



Approved by
President of the Caucasus University
01/01-71 (29.06.2026)
by order

School of Law of Caucasus University
Doctoral and Dissertation Board
REGULATIONS

Chapter I. General Provisions

Article 1. Scope of Regulations

The present regulation was developed in accordance with the Law of Georgia "On Higher Education" and regulates the principles and rules of operation of the Doctorate and Dissertation Board of the Caucasus University School of Law, as well as the minimum standard necessary for the implementation of the doctoral programme in the School of Law of the Caucasus University and the awarding of the academic degree of Doctor.

Article 2. Purpose and Objectives of the Doctoral Programme

2.1 "Doctorate educational program - is an educational program of the third level of academic higher education, which is a combination of the educational component and the scientific-research component, and the learning outcomes of which correspond to the generalized learning outcomes defined for the 8th level of the national qualifications framework; 2.2 The goals of the doctoral programme are:

- a) creation of new knowledge and/or development of existing knowledge, promotion of realization and dissemination of knowledge through the implementation of original, modern and innovative researches;
- b) preparation for independent research and scientific activities by deepening the research and transfer skills of the doctoral student;
- c) intellectual growth of the doctoral student and strengthening of academic-ethical norms as a result of passing the doctoral programme;
- d) integration of the doctoral candidate in the international scientific community.

Chapter II. School of Law Dissertation Board

Article 3. Dissertation Board of the School of Law

3.1. The Dissertation Board of the Law School (hereinafter referred to as the "Dissertation Board") includes: Dean of the Law School, academic head of the program; All professors, associate and assistant professors of the school with a doctor's degree or an equivalent academic degree. According to the decision of the Dissertation Board, other persons with a doctor's degree or an equivalent academic degree may be included in the composition of the council.

3.2. The composition of the Dissertation Board is approved by the President of the Caucasus University on the recommendation of the Dean of the Law School.

Article 4. Authority of the Dissertation Board of the School of Law

4.1. Dissertation Board:

- A. Makes a decision on the relevant doctoral educational programs and on the approval of the supervisor(s) of the doctoral programme;

- b. approves the title of the doctoral topic and/or changes to it;
- c. makes a decision about the date of defence of the thesis;
- d. makes a decision on the expediency of the articles published by the doctoral student and the participation in the conference;
- d. creates a dissertation commission and approves the composition of the commission (including the chairman of the commission);
- e. based on the resolution of the Dissertation Commission, makes a decision on awarding the academic degree of Doctor;
- V. makes a decision to terminate the status of a doctoral student.
- Z. implements the internal normative regulations valid in the university and this
- Other powers defined by the statute.

Article 5. The manner of work of the Dissertation Board

- 5.1. The Dissertation Board conducts its activities in accordance with this provision.
- 5.2. Dissertation Board meetings are held as needed, at least twice a year.
- 5.3. The Dissertation Board makes a decision at the meeting of the Board. The meeting is valid if more than half of the list of members is present.
- 5.4. The decision of the Dissertation Board is considered adopted if at least 2/3 of the attendees vote for it, unless otherwise provided by this regulation. Each member of the Dissertation Board has the right to one vote. In case of an even split of votes, the vote of the chairman of the Dissertation Board is decisive. Participation in the meeting and the decision-making process is possible with the opinion and consent expressed by the members in written form (including the message sent by e-mail).
- 5.5. Any decision made by the Dissertation Board is formalized in the form of minutes signed by the chairman and secretary of the council. The opinion expressed in written form will be attached to the minutes.
- 5.6. The secretary of the Dissertation Board ensures the production of minutes of the session.
- 5.7. The decision made by the Dissertation Board and the Chairman of the Board, which affects any doctoral candidate, must be communicated to him/her in writing (including the use of e-mail).
- 5.8. Between the sessions of the Dissertation Board, the work of the Council is led by the Chairman of the Council.
- 5.9. In the absence of the secretary, the chairman is authorized to assign the duty of the secretary to one of the members of the council.
- 5.10. The right to initiate the meeting of the Dissertation Board is held by: the dean of the school, the chairman of the Dissertation Board, the head of the doctoral programme or a member of the Dissertation Board. The first meeting of the council, before the election of the chairman, is chaired by the senior member of the council.

Article 6. Chairman and Secretary of the Dissertation Board of the School of Law

- 6.1. The Dissertation Board has a chairman and a secretary.
- 6.2. The Chairman of the Dissertation Board along with the composition of the Board is approved by the President of the Caucasus University, based on the submission of the Dean of the Law School.
- 6.3. The secretary of the Dissertation Board is elected by the Dissertation Board by the majority of the votes of those present, in an open vote.

Article 7. Powers of the Chairman of the Dissertation Board

Chairman of the Dissertation Board:

- A. convenes and presides over board meetings as needed;
- b. directs the work of the Council between the sessions of the Dissertation Board;
- c. prepares a submission for a doctoral student regarding termination of status;
- d. ensures the organization of mandatory thematic seminars for doctoral students;

- e. submits a report to the Dissertation Board once a year about the activities carried out and measures to be carried out in the future;
- V. makes a decision on changing the doctoral candidate's dissertation topic within the same doctoral programme;
- Z. makes a decision on changing the academic supervisor of the doctoral student;
- T. approves the list of dissertation topics and/or changes to them;
- i. Exercises other powers defined by this regulation.

Article 8. Secretary of the Dissertation Board of the School of Law.

8.1. The organizational activities of the Dissertation Board are ensured by the Secretary of the Dissertation Board, who:

- A. Ensures the preparation of the minutes of the Dissertation Board meeting in accordance with the uniform rules of proceedings at the university.
 - b. records the doctoral student's dissertation documentation;
 - c. helps the chairman in solving organizational issues;
 - d. manages the issues of archive and proceedings of the Council;
 - e. advises and helps the doctoral student in preparing appropriate documentation before and after the defence of the thesis;
 - V. ensures timely placement of information on the website;
- 8.3. The secretary of the Dissertation Board is obliged to inform the addressee of any decision of the Dissertation Board and the Chairman of the Dissertation Board in writing (including the use of e-mail).

Chapter III. Doctoral studies

Article 9. Prerequisites for admission to the doctoral educational program

9.1. A person who has been awarded an academic degree of Master of Research in Law or an academic degree equivalent to it is eligible to study at the doctoral educational programme of the Law School of the Caucasus University.

9.2. The research master's academic degree provided for in paragraph 9.1 of this article must be obtained on the basis of a master's educational program with a volume of at least 120 ECTS credits as a whole or, in case of implementation of the program in two parts, on the basis of the complete completion of both parts, the accumulation of at least 120 ECTS credits in total and the successful defence of the master's thesis.

9.3. The right to study at the doctoral educational program in law is also available to a person with an academic degree of Master of Laws, who enrolled in a Master's educational program of law with a volume of at least 120 ECTS credits before September 1, 2026 and completed the mentioned program.

9.4. A PhD candidate must have one of the following experiences or achievements in the relevant field:

- a) at least one scientific work or publication;
- b) participation in a scientific-research project or a scientific event;
- c) at least two years of professional activity experience in the relevant field.

