

Developed by the University Dissertation Council (Minutes 10.10.2017 № 1)

Approved by the University Senate (12.10.2017 Protocol №1)

(Edited on November 29, 2019)

Statute of the Doctoral Program and Dissertation Council of NNLE Saint King Tamar University of the Georgian Patriarchate

Preface

This statute regulates the necessary procedure for the implementation of the doctoral program (s) of the main educational unit (s) of Saint King Tamar University of the Georgian Patriarchate (hereinafter referred to as the University) and the awarding of the relevant academic degree, as well as the rules of functioning of the University Dissertation Council.

Article 1. Doctoral program of the main educational unit (s)

1. The doctoral program of the main educational unit (s) of the University (hereinafter referred to as the Faculty (s)) is the third stage of academic higher education, a combination of educational and scientific components, which aims to train highly qualified academic staff in the relevant fields of professional activity and ends with the award of a doctoral degree.

2. The goals of the doctoral program of the University faculty (s) are: intellectual development of a doctoral student, convergence of academic and research resources, intensification of scientific work, creation of relevant product / work, integration of doctoral student in the international scientific community; as well as, training of highly qualified academic staff in the relevant fields of activity, who will have the ability to: create new fundamental knowledge, critically analyze the accumulated scientific experience and disseminate the obtained scientific results through publications, as well as through their introduction in the educational process and practice.

3. A doctoral student is a person studying for a doctoral program.
4. A doctor is the holder of the academic degree that is awarded to a person as a result of the performance of the components provided for the doctoral dissertation and the defense of the dissertation.
5. The right to study for a doctoral program may be granted to a person holding a master's degree or a person with an equivalent academic degree, in accordance with the requirements of the doctoral program (s) in the relevant specialty.
6. The right to study for a doctoral program may be granted to a person with a relevant qualification / academic degree obtained in a foreign higher education institution in accordance with the requirements of Article 50 of the Law of Georgia on Higher Education.

Article 2. Conditions for Admission to Doctoral Program

1. Admission to the doctoral program of the University Faculty (s) is announced only for accredited doctoral programs.
2. A doctoral candidate submits an application in accordance with the established procedure and is interviewed by the examination committee.
3. An examination committee shall be set up at the relevant faculty (s), the composition of which shall be approved by the Rector of the University in accordance with the established procedure.
4. The doctoral candidate is required to have at least one foreign language (English, German, French, Russian or any other foreign language depending on the specifics of the research topic) knowledge at B2 level, which is tested by passing the doctoral entrance exam in the relevant foreign language. The exam is provided by the University.

5. A person who presents a diploma of higher education, specialization in the relevant foreign language, or an examination certificate (not less than B2 level) or an internationally recognized certificate of foreign language proficiency (TOEFL PBT, TOEFL IBT, IELTS) is exempted from the foreign language test. TOEFL PBT, TOEFL IBT, IELTS , Cambridge Exam.

6. A doctoral candidate whose native language is not Georgian and who wants to study in a Georgian language program presents a certificate of Georgian language proficiency (B2 level) or a certificate of examination in an accredited higher education institution of the relevant profile and / or a higher education diploma with Georgian language profile. In other cases, he / she passes the exam in Georgian language. The exam is provided by the University.

7. A doctoral candidate who passes exam for a foreign language program presents an internationally recognized certificate of knowledge of the relevant language at least C1 level or passes the relevant University exam. If the language is native to the doctoral candidate, he /she shall present a certificate of knowledge of another foreign language at B2 level, or passes the relevant University exam according to the established rules.

8. The enrollment of a student in the doctoral program of the faculty (s) of the University is done according to the requirements of the preconditions for admission to the relevant basic educational unit, according to the results of the preliminary interview, exams in specialty and foreign language.

9. Preliminary interviews / exams for doctoral programs are held at the address:
№68 Dimitri Uznadze Street, Tbilisi.

10. The results of the preliminary interview / exam / exams of doctoral candidates are evaluated by a 100-point system of maximum evaluation. Points should be calculated as follows:

A) Excellent knowledge and skills - 91-100% of the maximum grade;

B) Good knowledge and skills - 81-90% of the maximum grade;

C) Above average knowledge and skills - 71-80% of the maximum grade;

D) Average knowledge and skills - 61-70% of the maximum grade;

E) Minimum Criteria knowledge and skills - 51-60% of the maximum grade;

F) Knowledge and skills cannot meet the minimum Criterion - 0-50% of the maximum grade.

11. Additional requirements may be set by the University for a doctoral candidate.

Doctoral examination programs, form and date of exams, also, additional requirements for the doctoral candidate are determined by the Rector of the University upon the recommendation of the Faculty (s) of the University.

12. The doctoral candidate has the right to submit a claim for the results of the preliminary interview / exam / exams to be accepted for doctoral programs within 3 calendar days after the publication of the results. Claims are considered by the Claims Council as defined by the individual-legal act of the University Rector (if there is a claim) (the Claims Council may not be composed of persons who have participated in the evaluation of the doctoral candidate (s)).

Article 3. Enrollment in Doctoral Program

1. The person wishing to enroll in the doctoral program of the University Faculty (s) shall submit a written application to the Rector, in which the name of the doctoral program in the appropriate direction (concentration) and module (if any) should be indicated.

2. The application must be accompanied by:

- Applicant's autobiography (CV);

- Copy of Master's degree or equivalent academic degree (with submission of the original);
- Copy of ID card;
- Abstract or research article, which reflects his / her scientific interests (5-7 pages);
- If available, a copy of the certificate of foreign language proficiency (with submission of the original), or a copy of the exam certificate in a foreign language (with submission of the original); Or a copy of the document certifying the knowledge of the Georgian language (with submission of the original) for foreign language doctoral candidates in accordance with Article 2, Sections 5 and 6. If the applicant does not have the relevant certificate in a foreign language, the University will provide the examination.

3. In case of a positive decision of the Examination Committee of the Faculty, the Rector of the University shall issue an individual-legal act on the enrollment of the candidate in the doctoral program. The decision will be notified to the faculty (s).

4. The relationship between the University and the doctoral student is regulated by the normative acts of Georgia, the Statute of the University and its other individual legal regulations and agreements. The form and content of the agreement is determined by the University in each individual case.

Article 4. Tuition fee for the doctoral program

1. Tuition fees for doctoral studies can be covered in the form of state grants, university funding, scholarships, charities and self-financing.

2. In case of self-financing, the doctoral student pays the tuition fee in the prescribed manner. The financial obligation of the doctoral student is reflected in the cost sheet signed by this doctoral student, his / her supervisor and the head of the relevant educational program (see Annex № 1), which is formed at the beginning of the first

academic year. In case of proper grounds in the mentioned cost sheet, changes can be made by the order of the University Rector, which will be notified to the doctoral student within a reasonable time.

Article 5. Doctoral Program

1. The doctoral program is developed:

- by one or more professors of the University;
- jointly with a partner university;
- jointly with an educational or scientific institution - on the basis of an appropriate agreement or memorandum concluded between the University and this institution;

2. The doctoral program is led (co-led) by a university professor.

3. Accreditation in accordance with the established rules is required for the implementation of the doctoral program.

4. Participants in the implementation of the doctoral program are:

- University Professor or Associate Professor;
- a scientist with an appropriate degree from a partner educational or scientific institution;
- invited specialist with the relevant academic degree provided by the doctoral program.
- a recognized specialist in the field with relevant long-term practical experience.

Article 6. Scientific Supervisor of Doctoral Student

1. The University provides a doctoral student with a scientific supervisor with a doctoral degree.

2. The scientific supervisor of the doctoral student can be a member of the Dissertation Council, a professor involved in the doctoral program or an associate professor. The dissertation supervisor may be another member of the Dissertation Council or a person with an academic degree of doctor who is not a member of the Dissertation Council; A specialist may also be invited in accordance with Article 40, Part 6 of the Law of Georgia on Higher Education.

3. In case of necessity to appoint a scientific co-supervisor (s), the head of the doctoral program shall submit written information to the chairperson of the Dissertation Council that the doctoral student's co-supervisor candidate (s) meets the following requirements:

A) his / her qualification corresponds to the problems of the research topic;

B) at the moment, he / she has no more than 4 doctoral students (with active student status);

C) agrees to provide scientific supervision;

4. The head of the doctoral program can choose the scientific supervisor / co-supervisor of the doctoral student. The doctoral student can also choose a supervisor / co-supervisor in agreement with the program supervisor.

