-sits	7
Penalties for Late Submitted Work	7
<u><i>The Thesis</i></u>	8
Mespom students taking the thesis at CEU	8
11-month MS students	8
<u><i>Graduation Requirements</i></u>	9
Award of Distinction and Merit in the One Year MS	9
<u><i>Regulations</i></u>	9
Work and Attendance	9
Claims of Mitigating Circumstances	10
Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism	10
Appeals	11
Health and Safety	11
Unsatisfactory Record	11
Course and Departmental Management	12
<u><i>Departmental Student Representation</i></u>	12
<u><i>Teaching Schedule</i></u>	12
<u><i>Handouts and Readers</i></u>	12
<u><i>Communication</i></u>	12
<u><i>Academic Writing Tutor</i></u>	12
<u><i>PhD Students</i></u>	12
APPENDIX 1. Mitigating Circumstances Form	15
CEU Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy	15
APPENDIX 2. Departmental Policy on Plagiarism.	17
APPENDIX 3. Departmental Policies on Moderation and Feedback	19

Departmental Staff and Contact Details

(The last four digits of all telephone numbers work as internal extension numbers when you are in the CEU buildings or in CEU Residence Centre. Those starting with 327 can be contacted directly from outside CEU Buildings, others can only be accessed using the main CEU number. The country code for Hungary is 36, the area code for Budapest is 1).

Departmental Staff	Room	Telephone	Email
Departmental Phone Number		327 3021	envsci@ceu.edu
Departmental Fax		327 3031	-----
<i>Resident faculty</i>			
Dr. Guntra Aistara Assistant Professor	N13.108	327 3092	aistarag@ceu.edu
Dr. Brandon Anthony Associate Professor	N13.105	ext. 2007	anthonyb@ceu.edu
Dr. Alexios Antypas Associate Professor, Head of PhD Program	N13.103	327 3091	antypasa@ceu.edu
Dr. Aleh Cherp Professor, MESPOM Coordinator	N13.104	327 3089	cherpa@ceu.edu
Dr. Zoltán Illés Professor	N13.109	327 3094	illesz@ceu.edu
Dr. Michael LaBelle Assistant Professor, Coordinator of Masters' Programs	Business school	327 3094	LaBelleM@ceu.edu
Dr. Viktor Lagutov Assistant Professor		327 3886	lagutov@ceu.edu
Offices:			
CEU Campus	N13.116	327-3000 (ext 2482)	
CEU Residence Centre, Kerepesi u. 87	Syslab	327 3886	
Dr. Ruben Mnatsakanian Professor, Head of Department	N13.101 Environmental Lab	327 3071 327 3885	mnatsaka@ceu.edu
Dr. Laszlo Pinter Professor	N13.102	ext. 2017	pinterl@ceu.edu
Dr. Tamara Steger Associate Professor	N13.106	327-3000/ 2320	stegert@ceu.edu
Dr. Diana Űrge-Vorsatz (on maternity leave) Professor		327 3095	vorsatzd@ceu.edu
Dr. Alan Watt Professor	N13.107	327 3093	watta@ceu.edu

Other academic staff

Dr. Irina Molodikova Researcher	N13.113	Ext. 2081	molodiko@ceu.edu
Stephen Stec, JD Adjunct Professor	N13.113	Ext. 3890	sstec@ceu.edu
Visiting Professors	N13.109	327-3094	
<i>Administrative staff</i> Irina Herczeg Coordinator	N13.109	327 3021	herczegi@ceu.edu
Györgyi Puruczky PhD Program Coordinator MESPOM Administrator	N13.110	ext. 2167	puruczkygy@ceu.edu
Krisztina Szabados Departmental Coordinator	N13.117	ext. 2048	szabados@ceu.edu

Course Details

MS Course Data

Title of Course:	Environmental Sciences and Policy
Qualification Awarded:	Master of Science (MS) (11-month program including two teaching semesters and a 4-month research semester)
Awarding Body:	CEU (registered with New York State Department of Education)
External Examiner:	D. Collins, University of Salford, UK
Administrative Institution:	Central European University

MESPOM Course data

Title of Course:	Environmental Sciences, Policy and Management
Qualification Awarded:	Master of Science (MS) (20-month program including three teaching semesters and a 5 month research semester)
Awarding Body:	Joint Lund University (Sweden), University of Manchester (UK), CEU (Hungarian accreditation), and the University of the Aegean (Greece)
External Examiner:	D. Collins, University of Salford, UK
Administrative Institution:	Central European University, MESPOM Consortium

Timing, structure, credit requirements

Program Structure

In the first 7 months, the MS and MESPOM programs run in parallel, and the teaching content during the Fall and Winter semesters is almost identical for both programs. The Fall Semester - "Introduction to Environmental Sciences, Policy and Management" - comprises five modules with mandatory units. Its main objective is to "bridge" various initial competencies of the students and equip them with the skills necessary for further mastering environmental studies. The Winter Semester contains elective and mandatory modules in environmental sciences, policy and management. The Winter Semester finishes at the end of March. After that MESPOM students proceed with the Spring Semester (Advanced Topics in Environmental Management) which lasts until the end of June, while MS students start their 4-month Research Semester which may include a research trip abroad for a period of up to one month, if required by the thesis topic. A detailed description of the MS and MESPOM study program is available in a separate document ("Program Description").

