



**Order of the Rector of the Non-entrepreneurial (Non-commercial) Legal Entity - Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia**

№064/01 5 December 2018

City of Tbilisi

On the Approval of the Rules for Planning, Implementation and Evaluation of the Scientific-Research Component of the Educational Programs of the N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia

According to Article 35 of the Civil Code of Georgia of the Law of Georgia, Order №99/N of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia dated October 1, 2010 „On Approval of Authorisation Fees and Authorisation Regulations for Educational Institutions”, pursuant to Article 4, Part 3, Article 14, Part 1, Part 3, Paragraphs "b", "e", "f" and "l", Part 4 of the Charter of the N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia, I do hereby declare:

1. To approve the rules for planning, implementation and evaluation of the scientific-research component of the educational programs of the N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia in accordance with the Annex.
2. A copy of this order shall be made public.
3. To send this order to the structural units/staff of the University for the implementation within the scope of their competence.
4. I will personally control the implementation of the order.
5. The order may be appealed in accordance with the rules established by the legislation of Georgia.
6. The order shall enter into force upon signing.

Professor, Archimandrite Adam (Vakhtang Akhaladze) - /signed/

## **Rule of planning, implementation and evaluation of the scientific-research component of the educational programs of the N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia**

### **Introduction**

The scientific-research component of the educational programs of the N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia (hereinafter - the University) is an integral part of the program structure and a mandatory component of achieving the defined learning outcomes.

The purpose of the research component is to develop the student's research skills.

This rule includes the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the research component of the academic higher education programs available at the University at the undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral levels.

### **Chapter I. Planning, Implementation and Evaluation of the Scientific-Research Component of the Doctoral Program**

#### **Article 1. Doctoral Research Component**

The doctoral research component includes:

- Execution of a dissertation or scientific work, as well as publication of scientific articles, which should reflect the substantiated results of theoretical and/or empirical research.
- PhD student colloquium;
- Public oral examination of the dissertation, i.e, public presentation of the thesis.

#### **Article 2. Individual research project of the doctoral student**

1. The doctoral student's individual research project is written by the doctoral student in the agreement with the scientific supervisor / co-supervisor. The project should indicate the purpose of the research, relevance, brief review of the literature around the topic, scientific news, research method, brief description of the dissertation work, approximate schedule of the research, bibliography.
2. The doctoral student submits an individual research project to the relevant faculty council (at the colloquium) at the end of the first academic year.
3. The structure of the research project is defined by this rule.
4. The dissertation research project is the result of a review research and analysis, a preliminary outline of the dissertation that the doctoral student must complete within one year of the commencement of studies.
5. The dissertation research project is being worked on in consultation with the supervisor of the doctoral student (including online mode).
6. The volume of the dissertation research project should be at least 15-20 pages without appendices. All pages must be numbered sequentially, leaving no free space or page. The text should be done on A4 format (297-210 mm) 80 g/m<sup>2</sup> paper, font - Sylfaen, size 12. The minimum size of page numbers and footnotes is 10. Larger fonts may be used in chapter and subsection names. The interval for the main text is 1.5. The text should be printed on only one page. There should be 30 mm margin left on the left side of the page and 20 mm on the other sides. The text should be printed on a laser printer, or a printer which is close to a laser printer with its quality.
7. Structure of the dissertation research project:

- A) Introduction (general description, scientific novelty, urgency, goals and practical significance);
- B) Review of scientific literature (history of the research of the issue, the state of the research issue in modern science, why this issue is relevant, at what stage is the doctoral student in terms of research of selected sources);
- C) Research methodology (theoretical and methodological basics selected by the doctoral student);
- D) Main research issues (what problems does the doctoral student aim to solve);
- E) Expected results of the research (what can be the expected results of the research? To what extent does the doctoral student contribute to the development of the field);
- F) Estimated dissertation schedule (research plan);
- G) Estimated structure of the dissertation;
- H) Bibliography (first sources, scientific literature).

#### 8) Structure and design of the abstract:

A) The abstract is a short version of the main provisions of the dissertation. It is submitted with the dissertation in Georgian and in one of the foreign languages (English, French, German, Russian). One copy of the printed and electronic version of the abstract is submitted to the University Library and one to the National Parliamentary Library of Georgia.

B) The volume of the Georgian version of the abstract should be in the range of 35-50 thousand characters (20-25 pages of A4 format).

C) The following requirements apply to the technical data of the abstract:

- Language: Written works should be done in Georgian, without spelling, stylistic and grammatical errors. It is also possible to perform an abstract in another language in accordance with the established rules;

- Paper: The work should be done on A4 white paper, orientation-vertical. Printing is done on one page. Drawings, tables, photographs can be made in any other size format, only in this case, the mentioned pages should not be bound together with the main text;

- Margin: 2.5 cm from the left, 1.5 cm from the right and the area from the top and bottom no less than 2 and no more than 3 cm;

- Font: It is possible to use the font "Sylfaen", font size - 11, as well as the font "AcadNusx", font size - 12. In the names of the chapters and subsections a larger font can be used, size - 14 or 16;

- Spacing between lines: The spacing for the main text is 1.5. For small sections (table of contents, list of tables and drawings, abstract, footnote, note, etc.) an interval of 1 is used;

- Page numbering: All pages should be numbered sequentially. It is not allowed to leave free space or page, duplicate pages are also prohibited. Introductory pages with the main part of the text, except for the title page, are numbered in the lower right corner of the page in font size - 10;

- Names of chapters and subsections: The names of all chapters and subsections should be included in the table of contents. All chapters should start from a new page, and a subsection can continue from the same page;

- Footnote: Footnote should be placed at the end of the page or work. Font size - 10. When placing a footnote, numbering is done with symbols or Arabic numerals, which can be started from the beginning of each page;

- References: The list of used literature should be placed at the end of the work in alphabetical order (first in Georgian, then in the appropriate foreign language). The work may also have a title finder to be placed at the end of the work - in the order and / or alphabetical order indicated in the main text. The following style should be observed when referring to a literary source:

Article: Surname, initials / full title. Full name or the abbreviation of the journal, year, volume, number, page. Beginning - End. For example: Didebulidze M., New data about the XIII century painting of Kintsvisi St. Nicholas Church, Journal "Georgian Antiquities", 2002, #1, p. 85-100;

Scientific collection: surname of a specific author (or team of authors), initial / full title of the article. Collection (collection), the full name or abbreviation of the collection. Year, Publishing House, Volume, Number, page. Beginning - End. For example: Skhirtladze Z., On the Problem of Existence of Anicon Paintings in Georgia, Collection of Scientific Papers of the Department of Art History and Theory, TSU, #6, Tbilisi, 2005, pp.198-246;

When referring to separate pages of the book: surname, initial/full title, publishing house, year, (volume), page. Beginning - End. For example: Virsaladze T. Painting of Atenis sioni, Tbilisi, 1984. pp. 24-30;

When referring to the whole book: surname, initial / full title, place of publication, publishing house, year, (volume), p. For example: Virsaladze T. Painting of Atenis Sioni, Tbilisi, 1984;

Information Global Network: Author and article title (if any), website title. Last checked - date, month, year. For example: Shalley E. Taylor; Letitia Anne Peplau; David O. Sears "Social Psychology" [https://www.tsu.ge/data/file\\_db/faculty\\_psychology/Social\\_Psychology\\_12761.pdf](https://www.tsu.ge/data/file_db/faculty_psychology/Social_Psychology_12761.pdf) Last checked - 00.00.2017.

D) the printed version of the abstract should be submitted in A5 format, bound;

E) The structure of the abstract:

- Title page (outer cover): should be in standard form and include: full name of the university and logo;

Faculty and program name; Surname and first name of the doctoral student; The title of the dissertation work;

The format of the dissertation ("submitted (field name) for the academic degree of Doctor");

Date of oral examination (day, month, year);

Place of the examination (Tbilisi, Georgia).