5. The supervisor should have experience in research in the field of science related to the doctoral dissertation topic.

6. One scientific supervisor can supervise no more than 5 doctoral students (with active student status) at the same time.

7. The supervisor supervises the implementation of the doctoral student's individual plan (according to the project of the dissertation).

8. The Quality Assurance Service of the University shall, in accordance with the established procedure, provide feedback from doctoral students on how satisfied they are with the work with the scientific supervisor.

9. In case the supervisor refuses to supervise, he / she must submit a substantiated statement to the Dissertation Council at any stage of the study.

10. Resignation by a scientific supervisor from an academic position held at a university does not lead to the resignation from supervising the doctoral student if after resignation, the Dissertation Council decides to invite him / her to the Dissertation Council at the next meeting.

Article 7. Duration of doctoral studies

1. The duration of study for the doctoral program is defined by 3 years (180 ECTS). The doctoral student may be allowed to complete the research at an additional time, but no later than in 2 additional years. If the completed dissertation is not submitted to the Dissertation Council before this deadline, the doctoral student will have his / her student status suspended.

2. For additional 2 years, the scientific supervisor is obliged to provide scientific guidance to the doctoral student with the hourly workload defined by the rules of the University.

3. The specifics of doctoral studies are defined by this Statute, by the minimum standard for doctoral studies and the doctoral program.

Article 8. Components of Doctoral Program

1. The doctoral program includes study and research components, amounting to 180 ECTS credits: study component - 50 ECTS credits; Research component - 130 ECTS credits.

2. The **study component** of the doctoral program includes the field and methodological skills of the doctoral student:

- the content structure of the study component is determined by the doctoral program. The study components are selected based on the specifics of the dissertation to be prepared within the program. One of the components of the study component is mandatory for all doctoral students of the University:

- specific field courses (special seminars), which involve in-depth study of the subject depending on the program / module;

- module / course for development of basic scientific skills, which involves the study of research methodologies and methods, including the course of modern study methods, followed by the involvement of the doctoral student in the educational process (lectures and practical classes led by the professor). Upon completion of this component, the doctoral student is evaluated by the professor who supervised the course presented.

3. Assisting a professor within the doctoral program serves to integrate study and research processes, which aims to develop practical skills related to the study-research academic process, which is one of the important preconditions for a successful post-doctoral academic career. As part of the assistance, the doctoral student must earn at least 5 credits in the activities covered by the assistance.

4. Assisting a professor in the **study process** may include:

- participation in student evaluation;

- preparation of course materials under the guidance of a professor;

- conducting a course component (for example: seminars, practical training, field work, etc.);

- supervision of undergraduate and graduate students.

- conducting a seminar course independently.

5. Assisting a professor in the **research process** may include:

- assisting the supervisor in research - performing specific assignments of the supervisor (If necessary, searching for relevant literature / sources for research, data entry, etc.);

- development / piloting of research mechanism, data collection-input, analysis;

- translation of a special article / literature (10-15 pages);

- supervision of bachelor's and / or master's theses in the relevant field, preparation of reviews (doctoral student has the right to supervise no more than 2 bachelor's and / or master's theses and to review no more than 5 bachelor's / master's theses).

6. **The number of credits to be accumulated within the framework of assistance** is determined according to the hours spent on the work performed in the following manner (1 credit - 25 hours):

- in case of academic course assistance: evaluation of one closed-ended question (15-20 questions) test -15 minutes; evaluation of one open-ended question test - 30 minutes; evaluation of one written assignment (2-3 sheets) (eg project, essay, field diary / records, reflection, laboratory report, etc.) - 30 minutes; preparation of academic course material (eg lecture / seminar material, assignments / tests, etc.) - 15 hours on average;

- conducting an academic course component (eg seminars, fieldwork, laboratory work, etc.) - The hourly workload specified in the course in the relevant component, and additionally, the hours / time required to evaluate students and prepare material;

- in case of conducting a seminar or lecture course independently, the workload of the doctoral student is determined taking into account the contact hours provided during the seminar course, the hours required for the preparation of materials and evaluations.

- supervision of one bachelor's or master's thesis - 25 hours;

- review of one master thesis - 6 hours.

7. Assistance activity criteria are determined by the supervisor in accordance with the assistance activity. In the assisting component, a doctoral student will be credited if all or most of that component is evaluated positively according to the criteria.

In case of non-fulfillment of the criteria or receiving a positive evaluation in less than half of the criteria, the doctoral student will not be awarded a credit. When awarding credits, assistance to a doctoral student is evaluated with 100 points. Points are distributed and defined as follows:

- (A) 91-100 - excellent;

- (B) 81-90 - very good;

- (C) 71-80 - good;

- (D) 61-70 - satisfactory;

- (E) 51-60 - sufficient;

- (FX) 41-50 - could not pass, but student is allowed to retake the final exam once;

- (F) 0-40 - failed, the student must retake the course to receive credit.

8. Assessment Criteria for Professor Assistance:

- Conducting a seminar, laboratory work or internship - 5 points

5 points	Doctoral student is well prepared, has thoroughly mastered the material provided by the syllabus. The answers to the questions asked are complete, accurate and substantiated. The doctoral student is knowledgeable and well-versed on the problematic issue. Uses learning methods effectively, purposefully and comprehensively.
4 points	The doctoral student is prepared, has mastered the material provided by the syllabus. The answers to the questions asked are correct, though abbreviated. He /she is knowledgeable and well-versed on the problematic issue. Uses learning methods purposefully and comprehensively.
3 points	The doctoral student is not well prepared, has mastered the material provided by the syllabus, but with shortcomings. The doctoral student is familiar with the problem, but does not understand it. The answers to the questions asked are not flawless. Uses only certain learning methods purposefully.
2 points	A doctoral student is practically unprepared. Has insufficiently mastered the material provided by the syllabus. The answers to the questions asked are unclear. The doctoral student does not understand problematic issues. The learning methods used do not provide concrete results.
01 points	The doctoral student is completely unprepared. Has mastered only separate fragments of the material provided by the syllabus. The answers to the questions asked are essentially incorrect or the answers are not relevant to the question. Uses the learning methods in an unqualified manner or the mentioned component is not performed at all.

Note: Each 2-hour workshop, lab work, or internship is assessed by 5 points. A doctoral student can earn a maximum of 50 points (10X5) respectively in case of 10 two-hour seminars, laboratory work or internship.

- Preparation of issues for mid-term evaluation - maximum 5 points

5 points	Topics for the mid-term evaluation are prepared in an effective, purposeful and comprehensive manner by adhering to sectoral terminology. The doctoral student is thoroughly proficient in the material intended for the evaluation. The mid-term evaluation topics are formulated flawlessly.
4 points	Issues for the mid-term evaluation are prepared in a purposeful and comprehensive manner by adhering to sectoral terminology. The doctoral student is proficient in the material intended for the evaluation. The mid-term evaluation issues are formulated well.
3 points	Topics for the mid-term evaluation are prepared in a purposeful manner by adhering to sectoral terminology, albeit briefly. The doctoral student is proficient in the material intended for the evaluation. The mid-term evaluation topics are formulated satisfactorily.
2 points	Preparation of topics for the mid-term evaluation is incomplete. Sectoral terminology is deficient. The doctoral student is proficient in the material intended for the evaluation; however, with shortcomings. The topics formulated for the mid-term evaluation cannot provide concrete results.
0-1 points	Topics for the mid-term evaluation are deficient. Sectoral terminology is not used. The doctoral student is proficient only in separate fragments of the material intended for evaluation. The mid-term evaluation topics are prepared in an unqualified manner or the mentioned component has not been performed at all.

Note: Preparation of topics for each mid-term evaluation is graded with 5 points. The doctoral student may earn 10 points (5X2) respectively if he / she prepares topics for 2 mid-term evaluations.