Credit Requirements, Course Structure

Students on the MESPOM program must gain a minimum of 60 credits from taught courses during their first year at CEU. Students on the 1-year MS must gain a minimum of 45 credits from taught courses and complete their masters thesis (see Program Description for further details).

For graded taught courses, students will generally have 8 hours of "core" classroom contact hours with the course professor per course credit. In addition professors will offer other teaching and learning activities (group and individual consultations, field trips, etc). Participation in these activities is highly encouraged as they will provide an opportunity for closer contact with the professor and enhance learning opportunities. "Core" and "additional" learning activities will be clearly marked on the schedule. On courses for pass/fail, "core" classroom contact hours will generally be slightly higher (10 hours per credit). For cross-listed courses, the number of "core" contact hours may also be higher than the standard 8. Overall student workload (including required reading, assessment writing and preparation, etc.) is approximately 25 hours per credit.

Evaluation and Assessment

The Program Description indicates methods of assessment for each course. Normally this involves graded assignments and sit-in exams, although assessments based on class attendance and participation, take-home exams and other methods are also used in some courses.

Assignments

Graded assignments could take the form of written essays, oral presentations or reports on practical work or field trips. Assignments must be submitted by deadlines, and late submitted work will be penalised by reductions in the grade awarded, as outlined in the section on "penalties for late submission". Students will be required to work either individually or in groups: in the latter case students may be divided into teams by the instructors or may decide themselves, depending upon the nature of the course. Most assignments are graded individually, but group grading is also used in some courses. Group grading will not constitute more than 25% of the total marks in any course, unless - for marks above 25% - either a) there is a mechanism for differentiating the grade among members of the group, e.g. through peer evaluation, or b) students can opt for individual assessment on request. In the case of written assignments, the departmental academic writing style regulations must be followed.

Examinations

- Examinations are in the form of written papers. Exam papers generally consist of essay-type questions, which require in-depth answers on the topics studied. Shorter and more focused questions or take-away exams may be set for some courses. No books, papers, etc., can be taken into examinations unless otherwise permitted. Take-home exams allow students to prepare answers outside the examination room within a short period of time (normally 1 or 2 days), consulting any necessary sources.
- All students are subject to the terms of the *CEU Student Rights, Rules, and Academic Regulations, IV. Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism* (see CEU Student Handbook, Appendix I) regarding conduct during

examinations. For take-home examinations, papers will be checked for plagiarism and penalties for plagiarised work will be imposed, which can include failure of the course and even expulsion from the program in serious cases. A standing departmental committee handles all cases of possible/suspected plagiarism (see Appendix 2).

Departmental grading scheme

All assignments and exams will be graded on the percentage scale given below in Table 1 which can be translated into the overall university grading scheme outlined in the CEU Student Handbook.

Table 1

Percent	Grade	GPA*	ECTS band**	Category
90 – 100	A	4.00	A	Outstanding
80-89	A-	3.67	B	Excellent
70-79	B+	3.33	C	Very Good
60-69	B	3.00	D	Good
55-59	B-	2.67	E	Satisfactory
50-54	C+	2.33	E	Pass
40-49	F	0.00	FX	Fail (marginal)
0-39	F	0.00	F	Fail (poor)

* Grade Point Average; ** - European Credit Transfer System

As a general guide to the basis for assessment, students can refer to the criteria schematically shown in Table 2. and explained below.

Table 2. Grading criteria

Grade	Addressing the question	Familiarity with lecture material	Good presentation	Additional knowledge and insights
A				
A-				
B+				
B				
B-				
C+				
F (marginal)				
F				

A (90-100%) – the paper demonstrates perfect knowledge of the lecture material as well as clear evidence of additional reading and/or insights, data or information. The answer fully covers all aspects of the question. Clear, focused, logical and well-structured presentation, correct usage of terms, no mistakes or other faults.

A- (80-89%) – same as “A” but with some minor presentational or other technical faults or mistakes.

B+ (70-79%) – the paper fully covers lecture and reading material and addresses all aspects of the question, but fails to demonstrate additional knowledge or insights. Presentation is logical, well-structured and free of major faults.

B (60-69%) – the paper covers most aspects of the question and demonstrates good knowledge of the lecture material. It is focused on answering the question and free of major presentational or technical faults.

B- (55-59%) – the paper demonstrates partial knowledge of lecture material and satisfactorily addresses the key aspects of the question. It fails to address the question fully or comprehensively and may contain major presentational faults or demonstrate some gaps in understanding.

C+ (50-54%) – the paper demonstrates significant gaps in understanding of the lecture material and fails to address some of the key aspects of the question. However, it still shows that the student is familiar with the subject matter. **This is the minimum pass level.**

F (marginal) (40-49%) – the paper addresses the question in an unsatisfactory manner, however can be marginally improved to achieve C+ (pass).

F (0-39%) – the answer is so unsatisfactory that it cannot be marginally improved to achieve a pass.

In order to increase objectivity, marking is “blind” (i.e. examiners do not know students’ names) wherever practicable, and marking is moderated by faculty, the Head of Program, and the External Examiner. The Department keeps records of examiners’ comments on exam papers and assignments.