9.5. A candidate for a doctoral degree must have at least a B2 level of English. Knowledge of the English language is proven by one of the following documents or means:

- a) with a relevant international certificate, including an IELTS score of at least 6.0, a TOEFL score of at least 78 or another international certificate confirming the B2 level;
- b) LSI - with the corresponding valid certificate issued by the National Center for Evaluation and Examinations;
- c) with a diploma or other official document confirming the completion of the English-language educational program, if no more than two years have passed since the completion of the said program;
- d) by successfully passing the internal exam organized by the Caucasus University, which ensures compliance with the B2 level of the candidate's English language skills.

9.6. If the teaching language of the doctoral educational program is Georgian and the native language of the doctoral candidate is not Georgian, the candidate is obliged to confirm knowledge of the Georgian language at

least B2 level with a relevant certificate or to successfully pass an internal exam in the Georgian language organized by the Caucasus University.

9.7. Enrollment in the doctoral educational program of law is possible on a mobility basis, in accordance with the legislation of Georgia and the legal acts in force at the university. Applicants for mobility enrollment must meet the admission prerequisites defined by the doctoral educational program and this regulation.

9.8. Enrollment of a person in a doctoral educational program of law based on the qualification granted by a higher educational institution of a foreign country is carried out in compliance with the requirements of the Law of Georgia "On Higher Education" and other relevant legal acts.

9.9. The education or qualification obtained abroad must be recognized by the National Center for the Development of Education Quality, according to the rules established by the legislation of Georgia. The relevance of the education received abroad is determined by taking into account the results of the studies and the qualifications awarded.

9.10. Additional conditions for admission of a doctoral candidate to the program, documents to be submitted, selection procedures and the evaluation procedure are determined by the doctoral educational program, this regulation and relevant legal acts in force at the university.

Article 10. Conditions for enrollment in doctoral studies

Admission to the doctoral programme of the Caucasus University School of Law is announced only within the approved doctoral programme, once every two years.

Article 11. Documents to be submitted by the doctoral candidate

11.1. The doctoral candidate must submit to the secretary of the Dissertation Board an application made in the name of the President of the Caucasus University (Annex No. 1), in which the name of the relevant doctoral educational program is indicated. The application must be accompanied by:

- a) Copy of identity document or passport. A foreign language document submitted by a citizen of a foreign country must be translated and certified in the Georgian language according to the procedure established by the legislation of Georgia;
- b) duly authenticated copies of the diploma and the diploma appendix confirming the academic qualification specified in Article 9 of this regulation. The authenticity of the Caucasus University graduate's diploma and diploma supplement is confirmed by the relevant school of the university;
- c) if the diploma has not yet been issued — a certificate issued by the relevant higher educational institution on the awarding of an academic degree and an official document of academic performance, which confirms the full completion of the relevant master's educational program and the accumulation of at least 120 ECTS credits in total;
- d) in case of completion of a two-part master's educational program in law - a diploma, diploma supplement or other official document confirming the complete completion of both parts of the program, the accumulation of at least 120 ECTS credits in total, the successful defence of the master's thesis and the awarding of the research master's academic degree;
- e) in the case provided for in clause 9.3 of this regulation — a diploma confirming the academic degree of a Master of Law and an appendix to the diploma or other official documents confirming the candidate's enrollment in a Master of Law educational program with a volume of at least 120 ECTS credits before September 1, 2026 and the full completion of the said program;
- f) in the case of education received abroad - a document confirming the recognition of education received abroad issued by the National Center for the Development of Education Quality. In case of presentation of the diploma issued as a result of the completion of at least a five-year educational program, the equivalence of the above-mentioned qualification with the academic degree of a master's degree must be confirmed by a relevant document;
- g) One of the following documents confirming knowledge of the English language at least B2 level:

z.a) duly certified copy of the relevant international certificate, including IELTS with at least 6.0 points, TOEFL with at least 78 points or another international certificate confirming B2 level;

z.b) a copy of the corresponding valid certificate issued by the National Center for Assessment and Examinations;

z.g) Diploma confirming the completion of the English-language educational program or other official document issued by the relevant higher educational institution, if no more than two years have passed since the completion of the said program. In the case of education received abroad, the candidate must also present a recognition document issued by the National Center for the Development of Education Quality.

11.2. In the absence of the document provided for in subparagraph "g" of paragraph 11.1 of this article, the candidate must pass an internal exam organized by Caucasus University, which determines the knowledge of the English language at least at the B2 level.

11.3. A candidate whose native language is not Georgian must present a certificate confirming knowledge of the Georgian language at least B2 level. In case of not having a certificate, the candidate passes the internal exam organized by the Caucasus University in the Georgian language.

11.4. The statement specified in clause 11.1 of this article must also be accompanied by:

a) autobiography (CV), which describes the candidate's education, professional activity and scientific experience;

b) recommendation of two specialists with the academic degree of Doctor of Law in the field chosen by the candidate;

c) cover letter;

d) a document confirming one of the prerequisites defined by clause 9.4 of this provision:

d.a) a copy of at least one scientific paper or publication or official information confirming its publication;

d.b) a document confirming participation in a scientific-research project or a scientific event;

d.c) a document confirming professional activity of at least two years in the relevant field;

e) Doctoral research project — research application, in accordance with the requirements specified in Annex No. 2;

f) photograph - in the form determined by the rules of proceedings in force at the university;

g) A copy of the document confirming being on military registration, if the obligation to submit it is derived from the legislation of Georgia.

11.5. Applicants for mobility enrollment, along with the relevant documents provided for in this article, must submit:

a) a duly certified copy of the legal act or its extract on the student's enrollment in the relevant doctoral educational program;

b) official document of academic performance;

c) syllabi of completed training and research components or other official documents confirming their content;

d) other documents defined by the legislation of Georgia and relevant legal acts of the university for recognition of mobility and credits.

11.6. Enrollment on the basis of mobility and recognition of credits obtained by the candidate are carried out in compliance with the legislation of Georgia, relevant legal acts of the university and the requirements of this regulation. Applicants for mobility must meet the prerequisites for admission defined by Article 9 of this regulation.

11.7. The candidate has the right to additionally present:

a) a document confirming pedagogical experience;

b) a document confirming additional professional or scientific experience;

c) other relevant documents that the candidate considers necessary for the evaluation of his experience and abilities.

11.8. The university has the right to request the candidate to submit the original document or additional information to determine the authenticity of the document, the data contained in it, or compliance with the prerequisites for admission to the program.

Article 12. Prerequisites and evaluation criteria for admission to the competitive interview

- 12.1. If the candidate submits the necessary documents, he will be admitted to the interview.
- 12.2. The candidate goes through an interview in front of the admission commission, whose composition is approved by the president of the Caucasus University on the recommendation of the dean of the Caucasus Law School; The order is published together with the announcement of acceptance.
- 12.3. The candidate's questionnaire data will be reported to the commission by the secretary of the Dissertation Board.
- 12.4. A candidate will be considered enrolled in doctoral studies, if the arithmetic average of the grades received by him is at least 51 points.
- 12.5. The members of the admission commission for the doctoral programme evaluate the candidate according to the evaluation form (Annex No. 4). The evaluation of the doctoral research application (Annex No. 3) should be reflected in the candidate's evaluation form.
- 12.6. The maximum total score is 100.
- 12.7. In case of competition, during the selection of the candidate, at the discretion of the commission, in addition to the minimum documents, additional information and materials submitted by the candidate shall be taken into account.