The mentioned page number is - 1, but it is not specified.

- Signature page: should be in standard form and should have: full name of the university;

Name of faculty and doctoral program; Author's signature and his/her identification number;

Name, surname, academic degree, position of the dissertation supervisor - certified with a signature;

Names, surnames, academic degree, position of the dissertation expert/experts - position - certified with a signature;

Names, surnames of the dissertation reviewers, academic degree, position - certified with a signature;

Names, surnames, academic degree, position of the dissertation expert/experts - certified with a signature;

Names, surnames, academic degree, position of the dissertation reviewers - certified with a signature.

- The purpose of the research topic;

- Relevance of the research topic;

- Research topic methodology;

- Results of the research topic and scientific news;

- Practical coverage of the research topic;

- Literature review;

- Structure of the work (according to chapters and subsections);

- List of works published on the topic of the dissertation: The abstract should be accompanied by a list of works published by the author of the dissertation on the topic of the dissertation;
- Illustrations (if necessary, basic drawings, tables and illustrations can be attached). The bibliography is not attached to the abstract.

9. Doctoral dissertation preparation rule: The volume of the doctoral dissertation should be: for all specialties - not less than 160 and not more than 200 pages; Quantity refers to all bound pages.

The following requirements apply to other technical aspects of doctoral dissertation preparation:

- Language: Written works should be done in Georgian, without spelling, stylistic and grammatical errors. It is also possible to perform an abstract in another language in accordance with the established rules;
- Paper: The work should be done on A4 white paper, orientation-vertical. Printing is done on one page. Drawings, tables, photographs can be made in any other size format, only in this case, the mentioned pages should not be bound together with the main text;
- Margin: 2.5 cm from the left, 1.5 cm from the right and the area from the top and bottom - no less than 2 and no more than 3 cm;
- Font: It is possible to use the font "Sylfaen", font size - 11, as well as the font "AcadNusx", font size - 12. A larger font can be used in the names of the chapters and subsections, size - 14 or 16;
- Spacing between lines: The spacing for the main text is 1.5. For small sections (table of contents, list of tables and drawings, abstract, footnote, note, etc.) an interval of 1 is used;
- Page numbering: All pages should be numbered sequentially. It is not allowed to leave free space or page, duplicate pages are also prohibited. Introductory pages with the main part of the text, except for the title page, are numbered in the lower right corner of the page in font size - 10;
- Names of chapters and subsections: The names of all chapters and subsections should be included in the table of contents. All chapters should start from a new page, and a subsection can continue from the same page;
- Footnote: Footnote should be placed at the end of the page or work. Font size - 10. When placing a footnote, numbering is done with symbols or Arabic numerals, which can be started from the beginning of each page;
- References: The list of used literature should be placed at the end of the work in alphabetical order (first in Georgian, then in the appropriate foreign language). The work may also have a title finder to be placed at the end of it - in the order and / or alphabetical order indicated in the main text. The following style should be observed when referring to a literary source:
- References: The list of used literature should be placed at the end of the work in alphabetical order (first in Georgian, then in the appropriate foreign language). The work may also have a title finder to be placed at the end of it - in the order and / or alphabetical order indicated in the main text. The following style should be observed when referring to a literary source:  
Article: Surname, initials / full title. Full name or the abbreviation of the journal, year, volume, number, page. Beginning - End. For example: Didebulidze M., New data about the XIII century painting of Kintsvisi St. Nicholas Church, Journal "Georgian Antiquities", 2002, #1, p. 85-100;  
Scientific collection: surname of a specific author (or team of authors), initial / full title of the article. Collection (collection), the full name or abbreviation of the collection. Year, Publishing House, Volume, Number, page. Beginning - End. For example: Skhirtladze Z., On the Problem of Existence of Anicon Paintings in Georgia, Collection of Scientific Papers of the Department of Art History and Theory, TSU, #6, Tbilisi, 2005, pp.198-246;

When referring to separate pages of the book: surname, initial/full title, publishing house, year, (volume), page. Beginning - End. For example: Virsaladze T. Painting of Atenis sioni, Tbilisi, 1984. pp. 24-30;

When referring to the whole book: surname, initial / full title, place of publication, publishing house, year, (volume), p. For example: Virsaladze T. Painting of Atenis Sioni, Tbilisi, 1984;

Information Global Network: Author and article title (if any), website title. Last checked - date, month, year. For example: Shalley E. Taylor; Letitia Anne Peplau; David O. Sears "Social Psychology" [https://www.tsu.ge/data/file\\_db/faculty\\_psychology/Social\\_Psychology\\_12761.pdf](https://www.tsu.ge/data/file_db/faculty_psychology/Social_Psychology_12761.pdf) Last checked - 00.00.2017.

E) The structure of the doctoral dissertation:

- Title page (outer cover): should be in standard form and include: full name of the university and logo;

Faculty and doctoral program name; Surname and first name of the doctoral student; The title of the dissertation work;

The format of the dissertation ("submitted (field name) for the academic degree of Doctor");

Place of the examination (Tbilisi, Georgia).

The mentioned page number is - 1, but it is not specified.

- Signature page: should be in standard form and should have: full name of the university;

Author's signature and his/her identification number; Name of the faculty and doctoral program;

Text: "We, the undersigned, confirm that we have read the work done by the author (surname, name) under the title: (title) and recommend him/her to be considered by the Dissertation Council of N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia for the academic degree of a Doctor.";

Name, surname, academic degree, position of the dissertation supervisor - certified with a signature;

Names, surnames of the dissertation reviewers, academic degree, position - certified with a signature;

Names, surnames, academic degree, position of the dissertation expert/experts - position - certified with a signature;

Date of the oral examination (Date, month, year)

- Copyright page: Must be in standard format. The original of the dissertation must have the original signature of the author. This page is intended to give the University Library the right to dispose of doctoral dissertations (for non-commercial purposes, for peer review, etc.). This page shall include standard texts:

N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia has the right to copy and distribute the work for non-commercial purposes upon request by individuals or other institutions to look through the relevant title." And "the author retains the remaining copyright and neither the entire work nor any part of it may be reprinted or reproduced by any other method without the written permission of the author. The author asserts that the copyrighted material used in the work has received appropriate permission (except for small citations that require a specific approach to citing literature as is the case with scholarly work) and is responsible for all of it. It shall be certified by the signature of the author.

Resume (in Georgian and in one of the foreign languages); Table of Contents;

Introduction: The introductory part should describe the scientific novelty, urgency and practical significance of the problems posed in the dissertation. It should briefly and succinctly ask the problem to the solution of which the dissertation is dedicated.

**Research Methods:** This part should discuss the methods used by the dissertation researcher to address the research issue, what alternative methods have already been developed for researching similar issues, what is used by these recognized methods and/or what shortcomings do these methods have (if any).

**Current state of study of the issue and literature review:** The existing empirical basis around the problem posed in the dissertation should be considered. What is the status of the study of the issue and what are the shortcomings eliminated in the present dissertation work.

**Main text:** The main text should be divided into chapters and subsections of different levels. It must include a description of the issue - analysis, reasoning, judgment, the results obtained by the author. The structure of this part depends on the topic of the dissertation and the author has the right to present it in the form desired by him/her. It is not limited by the number of chapters and subsections. If the discussion of the results is divided into several subsections, then it is permissible to summarize the literature review and the discussion of the results.

**Conclusion:** The dissertation work should contain the conclusions of the research, which should be brief and laconic.

**Bibliography/References:** Stacked alphabetically (first Georgian literature, then foreign literature, then web pages).