The results of the assignments, exams, attendance of and participation in classes are combined according to the nature of the course. The principle of grading for each course is at the discretion of the course professor and should be communicated to students. Each course contains either an exam or an assignment or both. Several courses also include marks for class attendance and participation within the overall course assessment. Where there is more than one means of assessment, the weighting of each assessed element in the final grade will be communicated in writing to the students prior to the start of the course.

The pass mark for all examinations and assignments is 50% (C+). Marks / grades will be posted by the department within 4 weeks of assignment deadlines and exams, and qualitative feedback will also be communicated to students on all written assignments within this time (see Appendix 3 detailing departmental feedback policy).

Examination and Assignment Re-sits

If a student fails a course as a result of failing an exam or an assignment he or she will be permitted to take the test again in a process known as a re-sit. If a failure was marginal (40 - 49%) the student may receive a chance to improve the mark to minimum pass during a viva¹ (oral exam). If the fail was not marginal (less than 40%) then re-sit of the exam or assignment is required.

Students are only permitted to re-sit exams or assignments once; if a student fails a re-sit for a mandatory course, he/she will not be able to continue to future sections of the course and will therefore be deemed to have failed the course; the same also applies for optional courses if by failing the course the student can no longer achieve the required credit total for the program. The maximum grade that can be obtained for any re-sit (exam or assignment) is the lowest pass grade.

Penalties for Late Submitted Work

So that students who submit assessed work in a timely manner are not penalised, the department will impose penalties for late submitted assignments and take-home exams along the following lines:

- *For written assignments:* In the first week, 4 penalty percentage points will be deducted per day late – including weekends and holidays - (e.g. if the assignment is submitted 3 days late, the mark will be reduced by -12%). If the work is submitted within a week of the deadline it will be awarded at least a minimum pass (50%) so long as the marker awarded a passing mark prior to the calculation of penalty. If the work is submitted substantially (more than a week) late it will be awarded a fail (F – 0%) and at the discretion of the course director either the original assignment will be considered for retake pass (maximum 50%) or a new assignment and deadline will be set. Substantial late submission is also considered “Unsatisfactory record” and could result in suspension of any financial support the student is receiving or expulsion from the program (see section on “Unsatisfactory record” below).
- *For take-home exams:* Late submitted take-home exams will be penalised according to the formula: “(hours late/hours allocated to take-home exam) x 100”, e.g. if a paper is submitted 4 hours late for a 48-hour take-home exam the penalty will be -8% (4/48 x 100). The exam paper will be awarded at least 40% if it is submitted before the penalty formula reaches -100% (or submitted within a week for take-home exams with a time allocation of over a week), so long as the marker awarded a passing mark prior to the calculation of penalty. If the paper is submitted after the penalty formula reaches 100% (or after a week for a take-home exam with a time allocation of more than a week), the student will receive 0% for the paper and will be required to sit a new take-home exam with a new deadline for a “retake pass” [maximum 50%]. Substantially late submission of this type is also considered “Unsatisfactory record” and could lead to suspension of financial support or expulsion from the program.

¹ A viva is non-mandatory and a student’s grade can only rise, not fall, as a result. A viva may also occasionally be offered if mitigating circumstances may have significantly impaired a student’s performance in an assessment.

The Thesis

Mespom students taking the thesis at CEU

Most details of the Mespom thesis process are covered by the Mespom Handbook, which should be consulted carefully. Students writing their thesis with CEU as the host institution should follow the *Regulations for the presentation of masters theses and dissertations by Mespom students*, available on the e-learning site under “Masters Thesis Documents (Mespom Theses)”. A template for the thesis can also be found there. Style and referencing should follow the standard departmental guidelines, as contained in the department’s *Documentation and style manual*. Note: the failure and resubmission policy for 11-month MS students (below) also applies for MESPOM students taking their thesis at CEU.

11-month MS students

The thesis period for the 11-month MS runs from early April to late July, with a final submission deadline at the end of July (see calendar for precise details of dates).

Prior to the start of the thesis semester, students are required to submit a short research proposal (usually in late January), which includes the proposed thesis topic, summary of the planned methodological approach, and proposed supervisor. Students will then work with their supervisor to refine the methodological approach and develop the literature base for their research prior to any field research undertaken during the thesis semester. There will also be an opportunity (usually in February) to apply for small research grants to help cover the costs of any planned field research. 11-month MS students will also be required to take an academic writing course on MS thesis writing which is run for them during the second semester.

During the thesis semester, students are expected to maintain regular contact with their supervisor and to submit any progress reports as required by him/her. All students are required to spend the first two weeks and the final month of the thesis semester in Budapest. Exceptions to this rule can only be granted following a written appeal to the supervisor and head of department, stating the grounds for the request for absence, and submitted as soon as the reason for proposed absence becomes known.

Unless an alternative agreement is reached between student and supervisor, a full first draft of the thesis should be submitted to the supervisor 3 weeks prior to the final deadline for thesis submission, to give the supervisor time to provide feedback which can be incorporated into the final version of the thesis. Supervisors are under no obligation to provide feedback prior to final thesis submission on drafts received later than this deadline.

Students should follow the *Regulations for the presentation of masters theses and dissertations*, available on the e-learning site under “Masters Thesis Documents (ESP Theses)”. A template for the thesis can also be found there. Style and referencing should follow the standard departmental guidelines, as contained in the department’s *Documentation and style manual*.