Article 13. Enrollment in doctoral studies

- 13.1. Candidates who successfully pass the interview will be admitted to the law school's doctoral programme.
- 13.2. A person will be enrolled in the doctoral programme of the Law School by the order of the President of the Caucasus University.
- 13.3. Within one week after the publication of the order for enrollment in doctoral studies, a contract is signed between the Caucasus University and the doctoral candidate, which defines the rights and duties of the parties.

Article 14. Duration of doctoral studies

After the expiration of the standard term (6 semesters) of the doctoral educational program, the doctoral student with academic debt has the right to continue his studies in order to complete the educational program for an additional period of no more than 4 semesters (eligible term) while maintaining the status of a student.

Article 15. Suspension of doctoral student status

- 15.1. The doctoral student will be entitled to participate in the educational process and perform scientific research work after passing the corresponding semester administrative registration.
- 15.2. The doctoral student is obliged to register for study courses within the registration deadlines announced by the university, sign a semester agreement and pay the semester tuition fees in accordance with the rules established by the framework agreement signed with him. If the doctoral candidate does not complete the registration on time, he/she will be transferred to the late registration mode.
- 15.3. The terms of administrative registration in the semester are regulated according to the academic calendar.
- 15.4 Academic leave is granted to the doctoral candidate in accordance with the applicable legislation and the rules established by the university.

Article 16. Termination of doctoral student status

1. The grounds for termination of student status are given in the "Regulations on Student Status".

Chapter IV. PhD program

Article 17. Development and submission of doctoral programme

17.1. The doctoral programme is being developed:

- a) by the academic staff of the relevant field of the school;
- b) in cooperation with the partner university;
- c) together with an educational or scientific institution, on the basis of the agreement concluded between the university and the relevant institution.

17.2. The doctoral programme is supervised by an affiliated professor or associate professor of the Caucasus University. The co-leader of the doctoral programme can be a professor, associate professor or assistant professor of Caucasus University.

17.3. The doctoral programme is considered and approved by the president of the university.

17.4. The doctoral programme must be accompanied by the syllabi of the study courses defined by the program.

17.5. The following may participate in the implementation of the doctoral programme:

- a) university professor, associate professor and assistant professor;
- b) academic/scientific staff of a partner educational or scientific institution;
- c) Invited personnel with relevant academic degrees.

17.6. The number of doctoral students to be admitted to the doctoral programme in the relevant academic year is determined by the university's governing board.

17.7. At least 5 (five) affiliated academic staff of the relevant field, including at least 3 (three) professors and/or associate professors, should be involved in the implementation of the doctoral educational program.

17.8. Each professor, associate professor and assistant professor of the school can simultaneously be the academic supervisor of no more than 3 (three) doctoral students. As an exception, a 1:5 ratio between the supervisor and his doctoral students in active status is allowed only when a suspended doctoral student requests reinstatement in order to submit a dissertation for an academic degree.

17.9. The qualification of the academic/scientific staff involved in the implementation of the doctoral educational program is confirmed by a scientific work and/or a practical project published in a peer-reviewed journal with an international index within the last 3 (three) years, which proves his/her competence in the relevant field.

Article 18. Volume of doctoral educational program

18.1. Doctoral studies at the School of Law are conducted within the framework of the doctoral programme.

18.2. The duration of the doctoral educational program is at least 3 years (6 semesters) and its educational component includes no more than 60 credits, while the scientific-research component is carried out for at least 2 years.

18.3 The doctoral programme consists of educational and scientific-research components and is completed by the completion and defence of a dissertation.

Article 19. Educational component of doctoral studies

19.1. The educational component of the doctoral programme aims at the sectoral and methodological skills of the doctoral student, helps the doctoral student to complete the dissertation and prepares him for future pedagogical and scientific activities.

19.2 The training component of the doctoral programme includes the following lecture courses:

- A. Modern standards of scientific writing and methods of legal research (mandatory) – 10 ECTS credits;
- b. Innovative teaching methods (mandatory) – 5 ECTS credits;
- c. Two thematic seminars (mandatory) - 40 (20+20) ECTS credits.
- d. Professor's assistantship (mandatory) – 5 ECTS credits;

Article 20. Study courses determined by the doctoral programme

20.1. The training courses defined by the doctoral programme consist of a cycle of lectures, practical work, presentation and written examination of the material learned.

20.2. The educational component defined by the doctoral programme is considered successfully completed if the doctoral student separately overcomes the minimum competence thresholds determined for the intermediate and final evaluations and receives at least 60 points with the sum of the intermediate and final evaluations. The minimum competence limit for the intermediate assessment is 59% of the maximum score of the intermediate assessment, and the minimum competence limit for the final assessment is 60% of the maximum score of the final assessment, unless a higher limit is determined by the syllabus of the relevant educational component.

20.3. The right to additional evaluation of the educational component, the procedure for conducting the additional evaluation and the grounds for repeating the educational component are determined by the applicable legislation, the relevant legal act of the university and the syllabus of the educational component.

Article 21. Professor's assistantship

21.1. The professor's assistantship is a mandatory component of the program, which implies the involvement of the doctoral student in the educational process in order to provide assistance to the academic staff of the law school and practical training for possible future teaching activities.

21.2. A doctoral student engaged in teaching activities at the Caucasus University can be considered to have passed the teaching component of "Professor's Assistantship" if the content, volume and results of the teaching activities carried out by him correspond to the goals and learning outcomes defined by the syllabus of the said teaching component. To determine compliance, the doctoral student submits the documentation confirming the pedagogical activity.

21.3. The activities performed within the teaching component of "Professor's Assistantship" are evaluated separately by the head of the professor's assistantship and the appropriate administrative representative of the school in accordance with the learning outcomes and evaluation criteria defined by the syllabus of the training component (Appendices No. 12 and No. 13). In the case provided by paragraph 21.2 of this article, the relevance of the doctoral student's pedagogical activity is evaluated by the head of the doctoral programme and the appropriate administrative representative of the school. On the basis of their assessment, the doctoral candidate will be given the appropriate assessment determined by the syllabus of the study component, and the component will be considered passed.

Article 22. Thematic seminar

22.1. From the first semester of doctoral studies, the doctoral student prepares two thematic seminars and defends them before the commission. The topic of the thematic seminar should not be part of the dissertation topic.

22.2. The doctoral student chooses, writes and defends the topic of the thematic seminar in agreement and consultation with the academic supervisor of the dissertation topic. The title of the topic agreed with the academic supervisor is presented by the doctoral candidate in the form of an application no later than 2 weeks after the start of the semester, the head of the doctoral programme/administrative director of the doctoral programme discusses the topic and gives an overview of the topicality of the topic.