**List of tables (if required):**

**List of abbreviations used (if necessary):** For abbreviations used in the dissertation that are not generally accepted, it is advisable for the author to provide a list and explanation of them, which will make the work easy to understand.

**Alphabetical search (if necessary):** Alphabetical search can be added at the author's request.

**Photo-illustrations, drawings and tables (if necessary):**

Content of illustrations, drawings and tables, location, formatting is determined by the specifics of the work. Copyright should not be infringed upon the use of photographs, drawings and tables taken from literary or other sources. Drawings and tables shall be drawn in black and white, the use of color illustrations is also allowed.

**Location:** Illustrations, drawings, tables and their names can be placed on a separate individual page as an annex. When placing photo illustrations, drawings, spreadsheets, horizontal orientation of the sheet is allowed, if necessary. The horizontal page margin and page numbering should be similar to the vertical pages. Numbering of drawings and tables in the annex starts from the beginning.

**Annex (if necessary):** The annex can contain data tables, drawings, calculations, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes and more. In case of using copyrighted materials in the dissertation, a copyright letter(s) on the copyright should be added to the annexes as a separate page(s).

### Article 3. Doctoral student's Colloquium

1. The colloquium is a compulsory part of doctoral studies required to obtain research component credits. The colloquium is a presentation of the results of scientific research to the Faculty Council, where a discussion is held, where new scientific achievements, problems, literature in the field of doctoral work are evaluated and discussed, followed by a scientific discussion.

The process of the colloquium is reflected in the minutes, which is signed by the Chairman of the Faculty Board.

2. The doctoral student is obliged to submit a report on the colloquium at least once a year.

3. The schedule of the colloquium is determined at the beginning of the semester by the Dean of the Faculty(s) in agreement with the Program Supervisor and the scientific Supervisor of the doctoral student.
4. Participation in the colloquium is mandatory to obtain credit in the research component.

#### Article 4. Preparation of dissertation work

1. A dissertation is a scientific work based on an independent research of a doctoral student, which is based on the new knowledge gained by him/her. The dissertation should reflect the scientifically substantiated new results of theoretical and/or empirical research that contribute to the development of the field.
2. If the doctoral student is engaged in a research group, his/her contribution shall be clearly visible.
3. The dissertation must be completed in Georgian. It should be accompanied by a short version of the main provisions of the dissertation - an abstract in Georgian and in one of the foreign languages (English, French, German, Russian) (within the range of 35-50 thousand characters).
4. In exceptional cases, the preparation of dissertation in another language is decided by the Dissertation Board.
5. In case of preparation of the dissertation work in a foreign language doctoral program, the dissertation will be submitted in the relevant foreign language.
6. In case of preparation of the work in a foreign language, the main results of the research - the abstract should be submitted in Georgian language (within the range of 35-50 thousand characters, 20-25 pages in A4 format).
7. The volume, format and other technical data of the dissertation work is determined by the doctoral standard developed by the Dissertation Board and approved by the Faculty Councils and this Regulation.

#### Article 5. Submission of the dissertation work

1. A necessary precondition for submitting a dissertation to the Dissertation Board is the written consent of the Faculty Council (excerpt from the minutes of the session) to submit the dissertation for public oral examination.
2. The dissertation shall be submitted to the Board in three printed and bound and one electronic copy.
3. The doctoral student submits three copies of the Georgian version of the printed abstract and one copy of its foreign language version and their electronic versions in compliance with existing standards to the Dissertation Board.
4. Along with the dissertation, the doctoral student must submit the following documents:
  - Document confirming the accumulation of 60 ECTS study credits provided by the doctoral program;
  - Notice of fulfillment of financial obligations;
  - Excerpts of scientific papers published in peer-reviewed collections (collection title page, table of contents with the reference to the author of the article, title and article);
  - List of scientific seminars, conferences and forums, where the provisions or results of the dissertation were introduced (if any);
  - Application of the dissertationist addressed to the Chairman of the Dissertation Board;



- Doctoral student biography (CV) with a photo;
  - Extract from the minutes of the Faculty Council meeting with the recommendation to review the dissertation and to submit it to the Council;
  - The statement of the dissertationist that the text of the dissertation is performed by him/her and all the indicated sources are correct;
  - The dissertation must be accompanied by an explanation of the doctoral student that the work is performed by him/her and all the sources published in the work are properly referenced;
5. The main results of the dissertation work shall be published before the public oral examination, in the form of at least one scientific paper in the peer-reviewed journals. The list of peer-reviewed journals is established by the Dissertation Board.
  6. It is obligatory for the doctoral student to publish the scientific research publication(s) in the international peer-reviewed publications (scientific series) and international peer-reviewed journals included in the following scientific databases: Thomson Reuters Master Journal List, Scopus, Ulrich's Index, ERIH PLUS, EBSCOHost, Latindex Catalogue. The name of the N(N)LE Saint King Tamar University of Patriarchate of Georgia shall be indicated in the scientific publication.
  7. The doctoral student must be the first or second author of a published scientific article.
  8. The Faculty Council reviews and makes a decision on the relevance of the doctoral student's scientific publication to the dissertation work. In case of a negative decision/conclusion, the obligation to publish a scientific research publication(s) in international peer-reviewed publications (scientific series) and/or international peer-reviewed journals will not be considered satisfied by the doctoral student.
  9. The Dissertation Board may develop additional requirements in individual cases.
  10. The dissertation work must be publicly orally examined within 6 months from the date of submission of the dissertation to the dissertation council.
  11. Special cases are reviewed and decided by the Dissertation Board.
  12. After the appointment of the public oral examination day of the dissertation, before the examination, the doctoral student is obliged to submit an abstract (printed or electronic version) and an electronic version of the dissertation to the members of the dissertation commission.

#### Article 6. Preliminary evaluation of the dissertation work

1. After submitting the dissertation, the Dissertation Board shall appoint two evaluators (reviewers), who shall submit a written evaluation (review) of the dissertation work to the Dissertation Board no later than 2 months after receiving the work.
2. A person with the academic degree of Doctor, who has publications in the field of dissertation work or has created creative products in the relevant field or engages in long-term practical activities in the relevant field, is appointed as an evaluator (reviewer).
3. The evaluator (reviewer) may not be a co-author of the works performed by the dissertationist, as well as a person officially dependent on the dissertationist.
4. At the request of the doctoral student supervisor, one evaluator (reviewer) may be a current or retired employee of a foreign educational or scientific institution, a person with an academic degree of Doctor.
5. The review together with the evaluation of the dissertation work shall contain the relevant recommendation on admission to the public oral examination of the dissertation or return to the doctoral student for correction or refusal to examine, which will be reflected in the dissertation evaluation register according to the written dissertation evaluation rule.

6. The evaluation of the dissertation and its admission to public oral examination is based on the conclusions of the evaluators (reviewers) (see the evaluation register in Annex № 2).

7. The evaluation criteria are:

- Technical side (30 points):

Compliance with scientific standards (10 points)

9-10 points	The work is completed in full compliance with the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography is perfect, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is perfectly maintained.
7-8 points	The work is completed with partial observance of the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography partially meets the requirements, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is partially maintained.
5-6 points	The work is completed by improper observance of the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography is not at the proper level, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is not properly maintained.
3-4 points	The citation rule is used incorrectly in the work, technical condition of the bibliography, the delivery of attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is imperfect and fragmented.
0-2 points	The work is completed disregarding the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials do not meet the requirements.

