

1. Name of the subject (course unit)	2. Code
Comparative Constitutional Law	E2015BS004

3. Teacher(s)	4. Unit(s)
Lect. Arnoldas Matijošius	Law Faculty

5. Study cycle	6. Level of the subject (course unit)	7. Type of the subject (course unit)
First	Course is not divided into parts	Mandatory

8. Implementation form	9. Implementation period	10. Instruction language(s)
Full time	Autumn/Spring semester	English

11. Requirements for the student	
Prerequisites:	Associated requirements (if any):
-	-

12. Scope of the subject (course unit) in ECTS	13. Total student work load (hours)	14. Contact hours	15. Independent work hours
6	160	20	140

16. Purpose of the subject (course unit): competences sought to be developed by the study programme
In the course we look at some judicial cases that explain and interpret constitutional texts would be analysed in order not to leave this course dull and uninviting.

17. The interrelation between the learning outcomes of the study programme with the projected results of the subject, and the methods of the assessment of the studies and the student achievements		
Results of the study subjects	Study methods	Methods for the assessment of the achievements of the student
Deeper knowledge of different constitutional systems in the world	Lectures, library and home reading, discussions at the university	Practical tests and final exam
Better understanding of interdependency amongst the countries	Lectures, library and home reading, discussions at the university	Practical tests and final exam

18. Content of the subject									
Themes	Contact hours and studying method							Time and tasks of independent studies	
	Lectures	Consultations	Seminars	Practical class	Laboratory classes	Practicums	Total contact hours	Independent work	Tasks
1. A Constitutional structure. Examples of both old, traditional constitutions (U.S.A., Argentina, etc.), and new (1992 Lithuanian, 2011 Hungarian)	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain knowledge of the materials
2. Introduction to constitutional system of Lithuania (1992-2015)	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain knowledge of the materials
3. Values and directions set up by the	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain

preambles of various constitutions.									knowledge of the materials
4. Schemes of the separation of power in various constitutions (Lithuanian, French. USA).	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain knowledge of the materials
5. The Argentinian story – old constitution still stands for the 21st century. 5.1 Major amendments, including modern 1955 (Revolution Libertador), 1966 (Revolution Argentina), 1976 (Proceso de Reorganización Nacional). 5.2 Freedoms and rights (e.g. freedom of movement, Freedom to join any association, Individual actions that do not intervene with morals or public order, Habeas corpus.	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain knowledge of the materials
6. Spain: 6.1 historical points: During 150 years there were 7 Constitutions in Spain (1837-1845-1855-1869-1873-1876-1931). 6.2 Stages of adoption of the 1978 Constitution (referendum and contrasignation by the King). 6.3 Separation of power. 6.4 Autonomous regions.	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain knowledge of the materials
7. Federal system (the USA). Case law.	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain knowledge of the materials
8. Comparison of seemingly similar (by context of adoption and history of democracy) countries - the Baltic states. We take their constitutional human right Bills and see what differences they show.	1,5					1,0	2,5	17,5	Have to obtain knowledge of the materials
In total	12					8	20	140	

19. Strategy and criteria for the evaluation of students			
Evaluation method	Percentage	Accounting time	Evaluation criteria
Work in the classroom during seminars:	15	During the semester	1.5 points: active participation in discussions, answering questions, formulating problems and questions, providing critical remarks; 1 point: participate in discussions, answer to questions; 0 points: almost does not participate in discussions or missed more than 1/3 of seminars
Project presentation	30	During the semester	Evaluation criteria: - report structure is clear and logical. - contains all required structural parts. - the volume is acceptable. - topic analysis is complete, ideas are presented in a logical, consistent manner. Evaluation from 0 to 10 points.
Examination	55	During the examination session	Evaluation from 0 to 10 points.

20. Sources of studies, reference lists

Mandatory sources of studies, reference lists

1. S.E. Finer, Vernon Bogdanor, Bernard Rudden / COMPARING CONSTITUTIONS, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995
2. Massimo La Torre / CONSTITUTIONALISM AND LEGAL REASONING – NEW PARADIGM FOR THE CONCEPT OF LAW , Springer 2007, University of Catanazaro (Italy); University of Hull (UK).
3. John M. Kelly / WESTERN LEGAL THEORY , Oxford University Press, 2012.
4. Aharon Barak /THE JUDGE IN A DEMOCRACY, Princeton University Press, (reprinted 2015).
5. Melvin I. Urofsky / DISSENT AND THE SUPREME COURT. IT'S ROLE IN THE COURT'S HISTORY AND NATION'S CONSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE, Pantheon Books New York, 2015.
6. Eivind Smith (ed.) / THE CONSTITUTION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF CHANGE,SNS Förlag, Stokholm, 2003.
7. E. Vaitkiene, G. Mesonis / LYGINAMOJI KONSTITUCINĖ TEISĖ (COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, in Lithuanian language), Justitia- Vilnius , 2011.
8. V.E. Chirkin, (ed.) / Sravnitel'noje konstitucionnoje pravo (COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, in Russian language),Moscow, Mezdunarodnyje Otnoshenija, 2002.
9. Suggested readings: texts of various CoNstitutions (for example sound collection is found here: <http://www.legislationline.org/documents/section/constitutions>)
10. Suggested readings: Illustrating cases of the Constitutional Courts and Supreme Courts, etc.(FOR EXAMPLE of McCulloch v. Maryland (1819, the Supreme Court of the USA), Reitman v. Mulkey (1967, the Supreme Court of the USA)

Additional sources of studies, reference lists

Depending on the abilities and wishes of the students a lecturer supplies them with supplemental references on each of the subjects included into the course.