22.3. The rules of formalization, presentation and evaluation of the thematic seminar are determined by the relevant regulation (Annex No. 6).

22.4. The thematic seminar is evaluated with a 100-point system and includes intermediate and final evaluations.

22.5. Within the framework of the intermediate evaluation, the thematic seminar paper is independently evaluated by the thematic seminar leader — with a maximum of 30 points and the reviewer — with a maximum of 30 points, based on the criteria determined by the relevant evaluation forms. The sum of the points awarded by the supervisor and the reviewer constitutes an intermediate grade, the maximum grade of which is 60 points.

22.6. The prerequisite for admission to the public defence of the thematic seminar is to overcome the minimum competence limit defined for the intermediate assessment - 59% of the maximum score of the intermediate assessment. If the doctoral candidate fails to overcome the mentioned limit, he/she will be re-registered for the corresponding study component.

22.7. Within the framework of the final evaluation, the public defence of the thematic seminar is assessed with a maximum of 40 points by a commission consisting of persons with a doctorate degree in the relevant field or

equivalent. The commission may include academic and/or invited staff of the university, as well as, taking into account the specifics of the thematic seminar's research issue, a practicing professional in the relevant field. The minimum competence limit of the final assessment is 60% of the maximum score of the final assessment, which is 24 points.

22.8. The unified final grade of the thematic seminar is calculated by summing the scores of the intermediate and final grades. The minimum positive evaluation of the thematic seminar is 60 points.

22.9. The thematic seminar shall be deemed successfully completed if the doctoral student separately meets the minimum competency thresholds established for the interim and final assessments and obtains a total score of at least 60 points from the combined interim and final assessments. The detailed procedures for the preparation, submission, review, public defence and assessment of the thematic seminar shall be determined by Annex No. 6 to these Regulations, while the assessment criteria and assessment forms shall be determined by Annexes Nos. 5.1–5.4.

22.10. The date, time and place of the public defence of the thematic seminar with the indication of the audience or, in case of conducting it in a remote form, the relevant electronic information about the attendance should be posted on the university website in advance.

Article 23. Scientific-research component of doctoral studies

23.1. The implementation of the scientific-research component begins after the completion of the educational component and continues for at least two years. After completing the educational component, the doctoral candidate registers for the scientific-research component.

23.2. The scientific-research component includes the implementation of the dissertation research, preparation of the dissertation and public defence.

23.3. In the first semester after registration for the scientific-research component, the doctoral student is obliged to submit the title of the dissertation topic for approval to the Dissertation Board of the school.

23.4. In the first semester after the registration for the scientific-research component, the doctoral candidate establishes an individual research plan in agreement with the academic supervisor/co-supervisor.

An individual research plan should include:

- a) the data of the doctoral student and academic supervisor/co-supervisor;
- b) the topic of the thesis and the purpose of the research;
- c) the research question and/or the main tasks of the research;
- d) the approximate structure of the thesis;
- e) research methodology;
- f) the schedule of the main stages of the dissertation research and the work on the dissertation;
- g) plan and schedule of preparation and publication of two scientific articles;
- h) the plan and schedule of participation in the scientific conference with a report;
- i) other relevant information based on the specifics of the research.

The academic supervisor/co-supervisor supervises the implementation of the individual research plan. In the event of a need identified during the research or other justified circumstances, the individual research plan can be updated with the agreement of the doctoral student and the academic supervisor/co-supervisor.

23.5. In order to be awarded an academic degree, before submitting the dissertation, the doctoral candidate must have published at least two scientific articles in the relevant field of research and must have participated in at least one scientific conference with a report related to the topic of the dissertation research.

23.6. Both scientific articles must be published in an international scientific journal or conference proceedings. The relevant publication must have an ISSN or ISBN, an international editorial board/committee and international circulation. Both articles should be related to the topic of the dissertation research and reflect the main results obtained within the framework of the research.

A work published in the conference proceedings will be considered a scientific article only if it is a complete scientific work, has undergone peer review and has been published in a publication that meets the requirements set forth in this paragraph.

At least one of the two scientific articles provided for in this paragraph must be published in a peer-reviewed journal included in the foreign international index of the relevant field.

23.7. The scientific article must be published in Georgian and English languages. This requirement does not imply the obligation to publish the same article in two different scientific publications. It is possible to publish an article in Georgian and English within one scientific publication in a bilingual form or according to the rules established by the relevant publication. If the doctoral student publishes an article in a foreign journal, he is exempted from the obligation to publish the Georgian version of this article.

23.8. A scientific article is considered published if it is published in a printed or electronic issue of a relevant scientific publication or is placed on the official website of a scientific publication in the form of a final electronic publication or "online first".

23.9. Participation in the scientific conference provided for in paragraph 23.5 of this article is a requirement independent of the publication of two scientific articles. The conference report should be related to the topic of the dissertation research. Participating in a conference with a report does not in itself change the obligation to publish two scientific articles.

23.10. After registering for the scientific-research component, the doctoral student is obliged to submit a semester report of scientific-research activity at the end of each semester, in accordance with the form specified by Annex No. 11 of this regulation.

The semester report should reflect:

- a) the state of performance of the activities determined by the individual research plan;
- b) progress of work on the thesis;
- c) implemented research activities and obtained results;
- d) the state of preparation and publication of scientific articles;
- e) state of participation in the scientific conference;
- f) Difficulties identified in the research process and measures planned for their solution;
- g) Activities to be implemented in the next semester.

23.11. The semester report should include a written formative assessment and feedback from the supervisor/co-supervisor. The supervisor evaluates the progress of the doctoral student taking into account the fulfillment of the individual research plan, the scope and quality of the work performed, the consistency of the research activity and the observance of the requirements of academic integrity.

The academic supervisor/co-supervisor indicates one of the following grades in the semester report:

- a) research progress is satisfactory;
- b) research progress is partially satisfactory and needs improvement;
- c) Research progress is unsatisfactory.

23.12. In the case of partially satisfactory or unsatisfactory research progress, the semester report should indicate identified deficiencies, activities to be improved, support required for the doctoral candidate, relevant recommendations and their deadline. Unsatisfactory progress is re-evaluated within a period determined by the supervisor, but no later than the end of the next semester.

23.13. The semester report signed by the doctoral student and the written formative assessment of the academic supervisor/co-supervisor reflected in it are submitted to the head of the doctoral programme and the administrative director and are kept in the personal file of the doctoral student.

23.14. Submission of semester reports of scientific-research activity and passing of periodic developmental evaluations of research progress are mandatory prerequisites for admission to the defence of the dissertation.

23.15. To be admitted to the defence of the dissertation, the doctoral student must have completed:

- a) educational components determined by the doctoral programme;
- b) the main stages determined by the individual research plan;
- c) request to publish two scientific articles specified in this article;
- d) request to participate in at least one scientific conference with a report;
- e) requirements for submission of semester reports and periodic formative evaluations of research progress;
- f) requirements of academic integrity and research ethics.