Late submission without prior permission. Theses submitted after the deadline and without permission for late submission (based on mitigating circumstances) being sought prior to the deadline will be liable to receive a fail (F) grade. In any such case, the Program Director will make a recommendation to the Examination Board, which will determine the final penalty imposed.

Permission for late submission and Mitigating Circumstances Board. If, prior to the deadline, the student becomes aware of special circumstances which are likely to prevent the thesis being submitted on time, he/she should immediately contact the supervisor and head of department in writing to explain the special circumstances and to request a deadline extension, and should return a completed mitigating circumstances form (Appendix 1) to the department as soon as possible. See also the section on “Claims of mitigating circumstances” below. If the head of department (after consulting with the student’s supervisor) grants such an extension, the student will usually be required to submit a draft version of the thesis by the deadline in electronic form. All cases of late submission involving claims for mitigating circumstances will be reviewed by a Mitigating Circumstances Board prior to the next Examination Board, which will recommend to the Examination Board whether any penalty should be imposed.

Theses submitted substantially late (after mid-September), will usually only be accepted for examination in the following academic year, even where special circumstances are involved, and in such cases the student will also be liable to pay the Manchester registration fee for the following academic year to cover the costs incurred. In line with CEU rules, under no circumstances can a thesis be accepted for examination if it is submitted more than 2 years after the completion of coursework.

Marking of theses. All 11-month MS theses are double-marked, by the student's supervisor and one other member of departmental faculty. The external examiner also reviews some theses, to check that the grades awarded are fair and appropriate and in cases where there are any substantial differences in marks between the two internal examiners. Final grades for the thesis are agreed at the Examination Board which takes place in late September or early October.

Failure and resubmission policy. In case a thesis is awarded a "fail" grade, the student will be informed of the result and, in most circumstances, offered the opportunity to resubmit (for a retake pass). This resubmission must take place at the latest within 2 years of the completion of all coursework on the program, or earlier if another deadline is specified in writing to the student. Only one resubmission is allowed; a second failure is final.

Graduation Requirements

In order to be awarded the CEU MS degree, students must successfully complete and pass all teaching modules and all assigned coursework, including examinations, participation in mandatory field trips and completion of their thesis with the minimum pass. Students must also achieve an average GPA of 2.66 for the program as a whole in order to receive their MS degree.

Students successfully completing all taught courses but failing or not submitting the thesis will receive a postgraduate certificate of completion from CEU. They are also eligible on application for a British Postgraduate Certificate of Education, issued by the University of Manchester.

Detailed requirements for the MESPOM degree are specified in the MESPOM Handbook.

Award of Distinction and Merit in the One Year MS

Distinction is awarded to students on the one-year MS with a final cumulative grade point average (CGPA) of 3.67 or above. *Merit* is awarded to students with a CGPA between 3.33 and 3.66. (See the MESPOM handbook for rules on award of distinction for MESPOM students.)

Regulations

Work and Attendance

- The Head of the Department, on behalf of the Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy, will monitor the work and attendance of all students. This is for the benefit of the students and helps to ensure that you are coping with the work and are managing to complete the assignments given to you satisfactorily and on schedule.
- Unless otherwise noted in course descriptions, students are expected to attend all "core" classes of all mandatory units and those for which they have registered and must be familiar with their contents. They must also attend seminars which are scheduled as part of the program. For those courses which have different attendance policy, professors communicate this to students in advance.
- In the Fall Semester, students will be given the possibility to request opt outs from mandatory attendance of one unit each of any two modules with the exception of the Introduction to Environmental Methods module¹. The opting out is granted at the discretion of the Head of Department based on the student's previously demonstrated academic or professional qualifications and experience in the area. Opting out does not exempt a student from the exam and the full credits will be recorded for the module from which some units were dropped.

¹ For example, a student might wish to opt out of attending Water Management (Introduction to Environmental Sciences module) and Environmental Impact Assessment (Introduction to Environmental Management module).

- Students must produce coursework by the specified deadlines as required in the program and attendance at all examinations is compulsory.
- Students on the 11-month MS course must submit their final thesis to the Departmental Secretariat this year no later than Monday, July 31, 2017, 12:00 noon CET. Students who fail to do so run the risk of their thesis not being accepted and receiving a 'fail' grade, as detailed in the "thesis" section above.
- The use of personal computers with keyboards by students in the classroom during lectures and seminars is forbidden, unless explicitly permitted by the lecturer teaching that class.

Claims of Mitigating Circumstances

Documentation of mitigating circumstances leading to absence/ late submission/ impaired performance

Any valid reasons for absence, late submission or impaired performance, should be reported to the Course Director(s) of the affected course(s) and to the Departmental Secretariat as soon as possible, and wherever feasible before the absence takes place, and a "mitigating circumstances form", along with appropriate supporting documentation, should be filled out and returned to the departmental office (see Appendix 1). Details of acceptable and unacceptable circumstances are given in the notes accompanying the form: generally speaking they must be unforeseeable and unpreventable circumstances that could have a significant adverse effect on academic performance, e.g. illness, bereavement or other serious personal or family problem. In case of mitigating circumstances likely to afflict the student for a longer period, the student may apply to the head of department for a leave of absence from the program.