- Preparation of topics for final exam - 10 points

9-10 points	The final exam topics are prepared in an effective, purposeful and comprehensive manner by adhering to sectoral terminology. The doctoral student is thoroughly proficient in the exam material. Exam topics are composed flawlessly.
7-8 points	The final exam topics are prepared in a purposeful and comprehensive manner by adhering to sectoral terminology. The doctoral student is proficient in the exam material. Exam topics are well-composed.
5-6 points	The final exam topics are prepared in a purposeful manner by adhering to sectoral terminology, albeit briefly. The doctoral student is proficient in the material intended for the for the examination. Exam topics are composed satisfactorily.
3-4 points	Preparation of topics for the final exam is incomplete. Sectoral terminology is deficient. The doctoral student is proficient in the material intended for the examination, however, with shortcomings. The topics for the exam cannot provide concrete results.
0-2 points	Topics for the final exam are deficient. Sectoral terminology is not used. The doctoral student is proficient only in separate fragments of the exam material. The exam topics are prepared in an unqualified manner or the mentioned component has not been performed at all.

- Correction of students' mid-term evaluation and final exam works - 10 points

9-10 points	The student uses the evaluation criteria provided in the syllabus thoroughly, without making substantial errors.
7-8 points	The student uses the evaluation criteria provided in the syllabus properly, however makes several non-substantial errors.
5-6 points	The student uses the evaluation criteria provided in the syllabus properly, however makes a few substantial errors.
3-4 points	The student uses the evaluation criteria provided in the syllabus satisfactorily, albeit with significant shortcomings.
0-2 points	The student uses the evaluation criteria provided in the syllabus in an unqualified manner, with substantial errors or this component is not performed at all.

Note: Correction of students' mid-term evaluation and final exam works is graded with 10 points. In case of correction of 2 mid-term evaluations and 1 final exam work, a doctoral student may earn a maximum of 30 points (3X10) respectively.

- Preparation of a simple textbook, supporting literature or other material for undergraduate students - 100 points

91-100 points	Material for undergraduate students is prepared flawlessly.
81-90 points	The material for the undergraduate students is prepared very well.
71-80 points	Material for undergraduate students is prepared well; However, with a few non-substantial errors.
61-70 points	Material for undergraduate students is prepared

	satisfactorily, albeit with significant shortcomings.
51-60 points	The material for undergraduate students is prepared partially, with several substantial errors.
41-50 points	Material for undergraduate students is prepared incompletely. The doctoral student's approaches are erroneous. He / she could not reveal the ability to perform the task; and made a few substantial errors
0-40 points	The doctoral student prepared only certain fragments of the material for the undergraduate students and / or inadequately prepared the material for the undergraduate students and / or did not prepare the preparatory material at all.

Note: This evaluation criterion is used only for those doctoral students who hold the academic position of an assistant at Saint King Tamar University of the Georgian Patriarchate or lead the course with the status of an invited specialist.

9. The doctoral student chooses the elective courses given in the doctoral program, which will ensure the coincidence of educational and scientific processes, which should include substantiated theoretical and / or experimental results.

10. The purpose of preparing and conducting a demonstration lecture within the doctoral program is to link academic education and theory with practice; facilitate the creation of a doctoral student's career through the development of practical skills. Within this activity, the doctoral student must earn 5 credits.

11. Evaluation criteria for preparing and conducting a demonstration lecture:

- Pre-lecture preparation stage - 40 points (obtaining and processing of basic literature, obtaining additional materials - 20 points, drafting a lecture plan, preparing a questionnaire and other necessary materials - 20 points).

Obtaining and processing of basic literature, obtaining additional materials - 20 points

19-20 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture and its diversity; depth and quality of analysis, quality of concentration on the main topic, quality of in-depth study of existing material is presented in an effective, purposeful and comprehensive manner.
15-18 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture and its diversity; depth and quality of analysis, quality of concentration on the main topic, quality of in-depth study of existing material is presented in a purposeful manner.
11-14 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture and its diversity; depth and quality of analysis, quality of concentration on the main topic, low quality of in-depth study of existing material is presented in a partially purposeful manner.
4-10 points	Partial relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture and absence of its diversity, insufficient depth and quality of analysis, low quality of concentration on the main topic, insubstantial study of existing material partially ensures achievement of specific results.
0-3 points	Partial relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture and absence of its diversity, insufficient depth and quality of analysis, low quality of concentration on the main topic, insubstantial study of existing material fails to ensure achievement of specific results.

Lecture plan, questionnaire and other necessary materials - 20 points

19-20 points	The lecture plan, questionnaire and other necessary materials are compiled in an effective, purposeful and comprehensive manner. The doctoral student is comprehensively proficient in the methods of obtaining the necessary materials.
15-18 points	The lecture plan, questionnaire and other necessary materials are compiled in an effective, purposeful and comprehensive manner.

	The doctoral student is proficient in in the methods of obtaining the necessary materials.
11-14 points	The lecture plan, questionnaire and other necessary materials are compiled in an effective, purposeful and comprehensive manner, albeit briefly. The doctoral student is proficient in the methods of obtaining the necessary materials.
4-10 points	The lecture plan, questionnaire and other necessary materials are incomplete. The doctoral student has the skills to obtain the necessary materials. However, there are shortcomings. The prepared material only partially ensures achievement of specific results.
0-3 points	The lecture plan, questionnaire and other necessary materials are deficient. The doctoral student does not have skills to obtain the necessary materials. The work is performed in an unqualified manner or the indicated component is not performed at all.

- Presentability of the lecture - 60 points.

Content depth of the lecture - 20 points

19-20 points	The relevance of the topic discussed in the lecture, the proper substantiation of its relevance, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration on the topic, are clearly and logically formulated.
15-18 points	The relevance of the topic discussed in the lecture, the proper substantiation of its relevance, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration on the topic, are clearly and logically formulated, but lack precision.
11-14 points	The relevance of the topic discussed in the lecture, the proper substantiation of its relevance, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration on the topic, are logically formulated, but the contextual factors are not fully considered.

4-10 points	The relevance of the topic discussed in the lecture, the proper substantiation of its relevance is superficial and lacks argumentation. The ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration on the topic is less obvious.
0-3 points	The relevance of the topic discussed at the lecture, the proper substantiation of its relevance lacks argumentation. The ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration on the topic is not demonstrated.

Flawless presentation of the material - 20 points

19-20 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and understand relevant researches on the topic of the lecture, as well as the use of the latest researches relevant to the topic are clearly formulated, thoroughly analyzed and evaluated.
15-18 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and understand relevant researches on the topic of the lecture, as well as the use of the latest researches relevant to the topic are properly formulated, analyzed and evaluated.
11-14 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and understand relevant researches on the topic of the lecture, as well as the use of the latest researches relevant to the topic are partially formulated, analyzed and evaluated.
4-10 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and understand relevant researches on the topic of the lecture, as well as the use of the latest researches relevant to the topic are superficially formulated, analyzed and evaluated.
0-3 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the topic of the lecture, the diversity of the literature used, the ability to present and

	understand relevant researches on the topic of the lecture, as well as the use of the latest researches relevant to the topic are formulated in an unqualified manner, or are not formulated, analyzed and evaluated at all.
--	--

Interestingly presenting material through linguistic means and non-verbal forms of communication - 20 points

19-20 points	The lecture material is presented with logic, argumentation, brevity and accuracy, the visual side of the material is presented using modern technologies; speech logic, credibility, time management, the ability to give reasoned answers to questions, the ability to lead a discussion academically, the relevance of the presentation and visual material to the topic of the lecture, the relevance and accuracy of the accents are provided by demonstrating in-depth knowledge.
15-18 points	The lecture material is presented with logic, argumentation, brevity and accuracy, the visual side of the material is presented using modern technologies; speech logic, credibility, time management, the ability to give reasoned answers to questions, the ability to lead a discussion academically, the relevance of the presentation and visual material to the topic of the lecture, the relevance and accuracy of the accents are provided by demonstrating in-depth knowledge, however, lack credibility.
11-14 points	The lecture material is presented with lack of logic, argumentation and accuracy, the visual side of the material is presented with lack of using modern technologies; speech logic, time management, ability to give reasoned answers to questions, ability to lead a discussion academically, relevance of the presentation and visual material to the topic of the lecture, the relevance and accuracy of the accents are provided by demonstrating partial knowledge, and are not complete and convincing.

4-10 points	The lecture material is presented with lack of logic, argumentation and accuracy, the visual side of the material is presented with lack of using modern technologies; speech is less logical, time management, ability to give reasoned answers to questions, relevance of the presentation and visual material to the topic of the lecture are deficient, the reasoning are flawed and fragmentary, failing to reflect the content of the presented topic.
-------------	--

12. The **research component** of the doctoral program includes:

- Execution of a dissertation - scientific thesis, as well as publication of scientific articles, which should reflect the substantiated results of theoretical and / or empirical research.
- Doctoral student colloquium;
- Defense of the dissertation, ie, public presentation of the topic.