Article 24. Scientific supervisor of the doctoral student

24.1. The academic supervisor of the doctoral student may be an academic and/or scientific staff member of the Caucasus University, another higher educational institution of Georgia or a foreign higher educational institution, who has a doctorate in law or an academic degree equivalent to it, appropriate qualifications for the topic of the dissertation, research experience in the relevant field, and the necessary competence for proper supervision of the doctoral student's research.

24.2 In case of inviting a supervisor, the doctoral student must have a co-supervisor who will be a university professor. The requirement in the section on holding an academic position does not apply to the international supervisor/co-supervisor;

24.3 Depending on the specifics and development of the field, the academic supervisor of each doctoral student is equipped with the latest knowledge, has a qualification/academic degree and/or professional experience relevant to the topic and problem of the dissertation, has leadership/co-leadership experience, and/or has completed a relevant activity (training, seminar, professional development course, etc.) and also within the last 3 (three) years Has published at least 1 scientific paper in a peer-reviewed journal with a foreign international index determined by USD, which corresponds to the general topic/field of research of the dissertation of the doctoral student.

24.4. To approve a supervisor for a PhD student, the student must submit a letter of research interest (Attachment # 1-11).

24.5. The doctoral student's academic supervisor/co-supervisor, based on the submission of the chairman of the Dissertation Board, is approved by the school's Dissertation Board no later than 90 calendar days after the doctoral student's enrollment.

24.6. With the motivated petition of the chairman of the Dissertation Board, the council may approve two academic supervisors (co-supervisors) on one dissertation topic. In addition, one of the co-supervisors can be an employee of another (partner) institution, in case an agreement is signed between the Caucasus University and this institution.

24.7. The academic supervisor periodically observes the progress of the scientific-research component of the doctoral student, develops evaluation and gives feedback. Controls the implementation of the individual plan of the doctoral candidate.

24.8. The academic supervisor/co-supervisor can be changed or terminated at any stage of the doctoral programme if there is a justified reason, including:

- a) based on the agreement of the doctoral student and the academic supervisor/co-supervisor;
- b) in the presence of a conflict of interest or other circumstances impeding the impartiality of the head;
- c) in case of non-fulfilment or improper fulfillment of the duties defined by this regulation by the academic supervisor/co-supervisor;
- d) in long-term unavailability of the academic supervisor/co-supervisor;
- e) in the event of a substantial change in the topic or direction of the dissertation research, which requires the involvement of a supervisor with other qualifications or experience;
- f) in the presence of health condition, termination of employment relationship or other objective circumstances that make the continuation of management impossible or essentially complicated;
- g) based on the justified request of the doctoral candidate or the academic supervisor/co-supervisor, if the continuation of the existing supervision prevents the proper implementation of the dissertation research;
- h) in other cases provided by the legislation of Georgia, legal acts of the university or this provision.

24.9. A substantiated written statement on the change of academic supervisor/co-supervisor or termination of supervision can be submitted to the Dissertation Board of the school by the doctoral student, academic supervisor/co-supervisor, head of the doctoral programme or chairman of the Dissertation Board.

The Dissertation Board is authorized to hear the opinions of the doctoral student, academic supervisor/co-supervisor and other relevant persons when considering the application. The decision on changing or

terminating the academic supervisor/co-supervisor is made by the Dissertation Board of the school no later than 15 working days after receiving the application.

The Dissertation Board, if necessary, approves a new academic supervisor/co-supervisor at the same or the next meeting. The change of supervisor should not lead to unjustified cancellation or inappropriate limitation of the research activities and results achieved by the doctoral student.

24.10. The thesis topic can be changed at the joint justified request of the doctoral student and the academic supervisor, which is decided by the chairman of the Dissertation Board.

24.11. After the completion of the thesis, the academic supervisor makes a written conclusion, which must be completed in accordance with Annex No. 8.

Article 25. Function-duties of the academic supervisor.

25.1 The academic supervisor of the doctoral student shares the rules that apply in the university.

25.2 helps the doctoral student to select a research topic.

25.3. The academic supervisor of the doctoral student monitors the performance of the educational and research components of the doctoral student.

25.4. The academic supervisor of the doctoral student ensures the submission of the research or teaching components of the doctoral student within the established deadlines and in the format developed by the university.

25.5. The academic supervisor of the doctoral student ensures that the doctoral student is informed about the unwavering observance of the established norms on plagiarism in the university.

25.6. The academic supervisor of the doctoral student ensures compliance with the ethical norms and procedures adopted at the university.

25.7. The academic supervisor of the doctoral student conducts regular meetings with the doctoral student related to the thesis, gives instructions in the process of working on the thesis, prepares the doctoral student for the presentation of various completed components and monitors the progress of the qualification research at various stages.

25.8. The academic supervisor of the doctoral student ensures the involvement of the student in various scientific activities.

25.9. Termination of leadership by the scientific head/co-head and its replacement is carried out according to the grounds and procedure defined by clauses 24.8 and 24.9 of this regulation.

Article 26. Function-duties of a doctoral student

26.1. The doctoral student shares the rules that apply at the university.

26.2. The doctoral student submits to the Dissertation Board a document on the title of the selected qualification paper and the approval of the academic supervisor.

26.3. The doctoral candidate completes the teaching and research components in accordance with the rules established in the university

26.4. The doctoral candidate will present the research and teaching components within the established deadlines and in the format developed by the university.

26.5 The doctoral student shares the established norms regarding plagiarism in the institution. The doctoral student agrees to adhere to the ethical norms and procedures adopted in the institution.

26.6. The doctoral candidate holds regular meetings with the supervisor related to the thesis.

26.7. The doctoral student is involved in various scientific activities. The PhD student interacts with the supervisor for the preparation of the thesis and the presentation of the various components.

Chapter VI. Presentation of the thesis

Article 27. Requirements for the thesis

27.1 The dissertation is the result of the independent scientific research work of the doctoral student. Dissertation work should reflect the scientifically substantiated new results of theoretical and/or empirical research, be characterized by scientific novelty and contribute to the development of the field.

27.2. For the Georgian-language doctoral educational program, the dissertation must be written in Georgian, and the abbreviated version of the dissertation, outlining the main goals of the research and the achieved results, must be written in Georgian and English.

27.3. The Dissertation Board of the school decides on the issue of completing the dissertation in English on the Georgian-language doctoral educational program. In case of writing the work in English, the abbreviated version of the thesis must be submitted in Georgian.

27 4. The dissertation and the abbreviated version of the dissertation for the English-language doctoral educational program must be written in English.

27.5. An abbreviated version of the thesis should reflect all the components of the thesis. The volume of the abbreviated version of the dissertation is determined by the School's Dissertation Board and Doctoral Regulations, as well as by the relevant instructions approved by the School's Dissertation Board.

27.6. The dissertation must comply with these regulations (Annex No. 7) and academic standards.

Article 28. Submission of dissertation

28.1 The doctoral candidate submits four printed copies of the dissertation and its electronic version (in PDF format) to the Dissertation Board.