Handling of mitigating circumstances claims

Whenever the department receives a form claiming mitigating circumstances, the head of department will review it and make an initial judgement whether the circumstances are allowable and, if so, what the response should be (e.g. waiving of late submission penalty). This judgement will be reported to the student as soon as feasible, normally within a week. All mitigating circumstances claims will also be reviewed prior to the subsequent examination board by a mitigating circumstances committee composed of departmental faculty. This committee makes recommendations to the examination board about what action to take in each case. **Note that no claim for mitigating circumstances will be considered unless a completed form and supporting documentation is returned to the department.**

Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism

Definitions

Academic dishonesty involves acts which may subvert or compromise the integrity of the educational process at CEU. This includes any act by which a student succeeds or attempts to gain an academic advantage for himself or herself or another person by misrepresenting his or her or another person's work or by interfering with the completion, submission or evaluation of work. These include, but are not limited to, accomplishing or attempting any of the following acts:

1. Altering of grades or official records.
2. Using any materials that are not authorised by the instructor for use during an examination.
3. Copying from another student's paper during an examination.
4. Collaborating during an examination with any other person by giving or receiving information without the specific permission of the instructor.
5. Stealing, buying or otherwise obtaining restricted information about an examination to be administered.
6. Collaborating on laboratory work, take-home examinations, homework or other assigned work when instructed to work independently.
7. Substituting for another person or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself in taking an examination.
8. Submitting as one's own any theme, report, term paper, essay, other written work, speech, totally or in part by another author.

9. Submitting work that has been previously offered for credit in another course, except with prior written permission of the instructors of both courses.
10. Plagiarising, that is, the offering as one's own work of the words, ideas, or arguments of another person without appropriate attribution by quotation, reference or footnote. Plagiarism occurs both when the words of another are reproduced without acknowledgement or 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 university students to understand the methods of proper attribution and to apply those principles in all materials submitted.
11. Sabotaging of another student's work.
12. Falsifying or committing forgery on any university form or document.
13. Submitting altered or falsified data as experimental data from laboratory projects, survey research, or other field research.
14. Committing any wilful act of dishonesty that interferes with the operation of the academic process.
15. Facilitating or aiding in any act of academic dishonesty.

For further information, please refer to the university's *Code of Ethics* (see Appendix I in CEU Student Handbook).

Academic dishonesty may be a reason for disciplinary action as specified in relevant CEU policies. Such action can include failure of the course, a warning appearing on the student's record, and even immediate expulsion from the program in serious cases.

The Department uses 'Turnitin' plagiarism prevention software to detect plagiarism in written papers including Masters theses.

Appeals

Assessment for all courses is subject to moderation procedures assuring the objectivity of marking. Students have a right to feedback on all assessed work which should include explanation for the grade awarded. The grades approved by the Examination Board (consisting of faculty and the External Examiner) are final and cannot be subject to appeal on academic grounds. Appeals on other grounds (e.g. personal discrimination) are covered by CEU's *Code of Ethics* and should follow the procedures set out there.

Health and Safety

In any laboratory classes, field visits and practical research projects students may come across potential hazards. To minimise the risks to themselves and others students must follow the guidelines laid down in the health and safety requirements of CEU. Fieldwork and project work must be carried out according to the particular guidelines for that project.

Unsatisfactory Record

Students must make satisfactory progress in order to maintain any financial aid they are receiving and to retain their place on the program. A student's enrolment will be terminated if:

- a) he/she is found to have seriously plagiarised in an assignment, exam, or the thesis;
- b) he/she fails a resit examination/assignment (after an initial failure) on a mandatory course
- c) he/she fails a resit examination/assignment (after an initial failure) on an elective course, if as a result of the failure the student cannot gain enough credits to complete the program.

A student's enrolment or financial aid may also be terminated if:

- d) He/she is absent from classes for more than a week without permission or persistently misses classes
- e) He/she submits an assignment or take-home examination substantially late (as defined in "penalties for late submitted work", above) without justifiable cause¹.
- f) He/she fails multiple courses (even if resits are passed).

¹ See section on mitigating circumstances above and Appendix 1 for more detail regarding acceptable (and unacceptable) reasons for late submission.

The decision regarding termination of studies for unsatisfactory record is made by the head of department. Students have the right to appeal a decision to terminate studies to the Provost.

Course and Departmental Management

Departmental Student Representation

- Student representatives are elected by the student body to act as spokespersons for giving feedback to the course director on course management and academic content. Meetings will be held approximately once a month during the teaching period and students will be made aware of the dates of such meetings ahead of time. Student representatives may also be invited to attend general departmental meetings.
- Questionnaires are also used to solicit information / feedback after each semester from the student body on the organisation, delivery and content of individual course units.

Teaching Schedule

Copies of the teaching schedule will be distributed to all students before the beginning of each semester. However, since the department has a number of visiting professors, it is not uncommon for changes in the schedule to occur. The department will attempt to keep these to an absolute minimum, but students will be given as much notice as possible should alterations to the schedule be necessary. The most current version of the schedule will be placed on the departmental notice-boards, which are located on the 7th floor of the Faculty Tower.

Handouts and Readers

Electronic copies of handouts and readers accompanying each unit will be available for all registered students. Hard copies of handouts may be made available to all students registered for a particular course at the beginning of each lecture.