Article 9. Individual research project of a doctoral student

1. The doctoral student's individual research project is written by the doctoral student in agreement with the scientific supervisor / co-supervisor. The project should indicate the purpose of the research, its relevance, a brief review of the literature on the topic, scientific innovation, research method, brief description of the dissertation topic, approximate schedule of the research, bibliography.

2. The doctoral student presents an individual research project to the Faculty Council (at the Colloquium) at the end of the first academic year.

3. The structure of the research project is defined by this Statute.

4. The dissertation research project is the result of a review 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 through consultation with the doctoral student supervisor (including online).

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 in A4 format (297-210 mm) on 80 g / m² paper, font - Sylfaen, size 12. The minimum size of fonts for page numbers and footnotes is 10. Larger fonts may be used in naming chapters and subdivisions. The interval for the main text of the paper is 1.5. The text should be printed on only one page. A 30 mm field should be 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 in similar quality.

7. Structure of the dissertation research project:

A) Introduction (general description, scientific innovation, relevance, goals and practical significance);

B) Review of scientific literature (history of the research of the topic, the state of the research topic in modern science, why this topic is relevant, at what stage is the doctoral student in terms of research of selected sources);

C) Research methodology (theoretical and methodological bases selected by the doctoral student);

D) Main research topic (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 (primary sources, scientific literature).

8) Structure and design of the abstract:

A) The abstract is a short version reflecting the main provisions of the dissertation. It is submitted along with dissertation in Georgian and one of the foreign languages (English, French, German, Russian). One copy of the printed and electronic version of the abstract is delivered to the University Library, 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 in Georgian, without spelling, stylistic and grammatical errors. It is 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. The print is produced on one page. Drawings, tables, photos can be made in any other size format, only in this case, the mentioned pages should not be bound with the main text;

- **Field:** 2.5 cm from the left, 1.5 cm from the right and an area of not less than 2 cm less than 2 cm and not more than 3 cm from the top and bottom;

- **Font:** Sylfaen font, font size - 11, or AcadNusx font, Font size - 12. Use a larger font in the names of chapters and subdivisions, size - 14 or 16;

- **Spacing between lines:** The spacing for the main text is 1.5. For small sections (table of contents, list of spreadsheets and drawings, summary, footnote, note, etc.) an interval of 1 should be taken;

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

- **Names of chapters and subdivisions:** Names of all chapters and subdivisions should be included in the table of contents. All chapters should start from a new page, while a subdivision can continue from the same page;

- **Footnote:** Footnote should be placed at the end of the page or abstract. 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;

- **Sources used:** The list of used literature should be placed at the end of the abstract in alphabetical order (first in Georgian, then in the appropriate foreign language). The abstract may also have a title finder to be placed at the end of the abstract - in alphabetical order and / or the 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 abbreviation of the journal, year, volume, number, page beginning - end. For example: Didebulidze M., New data on the 13th century painting of Kintsvisi St. Nicholas Church, Journal of Georgian Antiquities, 2002, # 1, p. 85-100;

Scientific collection: surname of a specific author (or team of authors), initials / full title of the article. 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 the Existence of Anicon Paintings in Georgia, Collection of

Scientific Papers of the Department of Art History and Theory, TSU, # 6, Tbilisi, 2005, p.198-246;

When indicating individual pages of the **book**: surname, initials / full title, publishing house, year, (volume), page beginning - end. For example: Virsaladze T. Painting of Zion of Athens, Tbilisi, 1984. p. 24-30;

When referring to the **entire book**: surname, initial / full title, place of publication, publishing house, year, (volume), pages. For example: Virsaladze T. Paintings of Zion of Athens, Tbilisi, 1984;

Global Network Information: Author and article title (if any), website title. Last checked - day, 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
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 settlement; surname and name of the doctoral student; the title of the dissertation;

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

Date of defense (day, month, year);

Place of defense (Tbilisi, Georgia).

The indicated 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 the doctoral program;

Author's signature and his / her identification number;

Name, surname, academic degree, position of the **supervisor** of the dissertation - certified by signature;

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

Names, surnames, academic degree, position of the dissertation **reviewers** - certified by signature;

- **Purpose** of the research topic;

- **Relevance** of the research topic;

- Research topic **methodology**;

- **Results and scientific innovations** of the research topic;

- **Practical value** of the research topic;

- **Literature** review;

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

- List of papers published on the topic of the dissertation: The abstract should be accompanied by a list of papers published by the author of the dissertation on the topic of the dissertation;

- **Illustrations** (if necessary, basic drawings, spreadsheets and illustrations can be attached). The bibliography is not attached to the abstract.

9. Preparation rule for doctoral dissertation: 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. On **other technical aspects of completing a doctoral dissertation**, the following requirements apply:

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

- **Paper:** The paper should be done on A4 white paper, orientation - vertical. The print is produced on one page. Drawings, spreadsheets, photos can be made in any other size format, only in this case, the mentioned pages should not be bound with the main text;

- **Field:** 2.5 cm from the left, 1.5 cm from the right and an area of not less than 2 cm and not more than 3 cm from the top and bottom;

- **Font:** Sylfaen font, font size - 11, also in AcadNusx font, Font size - 12. Use a larger font in the names of chapters and subdivisions, size - 14 or 16;

- **Spacing between lines:** The spacing for the main text is 1.5. For small sections (table of contents, list of spreadsheets and drawings, summary, footnote, note, etc.) an interval of 1 should be taken;

- **Page numbering:** All pages should be numbered sequentially. It is not allowed to leave free space or page and also to repeat pages. Introductory pages with the main

part of the text, except the title page, are numbered in the lower right corner of the page in font size - 10;

- **Names of chapters and subdivisions:** Names of all chapters and subdivisions should be included in the table of contents. All chapters should start from a new page, while a subdivision can continue from the same page;

- **Footnote:** Footnote should be placed at the end of the page or abstract. 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;

- **Sources used:** 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). It may also have a title finder to be placed at the end of the abstract - in alphabetical order and / or the 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 abbreviation of the journal, year, volume, number, page beginning - end. For example: Didebulidze M., New data on the 13th century painting of Kintsvisi St. Nicholas Church, Journal of Georgian Antiquities, 2002, # 1, p. 85-100;

Scientific collection: surname of a specific author (or team of authors), initials / full title of the article. 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 the Existence of Anicon Paintings in Georgia, Collection of Scientific Papers of the Department of Art History and Theory, TSU, # 6, Tbilisi, 2005, p.198-246;

When indicating individual pages of the **book:** surname, initials / full title, publishing house, year, (volume), page beginning - end. For example: Virsaladze T. Painting of Zion of Athens, Tbilisi, 1984. p. 24-30;

When referring to the **entire book**: surname, initial / full title, place of publication, publishing house, year, (volume), pages. For example: Virsaladze T. Paintings of Zion of Athens, Tbilisi, 1984;

Global Network Information: Author and article title (if any), website title. Last checked - day, 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
Last checked - 00.00.2017.

10. 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 program settlement; surname and name of the doctoral student; the title of the dissertation;

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

Place of defense (Tbilisi, Georgia).

The indicated 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 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 Saint King Tamar University of the Georgian Patriarchate for an academic degree." ;

Name, surname, academic degree, position of the **supervisor** of the dissertation - certified by signature;

Names, surnames, academic degree, position of the dissertation **reviewers** - certified by signature;

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

Date of defense (day, month, year).

- **Copyright page:** Must be in standard form. The original copy of the dissertation must have the original signature of the author. This page is intended to give the University Library the right to utilize doctoral dissertations (for non-commercial purposes, for peer review, etc.). This page should include standard texts: "In case of a request for acquaintance with other institutions by a natural person for copying and distribution for non-commercial purposes, Saint King Tamar University of the Patriarchate of Georgia has the right to copy and distribute it" and the author reserves the right that no part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without the written permission of the author. The author asserts that the copyrighted material used in the abstract has received the appropriate permission (except for small citations that require a specific approach to citing literature as is the case with scholarly works) and is responsible for all of them.