28 2. Along with the dissertation, the doctoral student must submit to the Dissertation Board:

a) statement on the acceptance of the thesis for consideration in the name of the chairman of the Dissertation Board;

b) A statement by the doctoral student that the submitted paper fully reflects his independent research and meets all norms of academic integrity. In particular, the work does not contain plagiarism, falsified data or other violations; are original, and other authors' opinions and sources are cited in accordance with established academic rules. In addition, the PhD candidate certifies that the thesis is his/her own creation and is not based on AI-generated text or research.

c) academic certificate (confirmation document) issued by the dean of the school about the completion of the educational components provided by the doctoral programme;

d) a printout of the scientific papers showing the main results of the scientific research carried out on the dissertation topic under the authorship or co-authorship of the doctoral candidate and published in accordance with this provision;

e) materials of scientific seminars, forums and conferences, where the main results of the dissertation were reported (the doctoral student is obliged to have participated in at least one international scientific conference. His participation must be confirmed by a certificate and published materials).

28.3. The submitted dissertation must be accompanied by a written conclusion of the doctoral student's academic supervisor (co-supervisor/supervisors), in which, in addition to the evaluation, it will be noted that the dissertation is ready for public discussion.

The submitted dissertation must be accompanied by the conclusion of the head of the doctoral programme that he has familiarized himself with the dissertation and recommends its submission to the public discussion. 29.6. The thesis will be submitted to the Dissertation Board for review in the final semester before the end of the academic term.

28.4. Within one week following the submission of the dissertation, the Academic Manager and the Administrative Director of the doctoral programme shall verify the doctoral student's academic status, the completeness of the submitted documentation and the dissertation's technical compliance with the requirements established by these Regulations and the relevant internal acts of the University. If any deficiency is identified, the doctoral student shall be notified thereof in writing and shall be given a deadline for its correction.

28.5 If the conditions of Article 28.2 are met, the administrative director of the dissertation program sends the work to the plagiarism program for checking. The rules for checking plagiarism are regulated by the "rules for checking students' work in the Plagiarism Detection and Prevention Program (Turnitin)".

28 6. After checking the thesis for plagiarism, in the absence of plagiarism, the administrative director of the doctoral programme will submit the thesis to the chairman of the school's Dissertation Board.

Article 29. Abstract

29.1. An abstract is a shortened version of a dissertation.

29.2. The abstract should be written so that the interested person gets to know the main results of the paper.

29.3. The abstract should include a title page. It should reflect: the relevance of the topic, the purpose of the work, the object and methods of the research, the main results and scientific novelty of the work, as well as information about the scope and structure of the thesis. The main results of the thesis according to chapters and general conclusions should be presented in the abstract.

29.4. The abstract must contain a list of only those works published by the author, the content of which corresponds to the topic of the dissertation and is included in the dissertation.

29.5. The abstract should also include information about the discussion of the provisions of the paper (such as: reports at conferences, forums, symposia and workshops). 29.6. The abstract must be written in Georgian and English.

29.7. The total volume of the abstract (in both languages) should not exceed four printed plates.

Article 30. Dissertation thesis reviewers

30.1 The Dissertation Board of the school, in order to evaluate the novelty and readiness for public defence of the dissertation, based on the submission of the Chairman of the Dissertation Board, allocates one local and one international reviewer. Reviewer selection and appointment processes should be transparent, impartial and objective. When selecting reviewers, their anonymity should be ensured, which will help to prepare an unbiased, fair and objective conclusion. The identity of the reviewer is confidential to the doctoral student and/or his/her supervisor (co-supervisor) until the review is disclosed.

30.2 A local reviewer is a staff member of a university, scientific-research institute/center, or a person with emeritus status, who is equipped with the latest knowledge in the field, has actively participated in scientific research, and has published at least 1 scientific work (in artistic directions - creative/performing project) in a peer-reviewed journal with a foreign international index in the last 3 years, which corresponds to a doctoral student the general topic/field of research of the dissertation; ;

30.3 An international reviewer is a staff member of a foreign university, scientific-research institute/center, or a person with emeritus status, who is equipped with the latest knowledge in the field, has actively participated in scientific research, and has published at least 1 scientific work (in artistic directions - creative/performing project) in a peer-reviewed journal with a foreign international index in the last 3 years, which corresponds to the doctoral student's The general topic/field of research of the dissertation.

30.4 The opinion of the international reviewer is not mandatory if the doctoral student has an international supervisor.

30.5 Reviewer cannot be:

- a) chairman or secretary of the Dissertation Board;
- b) co-author of any work performed by the dissertation student;
- c) a person officially dependent on the dissertation student.

30.6 The secretary of the Doctoral (Dissertation) Council provides one copy of the thesis to the reviewer within 3 working days after the appointment of the reviewer.

30.7 The reviewer is obliged to evaluate the thesis according to the criteria defined by this regulation and the relevant evaluation form and to give a summary evaluation about the transfer of the thesis to the dissertation commission (positive evaluation);

30.8. The reviewer is obliged to prepare and submit to the School's Dissertation Board the written review and the evaluation form of the dissertation defined by this provision no later than 1 (one) month after receiving the dissertation.

30.9. In case of a positive assessment of the thesis by both reviewers, the thesis will be submitted to the thesis commission.

30.10. In case of a positive evaluation of the thesis by one reviewer, and a negative evaluation by the second reviewer, in the presence of a positive conclusion of the academic supervisor/co-supervisor, the Dissertation Board of the school makes a decision to admit the dissertation to public defence. Both reviewers' conclusions

and scores will be submitted to the defence committee and will be taken into account when calculating the final final grade for the dissertation.

30.11. In case of a negative assessment of the thesis by both reviewers, the doctoral student will not be admitted to the public defence, according to the decision of the School's Dissertation Board. The doctoral candidate has the right to rework the dissertation, taking into account the recommendations of the reviewers, and to resubmit it officially, including in electronic form, no later than two academic semesters after being informed of the aforementioned decision.

Article 31. Evaluation of a dissertation by a reviewer

31.1. The reviewers, after reviewing the paper, write a review and also evaluate the paper with an appropriate score (30 points), which becomes known on the defence and is a constituent component of the unified 100-point evaluation of the research component. Reviews are sent to the Dissertation Board.

31.2 The reviewer is obliged to prepare a written review and fill in the appropriate form for the evaluation of the dissertation within 1 (one) month after the submission of the dissertation (appendices No. 9 and No. 9.1).

31.3. If the flaws identified by the reviewer are only of a technical nature and do not affect the content of the dissertation, the research results or the reviewer's assessment, the doctoral student may be given a period of time to correct them and submit the revised work, which should not exceed 1 (one) month. The reviewer determines the specific deadline, taking into account the volume of identified technical flaws. Correction of technical errors is confirmed by the relevant reviewer.

31.4. Taking into account the specific criteria (Appendix 9.1), the reviewer presents a conclusion on the dissertation, which must include one of the following decisions:

- a) unconditional admission to the positive assessment and defence of the thesis;
- b) a positive assessment of the work and a conditional admission to correction of minor defects;
- c) negative assessment of the work and refusal to allow for defence.