Communication

Due to the large number of students in the department and the busy nature of the course schedule, it is essential that students make efforts to keep in regular contact with the department, that they read the departmental notice-boards located on the 7th floor of the faculty tower and check their mail boxes. The department uses electronic mail to distribute urgent notices and so students should login to their accounts at least on a daily basis to check for urgent messages sent to their personal account.

Academic Writing Tutor

One Academic Writing Tutor has been appointed for the department (Dr. Alan Watt). He serves as the departmental advisor on academic writing techniques, style and format as well holding advice tutorials and classes throughout the course.

PhD Students

Each year the department has six or more first-year PhD students who may participate as mentors in a teaching assistantship capacity. Teaching Assistants work closely with professors in a variety of ways that may include designing course exercises or syllabi, providing student assistance on course requirements and content including reviewing drafts of work, helping with grading and evaluation, etc.

Academic Calendar 2016/2017

September 3/4, Sat/Sun	Students of departments with short pre-session arrive
September 9, Friday	Short pre-session ends Welcome afternoon for all departments
September 12, Monday	Zero week begins (until September 16, Friday) Registration for Fall Term begins (until October 2, Sunday)
September 12-23	Student Union departmental elections
September 16, Friday	15:00 Opening ceremony Zero week ends
September 19, Monday	Fall Term begins (until December 16, Friday)
October 2, Sunday	Registration for Fall Term ends
October 23, Sunday	Hungarian National Holiday, CEU is officially closed
October 31, Monday	Special day off, CEU is officially closed
November 1, Tuesday	All Saints' Day, CEU is officially closed
November 9, Monday	Departments to submit schedule and cross-listed courses for Winter Term
December 5, Monday	Registration for Winter Term begins (until January 15, Sunday)
December 9, Friday	Exam period for the Environmental Sciences and Policy students (MESPOM and 1- year MS program) starts (until December 16, Friday)
December 16, Friday	Fall Term ends
December 19 /23	Offices with skeleton team Library and Labs on weekend schedule
December 24, Saturday	Christmas Eve CEU is officially closed
December 25, Sunday	Christmas CEU is officially closed
December 26, Monday	Christmas CEU is officially closed
December 27 - 30	Offices with skeleton team Library and Labs on weekend schedule
December 31, Saturday	New Year's Eve CEU is officially closed
January 1, Sunday	New Year CEU is officially closed

January 9, Monday	Winter Term begins (until April 1, Friday)
January 15, Sunday	Registration for Winter Term ends Deadline for the submission of Fall Term grades
February 10, Friday	Erasmus internship applications for 2015/16 MA Travel Grant application deadline PhD Research and Travel Grants application deadline
February 23, Thursday	ACADEMIC FORUM
February 28, Tuesday	Erasmus study grant applications for Fall, Spring 2017/187
March 15, Wednesday	Hungarian National Holiday, CEU is officially closed
March 20, Monday	Registration for Spring Term begins (until April 9, Sunday)
March, 31, Friday	Winter Term ends Exam period for Environmental Sciences and Policy starts
April 10, Monday	Spring Term begins for MESPOM students Environmental Sciences and Policy MS Thesis Module begins
April 16 Sunday	Easter Sunday, CEU is officially closed
April 17, Monday	Easter Monday, CEU is officially closed
May 1, Monday	Labor Day, CEU is officially closed
May 22, Monday,	Greek Module starts for MESPOM students
June 23, Friday	Commencement
June 30, Friday	MESPOM 1st year ends
July 31, Monday	Academic year ends. Environmental Sciences and Policy

APPENDIX 1. Mitigating Circumstances Form

CEU Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES FORM

Grounds for mitigation are '*unforeseeable and unpreventable circumstances that could have a significant adverse effect on your academic performance*'. Please see overleaf for examples of possible mitigating circumstances as well as circumstances which will not be considered as grounds for mitigation.

The information recorded on this form will be made available to the Head of Department and Mitigating Circumstances Review Committee.

NAME & STUDENT ID:	
PROGRAM:	
YEAR OF PROGRAM:	

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES Please describe the nature of the circumstances or events that you believe have affected or are affecting your performance or ability to submit coursework by the due deadline. Documentary evidence to support your case must be attached to this form (eg medical note, letter from Counselling Service, letter from welfare officer, police report, etc.)

DATES AFFECTED	From:	To:

A. ASSESSED COURSEWORK AFFECTED

Course Code:	Course Unit Title:	Assessment deadline:	Date work handed in:

Have you submitted the coursework affected? YES / NO

B. EXAMINATIONS OR OTHER ASSESSMENTS AFFECTED

Course Code:	Course Unit Title:	Date of Exam:

Have you taken the examinations or other assessments: YES / NO

NATURE OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION.

It is essential that this documentation is attached. Please tick the relevant box.

Letter from medical practitioner Letter from Counselling Service

Police / Incident Report

Other (please specify).....

I confirm hereby that all information given or referred to above is true and that I believe there has been a significant adverse effect on my performance as a result of the circumstances / and or events described.

Signature: _____ Date _____

PLEASE SUBMIT THE COMPLETED FORM, TOGETHER WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION, TO MRS. I . HERCZEG AT THE DEPARTMENTAL OFFICE, FT 705.