Resumé (in Georgian and one of the foreign languages);

Table of Contents;

Introduction: The introductory part should describe the scientific innovation, relevance and practical significance of the problems posed in the dissertation. It

should briefly and succinctly raise the problem for the solution of which the dissertation is dedicated.

Research Methods: It should be discussed in this introduction, how the dissertation addresses the issue posed in the research process, what alternative methods have already been developed for researching similar issues, and indicate uses and / or shortcomings of known methods (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 shortcomings are eliminated in the present dissertation.

Main text: The main text should be divided into chapters and subdivisions of different levels. It must include a description and analysis of the issue, reasoning, discussion, 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. It is not limited by the number of chapters and subdivisions. If the discussion of the results is divided into several subdivisions, then it is permissible to collate the literature review and the discussion of the results.

Conclusion: The dissertation should definitely contain the conclusions of the research, which should be concise and laconic.

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

List of spreadsheets (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 thesis easy to understand.

Alphabetical search (if required): Alphabetical search should be available at the author's request.

Photo illustrations, drawings and spreadsheets (if necessary):

Content of illustrations, drawings and spreadsheets, location and formatting is determined by the specifics of the thesis. Copyright should not be infringed upon the use of photographs, drawings and spreadsheets taken from literary or other sources. Drawings and spreadsheets can be drawn in black and white; it is also allowed to use colored illustrations.

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

Appendix (if necessary): The appendix 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) should be added to the appendices as a separate page (s).

Article 10. Doctoral Colloquium

1. The colloquium is a compulsory part of doctoral program 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, new scientific achievements, problems, literature in the field of doctoral studies are evaluated and discussed, followed by scientific discussion. The conduct of the colloquium is reflected in the protocol, which is signed by the Chairperson of the Faculty Council.

2. The doctoral student is obliged to present a report at 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 Manager and the doctoral student supervisor.

4. Admission to the colloquium is mandatory to obtain credit in the research component.

Article 11. University Dissertation Council

1. The University Dissertation Council is the body, which awards the academic degree of Doctor.

2. The University Dissertation Council is composed of all professors and associate professors with the academic degree of Doctor of the faculties.

3. By the decision of the University Dissertation Council, other persons with the academic degree of Doctor may be included in the Council, in accordance with the established rules.

Article 12. Rules of Procedure of the University Dissertation Council

1. The University Dissertation Council conducts its activities in accordance with this Statute.

2. The University Dissertation Council makes a decision at the Council meeting. The meeting is authorized to make a decision if it is attended by more than 30% of the total number of members. A decision requires at least 2/3 of the votes cast, decisions are made by ballot.

3. The Dissertation Council of the University elects the Chairperson of the Dissertation Council from among its members by secret ballot for a period of 4 years by a majority of the members. The candidate / candidates for the chairmanship of the

Council is nominated by the Dissertation Council. A member of the Dissertation Council can nominate himself / herself. The same person may be elected as chairperson only twice in a row. Prior to the election of the chairperson, the first meeting of the Council shall be chaired by the senior staff of the University Quality Assurance Service. Only a university professor can be elected as the chair of the Dissertation Council. The new Chair of the Dissertation Council must be elected no later than one month before the expiration of the term of the current chairperson.

4. The University Dissertation Council, upon the recommendation of the Chairperson, approves the Deputy Chairperson of the Dissertation Council and the Secretary (from the Council) for a period of 2 years. The Deputy Chairperson and Secretary of the Council shall be a University Professor or Associate Professor.

5. Meetings of the University Dissertation Council are convened by the Chairperson of the Dissertation Council at least three times a semester. In case of absence of the Chairperson of the Dissertation Council, the Council is chaired by the Deputy Chairperson.

6. In case of a written request of at least 1/5 of the members of the University Dissertation Council, the Chairperson of the Dissertation Council is obliged to convene an extraordinary meeting.

7. The proceedings of the University Dissertation Council are recorded in the minutes, which are signed by the Chairperson and the Secretary of the Council.

8. Any decision of the University Dissertation Council must be notified to the doctoral student in writing.

9. The summer vacation of the University Dissertation Council starts from July 1 and lasts until September 15. All procedures related to the receipt, review and defense of the dissertation are suspended during this period.

Article 13. Powers of the University Dissertation Council

The University Dissertation Council:

- elects and approves the Chairperson of the Council;
- approves the Deputy Chairperson of the Dissertation Council;
- approves the Secretary of the Council;
- determines the maximum volume of the dissertation, the approximate format and other technical data and sets the criteria for the evaluation of the dissertation;
- approves the topic of the dissertation;
- approves the scientific supervisor / co-supervisor of the dissertation;
- approves the evaluators (reviewers) of the dissertation;
- approves the composition of the Dissertation Committee (if necessary, invites recognized specialists in the field);
- approves the date of the defense;
- awards the academic degree of Doctor on the basis of the conclusion of the Dissertation Committee, on the very first Council meeting after the defense.

Article 14. Powers of the Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson and Secretary of the University Dissertation Council

1. Chairperson of the Dissertation Council:

- ensures the functioning of the University Dissertation Council on the basis of this Statute. Is responsible for the activities of the Dissertation Council;

- ensures the elaboration, specification and improvement of the action documents necessary for the functioning of the Council;
- ensures coordination with the structural units of the University in accordance with the Statute of the University;
- supervises the proceedings management in the Dissertation Council;
- convenes and chairs the meetings of the Dissertation Council;
- is responsible for organizing dissertation defense procedures and ensuring its uninterrupted functioning;
- submits an annual report on the performed activities to the Dissertation Council;
- controls the publication of the decisions of the Dissertation Council on the University website;
- candidates for the chairperson of the Dissertation Council are nominated by the members of the Dissertation Council before the elections.

2. Deputy Chairperson of the Dissertation Council:

- participates in the development, specification and improvement of normative and action documents necessary for the functioning of the Council;
- ensures timely and uninterrupted production of documents necessary for the functioning of the Dissertation Council in accordance with the uniform rules of proceedings management at the University;

- is responsible for the production of the minutes of the Dissertation Council meetings and other documents provided by the regulations of the Dissertation Council;
- checks the compliance of the scientific publications submitted by the dissertation with the requirements of the Dissertation Council regulations;
- manages the production of the council archives;
- assists the Chairperson of the Dissertation Council in resolving organizational issues;
- manages the activities of the Council during the absence of the Chairperson and chairs the meetings of the Council.

3. Secretary of the Dissertation Council:

- provides all organizational activities related to the defense of the dissertation;
- produces the minutes of the Dissertation Council meetings in accordance with the uniform rules of proceedings management at the University;
- assists the Chairperson in resolving organizational issues;
- maintains the archives of the Council;
- Ensures the publication of the decision of the Dissertation Council on the website.

Article 15. Preparation of dissertation

1. A dissertation is a scientific thesis based on an independent research of a doctoral student, based on 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 involved in a research group, his / her contribution should be clearly seen.

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 one of the foreign languages (English, French, German, Russian) (within the range of 35-50 thousand marks).

4. In exceptional cases, preparing of dissertation in a foreign language is decided by the Dissertation Council.

5. In case of preparing a dissertation in a foreign language doctoral program, the dissertation will be submitted in the relevant foreign language.

6. In case of performing the work in a foreign language, the main results of the research - the abstract should be submitted in Georgian (within the range of 35-50 thousand marks, 20-25 pages in A4 format).

7. The volume, format and other technical data of the dissertation shall be determined by the doctoral standard developed by the Dissertation Council and approved by the Faculty Councils and this Statute.

Article 16. Submission of a dissertation

1. A necessary precondition for submitting a dissertation to the Dissertation Council is the written consent of the Faculty Council (excerpt from the minutes of the meeting) to submit the dissertation for public defense.

2. The dissertation shall be submitted to the Council in three printed and one electronic copy.

3. The doctoral student shall submit to the Dissertation Council three copies of the Georgian-language version of the printed abstract and one copy of the foreign

language version, and their electronic versions in compliance with existing standards.