31.5. The reviewer's conclusion should end with an assessment - whether the paper deserves to be defended or not.

31.6. The reviewer's conclusion must be confirmed by his own signature.

31.7. If one reviewer evaluates the dissertation work positively, and the other reviewer evaluates it negatively, the issue of admission to the public defence of the work will be decided in accordance with paragraph 30.10 of this regulation. In the presence of a positive conclusion of the academic supervisor/co-supervisor, the decision on admission to public defence is made by the Dissertation Board of the school. The scores of both reviewers are used to calculate the arithmetic mean of the reviewers' ratings and the final final grade of the dissertation.

31.8. In case of negative evaluation of the dissertation work by both reviewers, the work will not be accepted for public defence. The doctoral student has the right, taking into account the relevant financial obligations, to rework the thesis based on the reviewers' recommendations and to resubmit it officially, including in electronic form, no later than two academic semesters after receiving the negative decision.

31.9. In the event that the reviewer is unable to present a conclusion due to objective circumstances (accident, illness, etc.), the dean, in consultation with the head of the doctoral programme, appoints a new reviewer.

31.10. The thesis is submitted to the doctoral (dissertation) council, together with the supervisor's conclusion, the reviewer's conclusions and other mandatory documentation. Within the next ten days, the Council makes a decision on the composition of the defence commission and appoints the date of the defence.

31.11. The chairman of the doctoral (dissertation) board must inform the doctoral student in writing of the board's decision regarding the admission to defence of the thesis, introduce the conclusion and also indicate the date of the defence.

31.12. The doctoral candidate has the right to read the reviewer's report. The graded assessment written by the reviewer becomes known to the doctoral candidate upon defence of the thesis.

31.13. In case of positive evaluation of the thesis and admission to the conditional protection of correction of minor technical deficiencies, the doctoral candidate must submit the revised dissertation officially, including in electronic form, no later than 1 (one) month after the presentation of the reviewer's conclusion. Bug fixes are confirmed by the appropriate reviewer.

31.14. The revised dissertation submitted again by the doctoral student will be submitted to the same reviewers, and if this is impossible due to objective circumstances (accident, illness, etc.), the dean, in consultation with the head of the doctoral programme, will appoint a new reviewer.

31.15. In case of a negative assessment of the revised dissertation submitted again, the dissertation will not be accepted for defence.

31.16. In case of refusal to admit to the defence, one copy of the rejected dissertation and the written conclusions of the reviewers will be transferred to the archives of the doctoral (dissertation) council of the school for storage.

31.17. The doctoral student has the right to withdraw his thesis from consideration at any stage on his own initiative. In the latter case, the thesis can be submitted again within 1 year from the date of withdrawal of the thesis.

Article 32. The procedure for appealing the negative conclusion of the thesis supervisor

32.1. The negative conclusion of the academic supervisor/co-supervisor must be written, substantiated, based on predetermined academic criteria and contain an indication of the essential flaws of the dissertation work. The conclusion is notified to the doctoral candidate officially, including in electronic form.

32.2. If the doctoral student does not agree with the negative conclusion of the academic supervisor/co-supervisor, he has the right to submit a reasoned complaint in the name of the university president within 5 (five) working days after the official notification of the conclusion. The appeal must state the specific grounds of appeal and, if any, must be accompanied by relevant evidence.

32.3. After receiving the complaint, its admissibility is checked by the president of the university or an authorized person designated by him. The complaint is admissible if it is submitted within the specified period and meets the requirements established by paragraph 32.2 of this article. A written and reasoned decision is made on declaring the complaint inadmissible.

32.4. Within 10 (ten) working days after receiving the admissible complaint, the president of the university, on the recommendation of the dean of the law school, appoints an independent specialist in the relevant field to evaluate the dissertation. An independent specialist must have an academic degree of Doctor of Laws or its equivalent and relevant scientific competence. He should not participate in the supervision of the dissertation work and should not have a conflict of interest with the doctoral student or his supervisor.

32.5. The independent specialist will be given the dissertation, the conclusion of the academic supervisor/co-supervisor and the complaint of the doctoral student. The independent specialist, within 10 (ten) working days after receiving the documentation, makes a written and substantiated conclusion about the feasibility of transferring the paper to the stage of further review.

32.6. If the independent specialist considers that the thesis meets the prerequisites for submission to the stage of further review, the complaint is considered satisfied and the thesis is submitted to the reviewers in the manner defined by this regulation. In such a case, the academic supervisor/co-supervisor can attend the session of the defence commission only with the right of deliberative vote and does not take part in the evaluation of the thesis.

32.7. If the doctoral student does not appeal the academic supervisor's/co-supervisor's negative conclusion within the period specified in this article, or an independent specialist also negatively assesses the transfer of the thesis to the post-review stage, the doctoral student will be assigned a final grade of "F" in the research component, and he/she will lose the right to resubmit the same dissertation.

Chapter VII. Dissertation thesis assessment and defence procedures

Article 33. Rules of formation and activity of the protection commission

33.1. The evaluation of the dissertation is done by a committee - by the defence commission. In order to evaluate and defend each thesis, the Dissertation Board of the school, on the recommendation of the Chairman of the Dissertation Board, approves the defence commission, including the chairman and secretary of the commission.

33.2. The protection commission must consist of at least 5 members. The defence commission should include representatives of the academic staff of the relevant field with the academic degree of doctor, whose qualifications and competence provide the opportunity to evaluate the work in depth and comprehensively and to evaluate the originality of the research and its results. At least two members of the Defence Commission must be representatives of local and/or foreign universities with appropriate qualifications and competence. Considering the peculiarities of the field, if necessary, the protection commission may include representative(s) of the governmental/non-governmental sector and the labor market.

33.3. The supervisor/co-supervisor of the doctoral student does not participate in the work of the defence commission

33.4 The Protection Commission shall conduct its activities in accordance with this provision.

33.5. The defence committee ensures the conduct of the dissertation defence process and the evaluation of the dissertation according to the procedures established by the current legislation and this standard.

33.6. The Secretary of the Protection Commission ensures the organizational activities of the Commission. The secretary of the defence committee prepares the protocol for the defence of the thesis, helps the chairman of the commission to solve organizational issues, directs the work of the commission, delivers the documentation produced by the dissertation commission to the Dissertation Board of the school.

Article 34. Actions to be taken before defending the thesis

34.1. The decision on the date of defence of the thesis is made by the chairman of the Dissertation Board of the School of Law.

34.2. Within 1 week after the approval of the composition of the commission, the secretary of the Dissertation Board ensures the transfer of copies of the thesis to the members of the dissertation commission.

34.3. The secretary of the Dissertation Board must inform the doctoral student about the decisions made by the chairman of the council. The date, time, and place of the Dissertation Commission meeting should be specified in the notification. At least 30 days must pass from the notice of protection to the date of protection (e-mail can be used to send the notification).

34.4. Based on the decisions made by the Dissertation Board, at least twenty days before the defence of the dissertation, the President of the Caucasus University issues an order on the appointment of the defence, which must state:

- A. Name of the thesis;
- b. its author;
- c. Dissertation commission composition;
- d. Reviewer's identity;
- e. Date, time and place of thesis defence.

34.5. The defence of the thesis, at the defence committee meeting, is public and open. Information about the defence of the thesis is published on the website of the university (in the Law School section) at least one week before the defence.