Structural coherency (10 points)

9-10 points	The structure of the work is clear and visible, logically formulated, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research; The structure of the work is clearly reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations.
7-8 points	The structure of the work is logically formulated, which clearly outlines the research objectives, process and results, although individual issues require clarification. The structure of the work is well reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations, but requires clarification.
5-6 points	The structure of the work is established, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research, but does not fully address a number of issues. The structure of the work is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations, but a number of issues are not fully addressed.
3-4 points	The structure of the work is superficial and without supporting evidence, which does not clearly outline the objectives, process and results of the research. The structure of the work is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations superficially and without supporting evidence.
0-2 points	The structure of the work is unqualified, which does not outline the objectives,

	process and results of the research. The structure of the work is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations as unqualified.
--	--

Linguistic and stylistic coherency (10 points)

9-10 points	Linguistically correct, the unified style of scientific language is precisely preserved, the accuracy of terminology is preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is relevant and adequate to the specifics of the field.
7-8 points	Linguistically correct, the uniform style of the scientific language is preserved, although there are small shortcomings, the accuracy of the terminology is preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is appropriate and adequate to the specifics of the field.
5-6 points	Linguistically not perfect, the unified style of scientific language is partially preserved, although there are some inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is partially preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is partially relevant to the specifics of the field.
3-4 points	Linguistically partially correct, the unified style of scientific language is partially preserved, although there are many inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is not maintained, the logical and conceptual apparatus is partially relevant to the specifics of the field
0-2 points	Linguistically partially correct, the unified style of scientific language is not preserved, there are many mistakes, the accuracy of the terminology is not maintained, the logical and conceptual apparatus does not correspond to the specifics of the field

Content side (70 points)

Urgency of the problem (10 points)

9-10 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are clearly and logically formulated.
7-8 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are clearly and logically formulated but lack clarity.
5-6 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are formulated, but the contextual factors are not fully considered.
3-4 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are superficially and unargued.
0-2 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are asked unqualifiedly, without taking into account the contextual factors.

Research novelty (10 points)

9-10 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is clearly and logically formulated
7-8 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is clearly and logically formulated, but lack clarity.

5-6 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is formulated, but contextual factors are not fully considered.
3-4 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is formulated superficially and unargued.
0-2 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development of the research posed unqualifiedly, without taking into account contextual factors

#### Clarity of research methodology (10 points)

9-10 points	The selected scientific method / methods are fully in line with the research topic, the research methods are used effectively, purposefully and comprehensively.
7-8 points	The selected scientific method / methods are almost completely in line with the research topic, the research methods are used purposefully and in a complex way.
5-6 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, separate research methods are purposefully used
3-4 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, research methods can not provide concrete results
0-2 points	Selected scientific method / methods do not correspond to the research topic, research methods are used unqualified

#### Relevance of the discussed material to the topic and substantiation (15 points)

13-15 points	The relevance of the retrieved material to the research topic and its diversity; Depth of analysis and quality of research Ability to reason independently, The degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, The degree of logical connection between the parts of the paper, The quality of in-depth study of the issue and the available material effectively, Purposefully and comprehensively presented
10-12 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its diversity, depth of analysis and quality of research, ability of independent reasoning, degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, degree of logical connection between parts of the paper, quality of in-depth question and existing material
7-9 points	The relevance of the retrieved material to the research topic and its diversity; Depth of analysis and quality of research Ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, The degree of logical connection between the parts of the paper, The low degree of in-depth study of the question and the available material is partly purposeful

4-6 points	
------------	--

	Partial relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its non-diversity; Insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research, Insufficient ability to reason independently, Low degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, Low degree of logical connection between parts of the paper, In-depth study of the question and the available material partially ensures the achievement of concrete results
0-3 points	Partial relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its non-diversity; insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research, inability to reason independently, low degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, lack of logical connection between parts of the paper, in-depth study of the question and the available material will not provide concrete results

#### Argumentation of the research result (conclusion) (15 points)

13-15 points	The new data are sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are sufficiently reflected in the report, the author's position is supported by clear and reliable data.
10-12 points	New data are sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are sufficiently reflected in the report, the author's position lacks clarity / substantiation with clear and credible data
7-9 points	New data are sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are partially reflected in the conclusion, the author's position is not substantiated
4-6 points	The new data is partially sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are partially reflected in the conclusion, the author's position is superficial and unargued.
0-3 points	The new data is partially sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are not reflected in the conclusion, the author's position is formed unqualified, without any substantiation

#### Diversity and novelty of used literature (10 points)

9-10 points	The relevance of the literature used to the research topic, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the use of the latest research relevant to the topic of the paper are clearly established, in-depth analyzed and evaluated
7-8 points	The relevance of the literature used to the research topic, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the ability to use the latest research are formulated, analyzed and evaluated.
5-6 points	The relevance of the literature used to the research topic, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the use of recent research are partially established but not analyzed and evaluated

3-4 points	Relevance of the used literature to the research topic, diversity of the used literature, presentation and comprehension of basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the ability to use the latest research is superficially formulated, not analyzed and evaluated
0-2 points	Relevance of the used literature to the research topic, diversity of the used literature, the ability to present and understand basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the use of the latest research is poorly developed or not presented at all

8. A paper is evaluated positively if it accumulates at least 51 points. In case of receiving 41-50 points, the doctoral student is entitled to submit a revised paper for review for the second time.

9. In case of a negative conclusion of one of the two evaluators, the Dissertation Board will allocate two additional evaluators within 10 days. If one conclusion is still negative, the Board will allocate one additional evaluator within 10 days.

10. If two reviewers request the return of the paper to the doctoral student for processing, the defense paper will not be allowed and will be returned to the doctoral student for processing within 2 months and the doctoral student is required to re-submit the processed paper to the reviewers; The dissertation will be submitted to the doctoral student for processing once; The revised version is evaluated by the reviewers only with the recommendation of admission or non-admission to the protection of the paper.

11. If one of the reviewers requests a revision, the doctoral student may revisit it within 2 months or request access to public protection.

12. If more than half of the evaluators (reviewers) evaluate the dissertation negatively, public defense of the dissertation will not be held.

13. Evaluators must submit their written report and evaluation sheet no later than 2 months after the submission of the dissertation. In case of appointment of additional evaluators, they are given 2 months to evaluate the paper.

14. The report shall indicate the decision to admit the dissertation to public defense, to return it to the doctoral student for its correction, or to refuse public protection. In case of minor remarks the dissertation will be allowed on defense

15. If the dissertation is not allowed for defense, by the decision of the Dissertation Board, the doctoral student is allowed to work on the dissertation and re-submit it to the Board within 1 year (after paying the relevant credit fee). Otherwise the person will not be allowed to defend.

16. In case of negative evaluation of the revised paper again, the dissertation paper will not be accepted for public defense.

17. The Dissertation Board submits the conclusions of the evaluators (reviewers) to the doctoral student, and in case of admission to the defense, announces the date of the defense. The doctoral student should be given a maximum of 1 month to prepare for the defense

18. If the doctoral student is denied public defense, one person of the rejected dissertation and the written conclusions of the reviewer-opponents will be transferred to the archives of the dissertation board. The doctoral student is entitled to read these documents. The rest of the documents will be returned to the doctoral student



19. Reviewers appointed by the Dissertation Board are required to detect plagiarism if found
20. Plagiarism is manifested in the use of someone else's work or idea in one's own name, as well as in borrowing fragments of someone else's work without reference to the source. A necessary sign of plagiarism is the appropriation of authorship
21. In case of plagiarism, the reviewer / expert is obliged to inform the dissertation board and submit the written evidence of plagiarism in writing.
22. The Dissertation Board decides on the form of discussion of the issue (deliberation and decision-making on the board, establishment of a commission, application to the section, etc.) and the appropriate response.