4. Along with the dissertation, the doctoral student must submit the following documents:

- Document confirming the accumulation of ECTS credit in the study component provided by the doctoral program;
- Certificate asserting fulfillment of financial obligations;
- Excerpt of scientific papers published in peer-reviewed collections (collection title page, table of contents with article author, title and article);
- List of scientific seminars, conferences and forums, where the provisions or results of the dissertation were reported (if any);
- Dissertation application addressed to the Chairperson of the Dissertation Council;
- Doctoral student biography (CV) with photo;
- Extract from the minutes of the Faculty Council meeting with the recommendation to review the dissertation and submit it to the Council;
- Dissertation applicant's statement that the text of the dissertation is performed by him and all the indicated sources are correct;
- The dissertation must be accompanied by an explanation of the doctoral student that the thesis is performed by him and all the sources published in the thesis are properly indicated;

5. The main results of the dissertation must be published in at least three scientific papers / journals (s) before the defense, including one international peer-reviewed

journal / publication, which is included in the following scientific database / databases: Thomson Reuters Master Journal List, Scopus, Ulrich's Index, ERIH PLUS, EBSCOHost, Latindex Catalog. The name of Saint King Tamar University of the Georgian Patriarchate should be indicated in the scientific publication.

6. The list of journals / publications where it is recommended to publish the main results of the dissertation is established by the Dissertation Council. When submitting a dissertation, it is permissible for the publication not to be printed, but there must be a notice from the publisher that the thesis is ready for publication. The dissertation must be submitted to the administration of the relevant educational unit of the University after the publication of this thesis.

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. In case of a negative decision / conclusion, the doctoral student's 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 fulfilled.

9. The Dissertation Council may develop additional requirements in individual cases.

10. The dissertation must be defended within 6 months from the date of submission of the dissertation to the Dissertation Council.

11. Special cases are considered and decided by the Dissertation Council.

12. After the appointment of the defense date of the dissertation, before the defense, the doctoral student is obliged to provide an abstract (printed or electronic version) and an electronic version of the dissertation to the members of the dissertation commission.

Article 17. Preliminary evaluation of the dissertation

1. After the submission of the dissertation, the Dissertation Council shall appoint two evaluators (reviewers), who shall submit a written evaluation (review) of the dissertation thesis to the Dissertation Council no later than 2 months after receiving the thesis.

2. A person with the academic degree of Doctor, who has publications in the field of dissertation 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 author of dissertation, as well as a person officially associated with him / her.

4. At the request of the doctoral student's scientific 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 along with the evaluation of the dissertation shall contain the relevant recommendation on admission to the defense of the dissertation or its return to the doctoral student for revision, or refusal to defend, which will be reflected in the dissertation evaluation form according to the written dissertation evaluation rule.

6. The evaluation of the dissertation and admission to public defense is based on the conclusions of the evaluators (see the evaluation sheet in Annex № 2).

7. The evaluation criteria are:

- Technical side (30 points):

Compliance with scientific standards (10 points)

9-10 points	The thesis is performed in full compliance with the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography is flawless, the reference to
-------------	---

	attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is formulated flawlessly.
7-8 points	The thesis is performed with partial observance of the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography partially meets the requirements, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is partially accurate.
5-6 points	The thesis is performed by improper observance of the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography is not at the proper level, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is deficient.
3-4 points	The citation rule is used incorrectly, the technical accuracy of the bibliography, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is incomplete and fragmentary.
0-2 points	The thesis is performed disregarding the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials do not meet the requirements.

Structural integrity (10 points)

9-10 points	The structure of the thesis is coherent and evident, logically formulated, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research; The structure of the thesis is clearly reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations.
7-8 points	The structure of the thesis is logically formulated, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research, although certain issues require clarification. The structure of the thesis is well reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations, but requires clarification.
5-6 points	The structure of the thesis is formulated, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research, but does not fully address a number of issues. The structure of the thesis 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 thesis is superficial and lacks argumentation, which does not clearly outline the objectives, process and results of the research. The structure of the thesis is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations superficially and without argumentation.
0-2 points	The structure of the thesis is unqualified, failing to outline the research objectives, process, and results. The structure of the thesis is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations in an unqualified manner.

Linguistic and stylistic accuracy (10 points)

9-10 points	Linguistically accurate, the uniform style of scientific language is precisely preserved, the accuracy of terminology is preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is appropriate and adequate to the specifics of the field.
7-8 points	Linguistically accurate, the uniform style of 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 uniform 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 appropriate to the specifics of the field.
3-4 points	Linguistically partially accurate, the uniform style of scientific language is partially preserved, although there are many inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is not preserved. The logical and conceptual apparatus is partially appropriate to the specifics of the field.

0-2 points	Linguistically partially accurate, the uniform style of scientific language is not preserved, although there are many inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is not preserved. The logical and conceptual apparatus does not correspond to the specifics of the field.
------------	---

- Content side (70 points):

Relevance of the problem (10 points)

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

Novelty of Research (10 points)

9-10 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area,
-------------	--

	possibility of further development of the research are clearly and logically formulated.
7-8 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are clearly and logically formulated but lack clarity.
5-6 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are formulated, but contextual factors are not fully considered.
3-4 points	Novelty of the of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are formulated superficially, and lack argumentation.
0-2 points	Novelty of the of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are formulated in an unqualified manner, 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 comprehensively.

5-6 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, separate research methods are used purposefully.
3-4 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, research methods cannot provide concrete results.
0-2 points	The selected scientific method / methods are not relevant to the research topic, research methods are used in unqualified manner.

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

13-15 points	The relevance of the material to the research topic and its diversity, the depth of analysis and quality of research, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, the degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, the degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material are presented effectively, purposefully and comprehensively.
10-12 points	The relevance of the material to the research topic and its diversity, the depth of analysis and quality of research, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, the degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, the degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material are presented purposefully.
7-9 points	The relevance of the material to the research topic and its diversity, the depth of analysis and quality of research, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, the degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, the low degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material are presented in a partially purposeful manner.
4-6 points	Partial relevance of the material to the research topic and lack of diversity, insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research,

	insufficient ability to reason independently, low degree of concentration of the abstract on the main research topic, low degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, the lack of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material partly provides concrete results.
0-3 points	Partial relevance of the material to the research topic and lack of diversity, insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research, inability to reason independently, low degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, lack of logical connection between parts of the thesis, the lack of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material does not provide concrete results.

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

13-15 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 is supported by clear and credible 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 position of the author is not substantiated.
4-6 points	New data are 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 formulated in a superficial manner and lacks argumentation.
0-3 points	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 formulated in an unqualified manner, without any substantiation.
--	--

Diversity and novelty of used literature (10 points)

9-10 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are clearly formulated, analyzed and evaluated in an in-depth manner.
7-8 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are formulated, analyzed and evaluated.
5-6 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are partially formulated, and are not analyzed and evaluated.
3-4 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are superficially formulated, and are not analyzed and evaluated.
0-2 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are formulated in an unqualified manner, or not presented at all.

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

9. In case of a negative conclusion of one of the two reviewers, the Dissertation Council shall appoint two additional reviewers within 10 days. If one conclusion is still negative, the Council allocates another additional reviewer within 10 days.

10. If two reviewers request the return of the thesis to a doctoral student for revision, the thesis will not be allowed and will be returned to the doctoral student for revision within 2 months; and the doctoral student is obliged to re-submit the revised thesis to the reviewers; The dissertation will be submitted to the doctoral student for revision only once; The revised version is evaluated by the reviewers only on the basis of recommendation for admission or non-admission to the defense.

11. If one of the reviewers requests a revision, the doctoral student may revise it within 2 months or request admission to the public defense.

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

13. Reviewers 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 reviewers, they are given 2 months to evaluate the thesis.

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

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

16. In case of negative re-evaluation of the revised abstract, the dissertation abstract will not be accepted for public defense.

17. The Dissertation Council transmits the conclusions of the reviewers (evaluators) to the doctoral student, and in case of admission to the defense, also informs 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 refused to the public defense, one copy of the rejected dissertation and the written conclusions of the reviewer-opponents will be transferred to the archives of the Dissertation Council. 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 Council are obliged to expose plagiarism, if found.

20. Plagiarism is manifested in the use of someone else's works or ideas in one's own name, as well as in borrowing fragments of someone else's works 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 Council and submit the written evidence of plagiarism in writing.

22. The Dissertation Council decides on the form of discussion of the issue (deliberation and decision-making in the Council, establishment of a commission, application to the section, etc.) and the appropriate response.