GROUNDS FOR MITIGATION

Possible examples of mitigating circumstances include:

- Significant illness or injury
- The death or critical illness of a close family member
- Family crises or major financial problems leading to acute stress
- Absence for jury service or maternity, paternity or adoption leave

Circumstances which will NOT normally be regarded as grounds for mitigation include:

- Holidays and events which were planned or could reasonably have been expected
- Assessments which are scheduled closely together
- Misreading the timetable or misunderstanding the requirements for assessments
- Inadequate planning and time management
- Failure, loss or theft of a computer or printer that prevents submission of work on time: students should back up work regularly and not leave completion so late that they cannot find another computer or printer
- Consequences of paid employment
- Exam stress or panic attacks not diagnosed as illness.

Note:

While pregnancy is not in itself grounds for mitigation, events may arise during a pregnancy which might constitute mitigating circumstances and will need to be judged on an individual basis.

LATE SUBMISSION

Please note that if you are unable to meet a deadline due to mitigating circumstances, you must submit your work as soon as you possibly can after the deadline. You should *not* wait for your case to be considered by the Departmental Head and Mitigating Circumstances Committee, or until after the decision concerning approval of mitigating circumstances has been communicated, to submit your work.

Absence from the University during the semester for any period of 5 working days or less will not normally be regarded as grounds for mitigation unless the absence occurred for good cause within a two-week period immediately preceding a formal University examination or the deadline for submitting a piece of assessed course work or delivering an assessed presentation.

APPENDIX 2. Departmental Policy on Plagiarism.

This policy outlines the department's procedures for handling cases of suspected plagiarism. It does not specify definitions and likely penalties for plagiarism, which are outlined in CEU's "*Guidelines for the implementation of 'academic dishonesty, plagiarism and other offences'*", available on CEU's website at <http://www.ceu.hu/documents>

1. A standing plagiarism committee will be established by the department, which will review all cases of suspected plagiarism in assessed written work submitted towards any of the department's degree programs. The committee's decisions and any penalties they choose to impose will be considered the department's final decision on the case. The student does however have the right to appeal against the decision to the University Disciplinary Committee.
2. The committee shall normally consist of 3 members, of whom one will be the Head of Department. The Head of Department appoints the two other members to the committee, for an initial period of two years. At the end of the two year period, and after each subsequent 2-year period, a faculty meeting will determine whether to change or retain the committee's composition, taking into consideration the wishes of the committee members to continue and/or other faculty members to serve on the committee.
3. The Head of Department will chair the committee and communicate its results to students, except in cases where he/she is not participating due to conflict of interest (see point 10 below).
4. Individual professors, including visiting professors, are responsible for ensuring that their own graded assignments and take-home exams are checked via the Turnitin software and for conducting a preliminary screening of Turnitin reports, in consultation with Irina Herczeg. The Turnitin reports can be generated automatically via the e-learning site when students upload their work; instructions on how to do this are available for both professors and students on the site under "Miscellaneous". Masters theses automatically generate turnitin reports when they are uploaded to the ETD, and for these a committee member will conduct the initial screening.
5. The screening professor should screen at least all turnitin reports with a score above 25%, and may choose to screen all reports. In case there is any suspicion of plagiarism, the professor should refer the case to the committee for review, which can be done by forwarding the report to the committee chair and Irina Herczeg with a recommendation for review. Reports with a score of 25% or above should automatically be reported to the committee chair, even if the screening professor does not believe that the work involves plagiarism.
6. Professors should screen Turnitin reports and make recommendations for committee review within 1 week of an assignment or take-home examination deadline, to ensure that the committee review procedure can be concluded without delaying the feedback process.
7. A professor may also choose to recommend for committee review any paper where he/she strongly suspects "ideas only" plagiarism, i.e. use of original data (but not words) from other authors without acknowledgement. In this case he/she should inform the committee that the suspicion is based on other grounds than the Turnitin report, and indicate what those grounds are.
8. The screening professor does not make any recommendation on penalty; it is up to the committee to determine that, which it will do based on the CEU guidelines and in light of past departmental precedent.
9. The committee will judge the case as soon as possible, and at any rate prior to the deadline for grades and feedback on the exam/assignment to be returned to students, and if it is deemed serious enough that a grade penalty or more is likely to be imposed, the student and course professor/supervisor will be informed immediately by the chair, and given details of the case. The student has the right to make a written submission to the committee or request a personal hearing with the chair (and other committee members, if available). Such a submission or request should be made within 48 hours of the student receiving notification that he or she may be penalised.

10. The committee will make a final decision on the case, including any penalty to be awarded, within 2 working days of a student's written submission or personal hearing (or within 2 working days of the deadline for such a submission/request, if none is received), and the chair will communicate it immediately to the course professor and student.

11. The committee may recommend that serious cases of malpractice be referred upwards to the University Disciplinary Committee.

12. If the case involves a student thesis supervised by one of the committee members, he/she will excuse him-/herself from the review and if possible another faculty member will be found to constitute a third reviewer of the case. If this refusal involves the Head of Department, another member of the committee will act as chair in the case.

13. Students penalised for plagiarism in the first year of a joint program with another university shall be informed that the nature and severity of the offence will be conveyed to the institution hosting the student in year two.