#### Article 7. Dissertation Commission

1. The Chairman of the Dissertation Council, in consultation with the Head of the Doctoral Program, establishes a dissertation commission for public defense of the dissertation.
2. The dissertation commission is composed of at least five persons who have the right to vote. The Dissertation Board approves the key and reserve members of the commission.
3. A specialist in the relevant field, who has a scientific degree equal to the academic degree of Doctor, must be elected as a member of the Commission. The supervisor and the evaluators (reviewers) have the right to participate in the commission with a deliberative vote if necessary. And only the members of the commission attend the final meeting of the dissertation commission and the voting procedure. The dissertation commission may also include specialists in the field with a doctoral degree who are not members of the dissertation board. At least half of the members of the dissertation commission must be composed of members of the dissertation board
4. The dissertation commission is headed by a chairman elected by the commission, who must be a university professor, associate or honorary professor, Emeritus. A member of the commission may not be the head of the doctoral dissertation or the evaluator (reviewer).
5. The session of the dissertation commission is considered authorized if at least 2/3 of the commission members participate in its work.
6. Upon approval of the dissertation commission, the board will provide the dissertation commission members with an abstract of the dissertation (printed or electronic version) and written feedback on the dissertation. Upon request, the members of the commission will be provided with a full dissertation

#### Article 8. Prepare and defend public dissertation

1. The date of public defense of the dissertation is set by the Dissertation Board no later than one month after the approval of the Dissertation Commission.
2. The Secretary of the Board, in agreement with the Chairman, notifies the doctoral student in writing about the date of public defense of the dissertation.
3. Information on the date and place of public defense of the dissertation is published in advance on the University website;
4. The defense of the dissertation is public.
5. The language of protection is Georgian.  
The language of protection for a doctoral student in a foreign language program will be in the appropriate language
6. All other specific cases are reviewed by the Dissertation Board.
6. The chairperson of the dissertation board shall submit all the dissertation documents to the public defense, after which the dissertation commission shall nominate and elect the chairperson of the session to chair the session. The chairperson of the commission ensures the voting and counting procedures and is responsible for the final conclusion of the commission decision. The chairperson of the commission shall submit the decision of the commission and all related documents to the

chairperson of the dissertation board.

7. The course of the defense and the decision made are reflected in the protocol, which is signed by the chairperson of the dissertation commission and the secretary of the dissertation board.

8. The dissertation public protection regulations include the following procedures:

- Submission of the doctoral student and documents to the dissertation commission by the chairman of the board;
- Presenting the composition of the dissertation commission to the attendees and electing the chairman of the commission;
- Doctoral student presentation (no more than 30 minutes);
- Publicly read the conclusion of the dissertation supervisor;
- Read reviews publicly;
- Answering the questions and remarks raised in the reviews by the doctoral student;
- Answering the doctoral student's questions to the members of the commission;
- Scientific discussion;
- Closed session of the commission - to evaluate the dissertation and draw a conclusion with the signatures of all members of the commission;
- Announcing the evaluation of the dissertation;
- The final word of the doctoral student.

9. Public defense of only one dissertation may be held at one sitting of the commission

10. After the Public Defense, the Secretariat of the Dissertation Council prepares the documents related to the defense (protocol, written text of the dissertation presentation, the texts of its response to the reviewers' remarks, the final evaluation document of the dissertation commission, used ballots, video recording of the dissertation). The Chairman of the Dissertation Board is responsible for the content, compliance with the existing rules and storage

Article 9. Final evaluation of the dissertation by the dissertation commission

1. The final evaluation of the dissertation is made at the closed session of the dissertation board as soon as the public defense is completed. Each member of the commission evaluates the dissertation on a point basis, according to the criteria given in this rule. The final score of the dissertation evaluation is determined by the arithmetic mean of the evaluation of the commission members

2. The work of the dissertation commission and the final evaluation are reflected in the defense protocol

3. The final evaluation is done according to the following system:

- 91-100 - Friadi - summa cum laude;
- 81-90 - very good - magna cum laude;
- 71-80 -good - cum laude;
- 61-70 -medium - bene;
- 51- 60 - Satisfactory - rite;
- 41- 50 - unsatisfactory - insufficienter;
- 0-40 - Completely unsatisfactory - sum omni canone.

4. The chairperson of the dissertation commission informs the doctoral student orally about the reasoned decision of the commission.

5. The dissertation is not considered defended if the final grade is "unsatisfactory" or "completely unsatisfactory".

6. In case of a positive evaluation, the doctoral student is awarded the academic degree of Doctor (PHD).

7. The score of the dissertation should be reflected in the form (see Annex №3), as follows:

- Technical side (20 points):

1. Compliance with scientific standards is checked (5 points):

- Adherence to citation rules;
- Technical correctness of bibliography presentation;
- Proper delivery of attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials (availability of naming, numbering and other necessary data)

5 points	The work is completed in full compliance with the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography is perfect, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is perfectly maintained.
4 points	The work is completed with partial observance of the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography partially meets the requirements, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is partially maintained.
3 points	The work is completed by improper observance of the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography is not at the proper level, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is not properly maintained.
2 points	The citation rule is used incorrectly in the work, technical condition of the bibliography, the delivery of attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is imperfect and fragmented.
0-1 points	The work is completed disregarding the citation rule, the technical condition of the bibliography, the delivery of annexes, diagrams, illustrations and other materials do not meet the requirements.

2. The correctness of the structure is checked (10 points):

- Clear and visible structuring of the paper, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research;
- Reflection of the structure of the paper in the table of contents or in the attached explanations.

9-10 points	The structure of the work is clear and visible, logically formulated, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research; The structure of the work is clearly reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations.
7-8 points	The structure of the work is logically formulated, which clearly outlines the research objectives, process and results, although individual issues require clarification. The structure of the work is well reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations, but requires clarification.
5-6 points	The structure of the work is established, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research, but does not fully address a number of issues. The structure of the work is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations, but a number of issues are not fully addressed.
3-4 points	The structure of the work is superficial and without supporting evidence, which does not clearly outline the objectives, process and results of the research. The structure of the work is reflected in the table of contents or in the

	attached explanations superficially and without supporting evidence.
0-2 points	The structure of the work is unqualified, which does not outline the objectives, process and results of the research. The structure of the work is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations as unqualified.

3. Linguistic and stylistic correctness is checked (5 points):

- Linguistic fluency;
- Adherence to a unified style of scientific language;
- Accuracy of terminology, adequacy of logical and conceptual apparatus and compliance with the specifics of the field

5 points	Linguistically correct, the unified style of scientific language is precisely preserved, the accuracy of terminology is preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is relevant and adequate to the specifics of the field.
4 points	Linguistically correct, the uniform style of the scientific language is preserved, although there are small shortcomings, the accuracy of the terminology is preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is appropriate and adequate to the specifics of the field.
3 points	Linguistically not perfect, the unified style of scientific language is partially preserved, although there are some inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is partially preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is partially relevant to the specifics of the field.
2 points	Linguistically partially correct, the unified style of scientific language is partially preserved, although there are many inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is not maintained, the logical and conceptual apparatus is partially relevant to the specifics of the field
0-1 points	Linguistically partially correct, the unified style of scientific language is not preserved, there are many mistakes, the accuracy of the terminology is not maintained, the logical and conceptual apparatus does not correspond to the specifics of the field

- Content side (60 points):

1. The urgency of the problem is checked (5 points):

- The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper;
- Diagnosis of a problem in the field and proper substantiation of its urgency.

5 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are clearly and logically formulated.
4 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are clearly and logically formulated but lack clarity.
3 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are formulated, but the contextual factors are not fully considered.
2 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are superficially and unargued.
0-1 points	The urgency of the scientific problem raised in the paper, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are asked unqualifiedly, without taking into account the contextual factors.

2. The novelty of the research is checked (10 points):

- Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology;
- Creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / field;
- Possibility of further research development perspective.