Article 18. Dissertation Committee

1. The Chairperson of the Dissertation Council, in consultation with the Head of the Doctoral Program, establishes a Dissertation Committee for public defense of the dissertation.
2. The Dissertation Committee is composed of at least five persons who have the right to vote. The Dissertation Council approves the key and reserve members of the Committee.
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 Committee. Supervisors and evaluators (reviewers) have the right to participate in the Committee with a deliberative vote if necessary. And only the members of the Committee attend the final meeting of the Dissertation Committee and the voting procedure. The Dissertation Committee may also include specialists with a doctoral degree who are not members of the Dissertation Council. At least half of the members of the Dissertation Committee must be composed of members of the Dissertation Council.
4. The Dissertation Committee is headed by a chairperson elected by the Committee, who must be a university professor, associate or honorary professor, or emeritus. A member of the Committee may not be the supervisor of the doctoral dissertation or the reviewer.
5. The session of the Dissertation Committee is considered authorized if at least 2/3 of the Committee members participate in its work.
6. After the approval of the Dissertation Committee, the Council shall provide the Dissertation Committee members with a dissertation abstract (printed or electronic version) and written feedback on the dissertation. Upon request, the members of the Committee will be provided with a full dissertation thesis.

Article 19. Preparation of public defense of the dissertation and defense

1. The date of public defense of the dissertation shall be set by the Dissertation Council no later than one month after the approval of the Dissertation Committee.
2. The Secretary of the Council, in agreement with the Chairperson, notifies the doctoral student in writing about the date of the 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 defense of the dissertation is Georgian. The language of defense for a doctoral student in a foreign language program will be in the appropriate language. All other specific cases are reviewed by the Dissertation Council.
6. The Chairperson of the Dissertation Council shall submit all the dissertation documents to the public defense, after which the Dissertation Committee shall nominate and elect the chairperson of the session to chair the session. The Chairperson of the Committee ensures the voting and result calculation procedures and is responsible for the final conclusion of the Committee decision. The Chairperson of the Committee shall submit the decision of the Committee and all related documents to the Chairperson of the Dissertation Council.
7. The course of the defense and the decision made shall be recorded in the protocol, which shall be signed by the Chairperson of the Dissertation Committee and the Secretary of the Dissertation Council.
8. The regulations for the public defense of the dissertation include the following procedures:
 - Presenting of the doctoral student and submitting the documents to the Dissertation Committee by the Chairperson of the Council;

- Presenting the composition of the Dissertation Committee to the attendees and electing the chairperson of the Committee;
- Presentation of the doctoral student (no more than 30 minutes);
- Public reading of the conclusion of the dissertation supervisor;
- Public reading of reviews;
- Answering the questions and remarks raised in the reviews by the doctoral student;
- Answering questions of the members of the Committee by the doctoral student;
- Scientific discussion;
- Closed session of the Committee - to evaluate the dissertation and draw a conclusion with the signatures of all members of the Committee;
- Announcing the evaluation result of the dissertation;
- The final word of the doctoral student.

9. Public defense of only one dissertation may be held at one session of the Committee.

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, texts of answers to the reviewers' remarks, final evaluation document of the Dissertation Committee, used ballots, video recording of the dissertation). The Chairperson of the Dissertation Council is responsible for the content validity, storage and compliance with the existing rules.

Article 20. Final Evaluation of the Dissertation by the Dissertation Committee

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

2. The work of the Dissertation Committee and the final evaluation are reflected in the defense protocol.

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

- 91-100 - excellent - 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 Committee informs the doctoral student orally about the reasoned decision of the Committee.

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 grading score of the dissertation must be reflected in the form (see Annex №3);

In the following way:

- Technical side (20 points):

1. Checking compliance with scientific standards (5 points):

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

5 points	The thesis is performed in full compliance with the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography is flawless, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is flawless.
4 points	The thesis is performed in partial compliance with the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography partially meets requirements, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is partially accurate.
3 points	The thesis is not performed in compliance with the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography is not at the proper level, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is not properly accurate.
2 points	The citation rule is used incorrectly, the technical accuracy of the bibliography, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials is incomplete and fragmentary.

0-1 points	The thesis is performed by disregarding the citation rule, the technical accuracy of the bibliography, the reference to attachments, diagrams, illustrations and other materials do not meet the requirements.
------------	--

2. Checking the integrity of the structure (10 points):

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

9-10 points	The structure of the thesis is clear and evident, logically formulated, which clearly outlines the research objectives, process and results; the structure of the thesis is clearly reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations.
7-8 points	The structure of the thesis is logically formulated, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research, although certain issues require clarification; the structure of the thesis is well reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations, but requires clarification.
5-6 points	The structure of the thesis is formulated, which clearly outlines the objectives, process and results of the research, but does not fully address a number of issues. The structure of the thesis 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 thesis is structured superficially and lacks argumentation, which does not clearly outline the research objectives, process and results. The structure of the thesis is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations superficially and lacks argumentation.

0-2 points	The thesis is structured in an unqualified manner, which does not outline the objectives, process and results of the research. The structure of the thesis is reflected in the table of contents or in the attached explanations in an unqualified manner.
------------	--

3. Checking linguistic and stylistic accuracy (5 points):

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

5 points	Linguistically accurate, the uniform style of scientific language is precisely preserved, the accuracy of terminology is preserved, the logical and conceptual apparatus is appropriate and adequate to the specifics of the field.
4 points	Linguistically accurate, the uniform style of 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 uniform 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 appropriate to the specifics of the field.
2 points	Linguistically partially accurate, the uniform style of scientific language is partially preserved, although there are many inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is not preserved. The logical and conceptual apparatus is partially appropriate to the specifics of the field.

0-1 points	Linguistically partially accurate, the uniform style of scientific language is not preserved, and there are many inaccuracies, the accuracy of the terminology is not preserved. The logical and conceptual apparatus does not correspond to the specifics of the field.
------------	--

- Content side (60 points):

1. Checking the relevance of the problem (5 points):

- The relevance of the scientific problem raised in the thesis;
- Diagnosing a problem in the field and proper substantiation of its relevance.

5 points	The relevance of the scientific problem raised in the thesis, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its relevance are clearly and logically formulated.
4 points	The relevance of the scientific problem raised in the thesis, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its relevance are precisely and logically formulated but lack clarity.
3 points	The relevance of the scientific problem raised in the thesis, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its relevance are formulated, but the contextual factors are not fully considered.
2 points	The relevance of the scientific problem raised in the thesis, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its relevance are formulated superficially and lack argumentation.
0-1 points	The relevance of the scientific problem raised in the thesis, the diagnosis of the problem in the field and the proper substantiation of its urgency are formulated in an unqualified manner, without taking into account contextual factors.

2. Checking the novelty of the research (10 points):

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

9-10 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are precisely and logically formulated.
7-8 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are precisely and logically formulated but lack clarity.
5-6 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are formulated, but contextual factors are not fully considered.
3-4 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are formulated superficially, and lack argumentation.
0-2 points	Novelty of the research subject / approach / methodology, creation / introduction of new scientific knowledge in the field / area, possibility of further development of the research are formulated in an unqualified manner, without taking into account contextual factors.

3. Checking the clarity of the research methodology (10 points):

- Relevance of the selected scientific method / methods to the research topic;
- Coherent 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 comprehensively.
5-6 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, separate research methods are used purposefully.
3-4 points	The selected scientific method / methods are partially relevant to the research topic, research methods cannot provide concrete results.
0-2 points	The selected scientific method / methods are not relevant to the research topic, research methods are used in an unqualified manner.

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

- Relevance of the obtained 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 thesis on the main research topic;
- The degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis;

- Quality of in-depth study of the issue and existing material.

13-15 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its diversity, the depth of analysis and quality of research, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, the degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, the degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material are presented in an effective, purposeful and comprehensive manner.
10-12 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its diversity, the depth of analysis and quality of research, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, the degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, the degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material are presented in a purposeful manner.
7-9 points	The relevance of the obtained material to the research topic and its diversity, the depth of analysis and quality of research, the ability to reason independently, the degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, the degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, low degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material are presented in a partially purposeful manner.
4-6 points	Partial relevance of the material to the research topic and its lack of diversity, insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research, insufficient ability to reason independently, low degree of concentration of the thesis on the main research topic, low degree of logical connection between parts of the thesis, low degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material partially ensures achievement of specific results.
0-3 points	Partial relevance of the material to the research topic and its lack of diversity, insufficient depth of analysis and quality of research,

	inability to reason independently, low degree of concentration on the main research topic, lack of logical connection between parts of the thesis, low degree of in-depth study of the problem posed and the available material fails to ensure achievement of specific results.
--	--

5. Checking the argumentation of the research result (conclusion) (15 points):

- Whether the new data are sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation;
- Whether the data obtained during the research process is 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 substantiated by accurate and credible data.
10-12 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, based on accurate and credible data the author's position lacks clarity / substantiation.
7-9 points	The 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 position of the author is not substantiated.
4-6 points	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 lacks argumentation.