APPENDIX 3. Departmental Policies on Moderation and Feedback

This document sets out departmental policy on moderation and feedback on assessed work in the department's masters programs. The policy sets out minimum standards which faculty involved in the programs (both internal and visiting) are expected to adhere to. Faculty are welcome to do more than the minimum set out here in terms of content, quantity and timing.

The policy will be publicised to students and included in subsequent editions of the department's student handbook. The policy will be subject to periodic review and possible amendment at future departmental meetings in the light of practice.

Moderation of Assessed Work.

1. Scope. All written examinations, whether take-home or sit-in, should be subject to moderation. In addition, all written assignments in graded courses worth 50% or more of the final mark should be moderated. Moderation is also encouraged for written assignments worth less than 50%, where both first marker and moderator agree to it. The policy applies to taught courses and does not include student theses, which are always double marked.

2. Definition of the moderation process. Moderation is understood to mean review of assessed work by a second faculty member – not the course director. In case a PhD student TA is involved in assessment, moderation is in addition to and separate from any 2nd marking/moderating by the TA. It takes place after the work has been graded by the first marker, and the moderator should have the first marker's marks, comments and answer tips available when he/she reviews the assessed work. The moderator samples a proportion of the assessed work to check that the initial marker's grading is consistent with the comments justifying the grade and with the department's grading criteria. At a minimum, the moderator should review 10% of papers (and at least 3 papers in courses with fewer than 30 students), though if time allows the moderator is encouraged to review up to 20% of the papers. The moderator should select for review papers at the high, middle and low end of the marking range so that he/she can also comment on whether the range of marks reflects the range of quality of answers.

3. Appointment of moderators. Moderators will be appointed by the Head of Department, in consultation with course directors, for each for-grade masters course. Wherever possible, faculty members with research/teaching interests close to those of the course content will be selected, but consistent with a roughly even share of the burden among faculty (and bearing in mind the load of first marking).

4. Timescale for moderation. Since we aim to deliver grades and other feedback to students within a month (see below), moderation should be completed within 1 week of receipt of the first marker's scripts/comments. The first marker should submit marks and comments to the departmental office and the moderator within 2 ½ weeks of the examination or assignment deadline. If a moderator is unable to moderate a piece of work within the required timeframe due to travel, illness, etc., he/she should immediately inform the department and the Head of Department will appoint a temporary replacement.

5. Answer tips. Professors should supply brief "answer tips" alongside their exam questions and assignments requiring moderation, indicating any particular features they are looking for in a good answer over and above the department's general grading criteria.¹ These should be sent to Irina Herczeg, who will forward a copy to the moderator; (they are also sent to the external examiner along with the questions, for his review).

¹ It is recognised that for some complex questions it may not be possible to give very concrete answer tips. In such cases, professors should still give general guidelines on the qualities they are looking for in a good answer.

6. Other practicalities. A form will be made available for use by moderators. One should be completed electronically for each examination or assignment that receives moderation, and be sent to Irina Herczeg and to the Head of Department.

7. Moderation by Head of Department. The list of marks (not scripts) received from the first marker should be forwarded to the Head of Department by Irina Herczeg or Kriszta Szabados. In case the range of marks and/or the average mark deviates significantly from the norm, the Head of Department will contact the first marker and moderator to invite their comment, and based on this discussion may recommend adjusting the marks awarded for the assessment. Any such adjustments will be communicated to the external examiner prior to review of the scripts, and to the examination board.

8. Procedure in case of moderator expressing concern. In case the moderator's report indicates any concerns regarding the marking, the Head of Department will contact the first marker and moderator to discuss the assessment in question, and may ask to review some of the scripts himself or appoint a second moderator if there is substantial difference of opinion between first marker and moderator. Based on this review, the Head of Department may recommend adjusting the marks awarded for the assessment. Any such adjustments will be communicated to the external examiner prior to review of the scripts, and to the examination board.

Feedback to students.

1. General principles. Feedback to students is the quantitative (grade) and qualitative (comment) assessment of their work. Feedback should be provided in a timely manner that helps students understand (i) the marks or grades they have received for the work submitted, and (ii) how their performance might be improved in future. Feedback should be as personal as possible to the individual student to enable reflection on individual skills and performance. All assessed work should receive comments as well as grades, and for moderated assessments these comments must be in written, preferably electronic form. Students should automatically receive these comments except in the case of written examinations (see point 3 below).

2. Timing of feedback. For work involving moderation, marks and other feedback must be made available within 1 month of the examination or the assignment deadline [a CEU requirement]. For work that does not involve moderation, feedback (grades and comments) should be provided within 3 weeks of the work being submitted.

3. Qualitative feedback for examinations. Qualitative feedback on written examinations is not normally issued to students, though individual professors may choose to do so, at their discretion. However, the student in any case has a right, if he/she wishes, to request access to qualitative comments and to discuss them with the professor. The student cannot appeal against the grade on academic grounds.

4. Qualitative feedback on other assessed work. Students should automatically be provided with qualitative feedback as well as grades for all assessed work apart from examinations. For assignments involving moderation this must be in written form; for non-moderated assignments it is up to the individual professor's discretion whether this feedback is oral or written. Emphasis should be on constructive criticism, with indications wherever possible of how the student can improve his/her performance.