9-10 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is clearly and logically formulated
-------------	--

7-8 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is clearly and logically formulated, but lack clarity.
------------	---

5-6 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is formulated, but contextual factors are not fully considered.
3-4 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development perspective of the research is formulated superficially and unargued.
0-2 points	Novelty of the research object / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / sphere, possibility of further development of the research posed unqualifiedly, without taking into account contextual factors

3. The clarity of the research methodology is checked (10 points):

- Relevance of the selected scientific method / methods to the research topic;
- Thoughtful use of research method / methods.

9-10 points	The selected scientific method / methods are fully in line with the research topic, the research methods are used effectively, purposefully and comprehensively.
7-8 points	The selected scientific method / methods are almost completely in line with the research topic, the research methods are used purposefully and in a complex way.
5-6 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, separate research methods are purposefully used
3-4 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, research methods can not provide concrete results
0-2 points	Selected scientific method / methods do not correspond to the research topic, research methods are used unqualified

4. The relevance of the discussed material to the topic and the substantiation are checked (15 points):

- Relevance of the found material to the research topic and its diversity;
- Depth of analysis and quality of research;
- Ability to reason independently;
- The degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic;
- The degree of logical connection between parts of the paper;
- Quality of in-depth study of the issue and existing material.

13-15 points	The relevance of the retrieved material to the research topic and its diversity; Depth of analysis and quality of research Ability to reason independently, The degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, The degree of logical connection between the parts of the paper, The quality of in-depth study of the issue and the available material effectively, Purposefully and comprehensively presented
--------------	---



10-12 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its diversity, depth of analysis and quality of research, ability of independent reasoning, degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, degree of logical connection between parts of the paper, quality of in-depth question and existing material
7-9 points	The relevance of the retrieved material to the research topic and its diversity; Depth of analysis and quality of research Ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, The degree of logical connection between the parts of the paper, The low degree of in-depth study of the question and the available material is partly purposeful
4-6 points	

	Partial relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its non-diversity; Insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research, Insufficient ability to reason independently, Low degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, Low degree of logical connection between parts of the paper, In-depth study of the question and the available material partially ensures the achievement of concrete results
0-3 points	Partial relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its non-diversity; insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research, inability to reason independently, low degree of concentration of the paper on the main research topic, lack of logical connection between parts of the paper, in-depth study of the question and the available material will not provide concrete results

5. The argumentation of the research result (conclusion) is checked (15 points):

- whether the new data is sufficient for the findings presented in the dissertation;
- Is the data obtained during the research process sufficiently reflected in the report?
- Whether the author's position is supported by clear and credible data.

13-15 points	The new data are sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are sufficiently reflected in the report, the author's position is supported by clear and reliable data.
10-12 points	New data are sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are sufficiently reflected in the report, the author's position lacks clarity / substantiation with clear and credible data
7-9 points	New data are sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are partially reflected in the conclusion, the author's position is not substantiated
4-6 points	The new data is partially sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are partially reflected in the conclusion, the author's position is superficial and unargued.
0-3 points	The new data is partially sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are not reflected in the conclusion, the author's position is formed unqualified, without any substantiation

6. The diversity and novelty of the used literature is checked (5 points):

- Relevance of the used literature to the research topic;
- Diversity of used literature;
- Quality of presentation and comprehension of basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper;
- Use the latest research relevant to the topic of the paper.

5 points	The relevance of the literature used to the research topic, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the use of the latest research relevant to the topic of the paper are clearly established, in-depth analyzed and evaluated
----------	---

4 points	The relevance of the literature used to the research topic, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the ability to use the latest research are formulated, analyzed and evaluated.
3 points	The relevance of the literature used to the research topic, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the use of recent research are partially established but not analyzed and evaluated

2 points	Relevance of the used literature to the research topic, diversity of the used literature, presentation and comprehension of basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the ability to use the latest research is superficially formulated, not analyzed and evaluated
0-1 points	Relevance of the used literature to the research topic, diversity of the used literature, the ability to present and understand basic academic research relevant to the topic of the paper, as well as the use of the latest research is poorly developed or not presented at all

- Defense-presentation (20 points):

1. Properness and presentability of the dissertation is checked (10 points):

- Quality of the paper in the dissertation: the presentation of the objectives of the paper, the selected method, process, conclusions and other related issues in a logical, reasoned, concise and correct manner;
- Relevance of the presented presentation and visual material to the topic of the paper, logic and correctness of the accents.

9-10 points	The aims of the dissertation, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions and other issues related to the topic of the presented presentation and the visual material, the logic of the accents and the correctness of the accents are well demonstrated by demonstrating knowledge.
-------------	--

7-8 points	The aims of the paper in the dissertation, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions obtained and other related issues are logically, argumentatively, concisely and correctly, in accordance with the topic of the presented presentation and visual material, the logic and correctness of the accents are demonstrated by demonstrating knowledge around this topic but lack convincing
5-6 points	In the dissertation, the objectives of the paper, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are presented less logically, less argumentatively. The relevance of the presentation and the visual material to the topic, the logic and correctness of the accents are demonstrated by the demonstration of partial knowledge around this topic, although the reasoning is incomplete and unconvincing.
3-4 points	In the dissertation, the objectives of the paper, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are presented less logically, less argumentatively. The relevance of the presentation and the visual material to the topic, the logic and correctness of the accents are demonstrated by the demonstration of scant knowledge around this topic. The reasoning is incomplete and fragmentary, failing to reflect the content of the presented topic
0-2 points	The objectives of the paper, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are presented in the dissertation in an illogical, unargued manner. He/she was unable to present the topic The reasoning is not relevant to the issue

2. The logic, justification and academic protection of answering the questions are checked (10 points):

- Logic, reasoning, conciseness and adequacy in answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the dissertation commission.
- Protecting academia - Adhering to the standards and ethical norms of scientific debate when giving answers.

9-10 points	The logic, reasoning, conciseness and adequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the dissertation commission are demonstrated by demonstrating a thorough knowledge of the issue. Protecting Academics - Adhering to the Standards and Ethics of Scientific Debate in Answering
7-8 points	The logic, reasoning, conciseness and adequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the dissertation commission are demonstrated by demonstrating a good knowledge of the subject. Protecting Academics - Adhering to the Standards and Ethics of Scientific Debate in Answering Reasoning is at a good level though lacking in persuasiveness

5-6 points	<p>The logic, argumentativeness, conciseness and adequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the dissertation commission are demonstrated by demonstrating average knowledge of the issue.</p> <p>Protecting Academics - Adhering to the Standards and Ethics of Scientific Debate in Answering</p> <p>The reasoning is incomplete and unconvincing</p>
------------	---

3-4 points	There is a lack of logic, argumentation, conciseness and adequacy in answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the dissertation commission. Protecting Academics - Adhering to the Standards and Ethics of Scientific Debate in Answering The reasoning is flawed and fragmentary
0-2 points	There is illogicality, non-argumentation, inconsistency and inadequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the dissertation commission Protecting Academia - Adhering to the Standards and Ethics of Scientific Debate in Answering Cannot reason and can not answer questions.

8. The result of the thesis evaluation should be immediately communicated to the doctoral student, the doctoral student supervisor and the head of the doctoral program.

9. Thesis and the evaluation of the thesis are not publicly available until the appointment of the defense by the dissertation board, except for the persons provided for in paragraph 8 of this article.

#### Article 10. Awarding the academic degree of Doctor

The academic degree of University Doctor (Ph.D) is awarded by the University Dissertation Council in the relevant specialty in accordance with the relevant regulations.

#### Article 11. Publication of the dissertation

1. Doctor's Diploma is issued after the publication of the dissertation
2. After defending the dissertation, within 6 months, the University, upon the request of the Dissertation Board, provides the publication of the dissertation in printed or electronic form.