0-3 points	New data is partially sufficient for the conclusions presented in the dissertation, the data obtained in the research process are not reflected in the report, the author's position is unqualified, and lacks any substantiation.
------------	--

6. Checking the diversity and novelty of the used literature (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 thesis;
- Use of the latest researches relevant to the topic of the thesis.

5 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are clearly formulated, analyzed and evaluated in an in-depth manner.
4 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are formulated, analyzed and evaluated.
3 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are partially formulated, and are not analyzed and evaluated.
2 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend

	basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are superficially formulated, and are not analyzed and evaluated.
0-1 points	The relevance of the used literature to the research topic, the diversity of the literature, the ability to present and comprehend basic academic research relevant to the topic of the thesis, as well as the use of the latest research materials relevant to the topic are formulated in an unqualified manner, or not presented at all.

- Defense-presentation (20 points):

1. Checking the accuracy and presentability of the dissertation (10 points):

- Quality of the presentation of the thesis by the dissertation student: the presentation of the objectives of the thesis, the selected method, process, conclusions and other related issues in a logical, reasoned, concise and accurate manner;
- Relevance of the presented presentation and visual material to the topic of the abstract, logic and accuracy of the accents.

9-10 points	The aims of the thesis in the dissertation speech, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are formulated with logic, argumentation, brevity and accuracy, the relevance of the presentation and visual material with the topic of the research, the logic and accuracy of the accents are provided by demonstrating in-depth knowledge.
7-8 points	The aims of the thesis in the dissertation speech, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are formulated with logic, argumentation, brevity and accuracy, the relevance of the presentation and visual material with the topic of the research, the logic and accuracy of the accents are provided by demonstrating knowledge, but lack credibility.

5-6 points	The aims of the thesis in the dissertation speech, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are formulated with deficit of logic, argumentation, brevity and accuracy, the relevance of the presentation and visual material with the topic of the research, the logic and accuracy of the accents are provided by demonstrating partial knowledge, although the reasoning is incomplete and lacks credibility.
3-4 points	The aims of the thesis in the dissertation speech, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are formulated with deficit of logic, argumentation, brevity and accuracy, the relevance of the presentation and visual material with the topic of the research, the logic and accuracy of the accents are provided by demonstrating poor knowledge. The reasoning is flawed and fragmentary, failing to reflect the content of the presented topic.
0-2 points	The aims of the thesis in the dissertation speech, the chosen method, the process, the conclusions reached and other related issues are formulated illogically with absence of argumentation. The student was unable to present the topic. The reasoning is not relevant to the issue.

2. Checking the logic, substantiation and academic adherence in answering the questions (10 points):

- Logic, reasoning, brevity and adequacy in answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the Dissertation Committee.
- Academic adherence - adherence to the standards and ethical norms of scientific debate when giving answers.

9-10 points	The logic, argumentation, brevity and adequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the Dissertation Committee are displayed by demonstrating a
-------------	---

	comprehensive knowledge of the issue. Academic adherence - adhering to the standards and ethical norms of scientific debate when giving answers is evident.
7-8 points	The logic, argumentation, brevity and adequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the Dissertation Committee are displayed by demonstrating a proper knowledge of the issue. Academic adherence - adhering to the standards and ethical norms of scientific debate when giving answers is evident. Reasoning is at a good level though lacks credibility.
5-6 points	The logic, argumentation, brevity and adequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the Dissertation Committee are displayed by demonstrating a good knowledge of the issue. Academic adherence - adhering to the standards and ethical norms of scientific debate when giving answers is evident. The reasoning is incomplete and unconvincing.
3-4 points	There is a lack of logic, argumentation, brevity and adequacy of answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the Dissertation Committee. Academic adherence - adhering to the standards and ethical norms of scientific debate when giving answers is evident. The reasoning is flawed and fragmentary.
0-2 points	There is illogicality, deficiency of argumentation, inconsistency and inadequacy in answering the questions and remarks of the reviewers, experts, members of the Dissertation Committee. Academic adherence - adhering to the standards and ethical norms of scientific debate when giving answers is evident. But the student cannot reason and cannot answer questions.

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

9. The thesis and the evaluation of the thesis are not publicly available until the appointment of the defense by the Dissertation Council, except for the persons provided for in paragraph 8 of this Article.

Article 21. Awarding the academic degree of Doctor

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

Article 22. Publication of the Dissertation

1. A diploma certifying the academic degree of Doctor is issued after the publication of the dissertation.

2. After defense of the dissertation, within 6 months, the University, upon the request of the Dissertation Council, shall ensure the publication of the dissertation in printed or electronic form.

Article 23. Diploma certifying the academic degree of Doctor

1. Awarding the academic degree of Doctor of the University is confirmed by a diploma (certificate).

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 shall indicate the name of the Dissertation Council, the date of the defense, the general evaluation 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 Chairperson of the Dissertation Council. The diploma is certified with the seal of the University.
5. A copy of the diploma is kept in the archives of the University.
6. In case of submitting inaccurate data during the dissertation process and violation of the norms of academic honesty, a diploma certifying the academic degree of Doctor will not be issued. The relevant decision is made by the Dissertation Council.
7. The doctor will be deprived of the academic degree of Doctor by the decision of the University Dissertation Council in case of violation of the norms of academic honesty (use of falsified data or plagiarism) in the dissertation.

Article 24. Awarding the title of Honorary Doctor

1. The title of Honorary Doctor of the University will be awarded to a person with special scientific and long-term (not less than 15 years) creative-pedagogical merit.
2. The decision to award the title of Honorary Doctor of the University is made by the Faculty Council upon the recommendation of the Dissertation Council.
3. The diploma of the Honorary Doctor is signed by the Rector of the University and is confirmed by the seal of the University.

Appendix №1

**Study Cost Sheet for _____ Faculty's Doctoral Program
of NNLE Saint King Tamar University of the Georgian Patriarchate**

№	Cost component	Unit (credit per hour)	Unit cost (GEL)	Amount	Total cost (GEL)
---	----------------	------------------------	-----------------	--------	------------------

1	Study component				
2	Scientific guidance of the doctoral student				
3	Activities required for the dissertation (searching for literature / sources based on the specifics of the topic; conducting an experiment ...)				
4	Publication of a work / article				
5	Assignment trip				
6	International review of dissertation				
7	Thesis evaluation and public defense in the Dissertation Council				
8	Administration cost				
9	Total				

Appendix №2

Transcript (Reviewer Evaluation) of Preliminary Evaluation of Dissertation

Author Name, Surname _____

Title of the abstract _____

№	Criteria	Maximum amount of points	evaluation
Technical side 30 points			
1	Compliance with scientific standards	10	
2	Structural integrity	10	
3	Linguistic and stylistic accuracy	10	
Content side 70 points			
1	Relevance of the problem	10	
2	Novelty of research	10	
3	Clarity of research methodology	10	
4	Relevance of the discussed material with topic and substantiation	15	
5	Argumentation of research outcome (Conclusion)	15	
6	Diversity and novelty of references	10	
	Total		

Date _____ Signature _____

Appendix №3

Transcript (Reviewer Evaluation) of Final Evaluation of Dissertation

Author Name, Surname _____

Title of the abstract _____

№	Criteria	Maximum amount of points	evaluation
Technical side 20 points			
1	Compliance with scientific standards	5	
2	Structural integrity	10	
3	Linguistic and stylistic accuracy		
Content side 60 points			
1	Relevance of the problem	5	
2	Novelty of research	10	
3	Clarity of research methodology	10	
4	Relevance of the discussed material with topic and substantiation	15	
5	Argumentation of research outcome (Conclusion)	15	
6	Diversity and novelty of references	5	
Defense - Presentation 20 points			
1	Integrity and presentability of the performance of the dissertation student	10	
2	Consistency of answering to questions, validity and academic adherence	10	
	Total		

Date _____ Signature _____