#### Article 12. Diploma certifying the academic degree of Doctor

1. Diploma (certificate) confirms the academic degree of Doctor of the University.
2. The diploma is issued no later than 6 months after the defense of the dissertation  
Prior to the issuance of the diploma, the doctoral student is given a relevant certificate on the award of an academic degree.
3. The diploma mentions the name of the dissertation board, the date of defense, the general assessment and the name of the specialty. The diploma must be accompanied by an appendix.
4. The diploma is issued after the publication of the dissertation. The diploma is signed by the Rector of the University, the Dean of the relevant faculty of the doctoral program, the Chairman of the Dissertation Council. The diploma is certified with the seal of the University.
5. A copy of the diploma is kept in the university archives.
6. In case of submitting incorrect data during the dissertation process and violation of the norms of academic honesty, the diploma certifying the academic degree of Doctor will not be issued. The relevant



decision is made by the Dissertation Board.

7. Doctor's academic degree will be revoked by the decision of the University Dissertation Board in case of violation of the norms of academic honesty (use of falsified data in the dissertation or plagiarism).

## Chapter II. Planning, Implementation and Evaluation of the Scientific-Research Component of the Master's Program

### Article 1. Master's research component

The master's research component includes:

- Execution of a master's thesis, which should reflect the substantiated results of theoretical and / or empirical research;
- Defense of the master's thesis, ie, public presentation of the topic

### Article 2. Master Thesis

1. The master's program is considered completed by the student if he / she has accumulated the credits provided by the educational program and, in the prescribed manner, successfully defended the master's thesis
2. The master's thesis is a kind of summary work, which tests the student's reasoning, analysis and synthesis skills in the specialty, as well as the ability to see and evaluate problems. It reveals the compliance of the student's level of knowledge and the level of creative, research skills with the requirements set by the master's program.

### Article 3. Structure and formulation of the master's thesis

The master's thesis must meet the following requirements:

- A) The volume of the paper should not be less than 60 pages in A-4 format.

Font: "Sylfaen"; Font size: 12; Title and subtitle size: 14; Distance between rows: 1.5; Page fields (from all sides): 2 cm;

- B) The following components should be considered in the structure of the paper:

- b.a) Title (first page of the paper);
- b.b) Annotation (should not exceed one page should reflect the structure, objectives and brief conclusion of the master thesis);
- b.c) Introduction (substantiation of topic relevance, goals, objectives, research subject and methods used);
- b.d) The main part of the text (should be divided into chapters and paragraphs. Can be attached to diagrams, tables, drawings);
- b.e) Conclusion (should reflect the results of the bachelor's thesis);
- b.f) List of used literature (should be presented at the end of the paper in alphabetical order, first editions in Georgian and then editions in foreign languages).
- b.g) The list of used literature should indicate:
  - b.g.a) In case of using periodicals: surname and initials of the author (s), title of the paper, year, number of the volume, name of the scientific journal (in italics), number of the publication and pages on which the paper is placed;
  - b.g,b) In case of using a book or monograph: surname and initials of the author (s), title (in italics), year of publication, place of publication, publishing house;
  - b.g,c) In case of using the Internet: surname and initials of the author (s) of the material, author of the website, title of the material with a link, website address and date of finding the material;

b.g.d) In case of using the electronic publication: surname and initials of the author (s) of the article, title of the article, year, name of the electronic publication (in italics), publication number, chapter, paragraph (written in parentheses), website address and date of finding the material;

b.g.e) In case of using government documents: name of the country, name of the agency to which the document belongs, type of document (order, law, etc.), name of the document with the appropriate identification number and year, place of publication in which the specified document is found and name of the publication where The document was specified;

b.g.f) The literature used in the text should be marked as follows: At the end of the quotation, a parenthesis is opened, where the serial number of the named literature is written according to the attached list and is separated by a comma. Then the pages from which the quote or thesis is taken are indicated (e.g. 15, 150-161);

b.g.g) Footnotes should be used to indicate additional information in the main body of the paper (eg see Annex 2).

C) The paper should be organized in the following order: title page, annotation, table of contents, introduction, chapters, conclusion, used literature and appendix (footnote).

#### Article 4. Supervisor of the master thesis

1. The student has a supervisor while working on a master's thesis. The supervisor of the master's thesis is selected by the student from the academic staff of the university. The master can choose the topic and supervisor of the master's thesis at the beginning of the 3rd academic semester of the master's program, not later than one month after the beginning of the academic semester. The topic of the master's thesis can be changed only once, not more than two months before the end of the submission period, in agreement with the supervisor and by submitting a written application to the Dean of the main educational structural unit (faculties) of the University.

2. Master Thesis Supervisor: In order to guide the student in the right direction of the Master Thesis, helps him / her to select a topic, compile a work plan and develop a bibliography; Checks the progress of the student's work on the topic, expresses remarks and recommendations; In case of directing the research in the wrong direction, it helps the student in its correction

3. The head of the master's thesis has the right to refuse in writing the motivation of the student to supervise the master's thesis, both before starting the work and during the work on the topic, not later than one month after starting the work.

#### Article 5. Evaluation of the master's thesis

1. The evaluation of the master project / thesis is carried out by the University Faculty Board

2. The master project / thesis must be evaluated in the same or next semester in which the student completes the work on it

Master project / thesis must be evaluated once (with final evaluation). Relevant method / methods and criteria for evaluation of the result should be used in the evaluation

3. The evaluation system allows:

Five types of positive assessment:

A.a) (A) Excellent - 91-100 points of the assessment;

A.b) (B) Very good - 81-90 points of maximum assessment;

A.c) (C) Good - 71-80 points of maximum assessment;

A.d) (D) Satisfactory - 61-70 points of maximum assessment;

A.e) (E) Sufficient - 51-60 points of maximum assessment.

B) Two types of negative assessment:

B.a) (FX) Did not pass - 41-50 points of the maximum grade, which means that the student needs more work to pass and is given the right to take the additional exam once with independent work;

B.b) (F) Failed - 40 points or less of the maximum grade, which means that the work done by the student is not enough and he/she has to re-take the course.

4. The evaluation score of the master project / thesis is calculated using the arithmetic mean of the scores written by the faculty members. The master project / thesis will be considered completed by the student if he / she accumulates 51 and more points in the assessment.

5. In case of a positive evaluation of the master's project / thesis, the University Faculty Council makes a decision on awarding a master's degree to a graduate student.

6. In case of evaluation of the master's project / thesis with 41-50 points (FX) the student is given the right to apply for additional master's thesis once in public. The interval between public defense and additional defense of the master thesis should be not less than 10 days.

7. In case of evaluation of the master project / thesis with 0-40 points (F), the student is given the right to choose a new topic and to defend the master thesis before the faculty council in the prescribed manner.

#### Article 6 Master's Degree

1. The award of a Master's degree is confirmed by a Master's Diploma.

2. The diploma will be issued no later than 6 months after the public presentation and defense of the master's thesis. Prior to the issuance of the diploma, the master student is given a relevant certificate of academic degree. The master's degree must be accompanied by a standard appendix.

3. The Master's Diploma is signed by the Rector of the University and the Dean of the relevant faculty of the Master's program and is certified with the seal of the University.

4. In case of incorrect data submission by the Master and / or violation of the norms of academic honesty, the Master's degree certifying the academic degree will not be issued. The relevant decision is made by the Faculty Board.

5. Master's degree will be revoked by the decision of the University Faculty Board in case of violation of the norms of academic honesty (use of falsified data or plagiarism).

### **Chapter III. Planning, Implementation and Evaluation of the Scientific-Research Component of the Bachelor's Program**

#### Article 1. Bachelor's research component

The bachelor's research component includes:

- Execution of a bachelor's thesis, which should reflect the substantiated results of theoretical and / or empirical research;
- Defense of the bachelor's thesis, ie, public presentation of the topic

## Article 2. Bachelor's Thesis

1.The bachelor's program is considered completed by the student if he / she has accumulated the credits provided by the educational program and, in the prescribed manner, successfully defended the bachelor's thesis

2.The bachelor's thesis is a kind of summary work, which tests the student's reasoning, analysis and synthesis skills in the specialty, as well as the ability to see and evaluate problems. It reveals the compliance of the student's level of knowledge and the level of creative, research skills with the requirements set by the bachelor's program.

## Article 3. Structure and formulation of the bachelor's thesis

The bachelor's thesis must meet the following requirements:

D) The volume of the paper should not be less than 60 pages in A-4 format.

Font: "Sylfaen"; Font size: 12; Title and subtitle size: 14; Distance between rows: 1.5; Page fields (from all sides): 2 cm;

E) The following components should be considered in the structure of the paper:

b.a) Title (first page of the paper);

b.b) Annotation (should not exceed one page should reflect the structure, objectives and brief conclusion of the bachelor's thesis);

b.c) Introduction (substantiation of topic relevance, goals, objectives, research subject and methods used);

b.d) The main part of the text (should be divided into chapters and paragraphs. Can be attached to diagrams, tables, drawings);

b.e) Conclusion (should reflect the results of the bachelor's thesis);

b.f) List of used literature (should be presented at the end of the paper in alphabetical order, first editions in Georgian and then editions in foreign languages).

b.g) The list of used literature should indicate:

b.g.a) In case of using periodicals: surname and initials of the author (s), title of the paper, year, number of the volume, name of the scientific journal (in italics), number of the publication and pages on which the paper is placed;

b.g,b) In case of using a book or monograph: surname and initials of the author (s), title (in italics), year of publication, place of publication, publishing house;

b.g,c) In case of using the Internet: surname and initials of the author (s) of the material, author of the website, title of the material with a link, website address and date of finding the material;

b.g.d) In case of using the electronic publication: surname and initials of the author (s) of the article, title of the article, year, name of the electronic publication (in italics), publication number, chapter, paragraph (written in parentheses), website address and date of finding the material;

b.g.e) In case of using government documents: name of the country, name of the agency to which the document belongs, type of document (order, law, etc.), name of the document with the appropriate identification number and year, place of publication in which the specified document

is found and name of the publication where The document was specified;

b.g.f) The literature used in the text should be marked as follows: At the end of the quotation, a parenthesis is opened, where the serial number of the named literature is written according to the attached list and is separated by a comma. Then the pages from which the quote or thesis is taken are indicated (e.g. 15, 150-161);

b.g.g) Footnotes should be used to indicate additional information in the main body of the paper (eg see Annex 2).

F) The paper should be organized in the following order: title page, annotation, table of contents, introduction, chapters, conclusion, used literature and appendix (footnote).

#### Article 4. Supervisor of the bachelor's thesis

1. The student has a supervisor while working on a bachelor's thesis. The supervisor of the bachelor's thesis is selected by the student from the academic staff of the university. The Bachelor student can choose the topic and supervisor of the bachelor's thesis at the beginning of the 8th academic semester of the bachelor's program, not later than one month after the beginning of the academic semester. The topic of the bachelor's thesis can be changed only once, not more than two months before the end of the submission period, in agreement with the supervisor and by submitting a written application to the Dean of the main educational structural unit (faculties) of the University.

2. Bachelor's Thesis Supervisor: In order to guide the student in the right direction of the bachelor's Thesis, helps him / her to select a topic, compile a work plan and develop a bibliography; Checks the progress of the student's work on the topic, expresses remarks and recommendations; In case of directing the research in the wrong direction, it helps the student in its correction. After the student completes the work on the bachelor's thesis, in accordance with the established procedure, the bachelor's thesis is reviewed (preliminary review) and evaluated within 60 points no later than 2 weeks.

3. The head of the bachelor's thesis has the right to refuse in writing the motivation of the student to supervise the bachelor's thesis, both before starting the work and during the work on the topic, not later than one month after starting the work.

#### Article 5. Evaluation of the bachelor's thesis

1. The bachelor's thesis is determined in the general system of evaluation by an independent percentage, and the evaluation obtained as a result of its observance in accordance with the established rules is indicated in the standard appendix of the relevant diploma.

2. The evaluation system allows:

Five types of positive assessment:

A.a) (A) Excellent - 91-100 points of the assessment;

A.b) (B) Very good - 81-90 points of maximum assessment;

A.c) (C) Good - 71-80 points of maximum assessment;

A.d) (D) Satisfactory - 61-70 points of maximum assessment;

A.e) (E) Sufficient - 51-60 points of maximum assessment.

B) Two types of negative assessment:

B.a) (FX) Did not pass - 41-50 points of the maximum grade, which means that the student needs more work to pass and is given the right to take the additional exam once with independent work;

B.b) (F) Failed - 40 points or less of the maximum grade, which means that the work done by the student is not enough and he/she has to re-take the course.

3. The maximum grade of the undergraduate thesis is 100 points divided into the following components of the grade:

A) Preliminary examination of the bachelor's thesis - by the head of the bachelor's thesis - is evaluated with 60 points, according to the following criteria:

Aa) Novelty and relevance of the topic - 10 points;

Ab) thoroughly researched relevant literary sources, their systematization - 10 points;

Ac) Ability to study and present the materials around the research topic - 10 points;

A.d) Ability to identify, research and analyze the problem, consistency of reasoning - 20 points;

Ae) Technical, stylistic and grammatical correctness of the paper - 10 points.

B) Public protection of the bachelor's thesis - is evaluated with 40 points by the Faculty Council, according to the following criteria:

Ba) Comprehension of the submitted paper - 10 points;

Bb) Verbal side of the presentation - 15 points;

Bc) Technical side of the presentation - 5 points;

Bd) Answers to questions, remarks and recommendations - 10 points

4. In order to be eligible for the bachelor's thesis, a student must have accumulated at least 11 points in the pre-examination of the bachelor's thesis.

5. The evaluation score of the bachelor's thesis is calculated by means of the arithmetic mean of the scores written by the Faculty Board. An undergraduate thesis will be considered completed if the student accumulates 51 or more points in the assessment.

6. In case of a positive evaluation of the bachelor's project / thesis, the University Faculty Board makes a decision on awarding a bachelor's degree to a student.

7. In case of evaluation of the bachelor's thesis with 41-50 points (FX) the student is given the right to submit an additional bachelor's thesis once for public defense. The interval between public defense and additional defense of the bachelor thesis should be not less than 10 days

8. In case of evaluation of the bachelor's thesis with 0-40 (F) points, the student is given the right to choose a new topic and to defend the bachelor's thesis before the Faculty Council in accordance with the established rules.

#### Article 6 Bachelor's Degree

1. The award of a Bachelor's degree is confirmed by a Bachelor's Diploma.

2. The diploma will be issued no later than 6 months after the public presentation and defense of the bachelor's thesis. Prior to the issuance of the diploma, the bachelor's student is given a relevant certificate of academic degree. The bachelor's degree must be accompanied by a standard

appendix.

3. The Bachelor's Diploma is signed by the Rector of the University and the Dean of the relevant faculty of the bachelor's program and is certified with the seal of the University

4. In case of incorrect data submission by the bachelor student and / or violation of the norms of academic honesty, the bachelor's degree certifying the academic degree will not be issued. The relevant decision is made by the Faculty Board.

5. Bachelor's degree will be revoked by the decision of the University Faculty Board in case of violation of the norms of academic honesty (use of falsified data or plagiarism).