34.6. The session of the thesis committee is authorized if 3/4 or more of the members of the committee with the right to vote attend it. If one of the reviewers is absent from the defence for an honorable reason, the review must be read in its entirety during the defence.

34.7. The academic supervisor must be present at the defence. If he/she does not attend the commission session for an honorable reason, he/she sends the commission a corresponding report card and personal description of the doctoral student.

34.8 If the doctoral student failed to pass the defence of the thesis for a documented good reason, or the quorum of the dissertation committee was not met, or the defence did not take place due to other reasons independent of the doctoral student, the Dissertation Board will appoint an additional defence in the same semester.

34.9 Only one thesis can be defended at one session of the dissertation committee.

34.10. The progress of the dissertation commission session is reflected in the minutes signed by the chairman and secretary of the commission (Annex No. 10)

Article 35. Defence of the thesis

35.1. At the committee meeting, the chairman of the dissertation committee announces the name of the dissertation student and the topic of the dissertation, the names of experts and reviewers. The secretary of the commission informs the commission of the documents presented by the doctoral student, the procedure for the defence of the thesis and brief biographical information of the doctoral student.

35.2. The defence process includes the presentation of the thesis by the doctoral student, the scientific debate, the evaluation of the thesis and the announcement of the evaluation of the thesis. The regulation of the defence process is determined by the Dissertation Commission.

35.3. The presentation of the work by the doctoral student means the presentation of the topic by the doctoral student, the duration of which, as a rule, should not exceed 30 minutes. At the proposal of the chairman of the commission, the doctoral candidate will report to the commission the main provisions of his work and the obtained results, clearly form a scientific innovation.

35.4. During the presentation of the thesis, the candidate must use visible material: for example, slides, posters, video-cinema equipment, etc.

35.5. After the presentation of the paper, a scientific debate is held. The doctoral student will answer the questions asked by the attendees, after which the chairman of the commission will inform the commission of the results of the preliminary review of the thesis. The interview of the reviewers with the doctoral student begins, after which the floor is given to the academic supervisor (co-supervisors) of the topic to characterize the doctoral student. A discussion is held, in which both the members of the commission and the representatives of the community can participate.

35.6. After the end of the scientific debate, at the proposal of the chairman of the commission, the doctoral student is given a final speech, the duration of which should not exceed 10 minutes.

35.7. After the doctoral student's final speech, the voting members of the dissertation commission make a decision in a closed session to evaluate the dissertation.

Article 36. Closed session of the dissertation committee and evaluation of the dissertation

36.1. The Dissertation Commission makes its final decision confidentially, in a closed session.

36.2. At the closed session, the members of the dissertation committee, initially, individually evaluate the public presentation of the dissertation and the participation of the doctoral student in the scientific debate.

36.3. The evaluation criteria for the public presentation of the dissertation and the participation of the doctoral student in the scientific debate are determined by the Dissertation Board of the relevant school and this regulation.

36.4. In order to evaluate the doctoral student's participation in the public presentation of the thesis and the scientific debate, the secretary of the dissertation committee calculates the arithmetic average of points (the sum of received points divided by the number of committee members).

36.5. The protection commission evaluates the results of public protection with a maximum of 70 points, based on the criteria defined by this regulation and the relevant evaluation form. The unified final evaluation of the thesis is calculated by summing up the points of the reviewers' evaluation and the evaluation of the public defence, and amounts to a maximum of 100 points, in accordance with the rules defined in Article 37 of this regulation.

36.6. Immediately after the session, the chairman of the dissertation commission announces the reasoned final decision of the commission in public.

Article 37. Unified final evaluation of the dissertation

37.1. The reviewer evaluates the thesis with a maximum of 30 points in accordance with the established criteria (Annex No. 9; # 9.1)

37.2. The members of the defence commission evaluate the results of the public defence of the thesis individually and secretly, with a maximum of 70 points, in accordance with the criteria defined by this regulation and the relevant evaluation forms (appendices No. 9.2 and No. 9.3)

37.3 Based on the evaluation of the members of the dissertation commission, the final score is determined - the arithmetic average (the sum of the received points divided by the number of members of the commission. The evaluation form of the members of the dissertation commission is signed by each member of the commission.

37.4 The final score of the dissertation evaluation is calculated by the sum of the arithmetic average of the evaluation of the members of the dissertation commission (70 points) and the arithmetic average of the evaluation of the reviewers (30 points) (100 points). The evaluation form of the commission members is signed by each member of the commission.

37.5 In the thesis, the student receives a positive grade if he/she exceeds the minimum competence threshold - according to the numerical equivalent of the grade, 60% of the maximum grade point.

37.6 If the dissertation is evaluated with 41-59 points, the doctoral candidate has the right to rework the dissertation and resubmit it to the public defence no later than 1 (one) year after the official notification of the evaluation result, taking into account the preservation of student status and relevant financial obligations. Repeat defence of the thesis is allowed only once.

37.7 The doctoral candidate must apply to the School's Dissertation Board for revision and re-defence of the thesis, officially, including in electronic form, no later than 1 (one) month after the presentation.

37.8. If the dissertation is evaluated with 40 points or less, the doctoral student loses the right to resubmit the same dissertation. The final evaluation of the doctoral student is formed by points and verbally, in accordance with the evaluation system defined in this article.

37.9. Five positive and two negative evaluations are used to evaluate the thesis. The minimum threshold for a positive evaluation of the dissertation is 60 points.

37.10. The positive evaluation of the thesis (P — pass) is determined by the following system:

- a) summa cum laude — excellent paper — 91-100 points;
- b) very good (magna cum laude) — a result that exceeds the requirements in every respect — 81-90 points;
- c) good (cum laude) — a result that exceeds the requirements — 71-80 points;
- d) average (bene) — the result that meets the requirements in every way — 61-70 points;
- e) Satisfactory (rite) — the result, which despite the shortcomings, still meets the requirements — 60 points.

37.11. The negative evaluation of the thesis (F — failed) is determined by the following system:

- a) Insufficienter — a result that fails to meet the requirements due to significant deficiencies — 41-59 points. The doctoral student has the right to rework the dissertation and submit it once again for public defence in the manner and within the time limit specified by clauses 37.6-37.7 of this article;
- b) completely unsatisfactory (sub omni canone) — a result that does not meet the requirements at all — 40 points and less. The doctoral student loses the right to resubmit the same dissertation.

37.12 The chairman of the defence commission publicly announces the unified final evaluation of the thesis immediately after the session. The doctoral student has the right to get acquainted with the evaluations of the members of the defence commission and reviewers.

37.13. The secretary of the commission draws up a protocol for the defence of the thesis, its course and its final results, which is signed by all members of the commission.

37.14. The thesis is published on the university's website within 30 (thirty) calendar days after its successful defence. Paper and electronic (PDF) versions of the paper will be delivered to the University Library. A diploma certifying an academic degree is not issued until the dissertation is published.

Article 38. Appealing the evaluation and defence procedure of the thesis

38.1. The doctoral candidate has the right to appeal the violation of the procedure defined by this regulation or the issue related to the application of the evaluation criteria, the justification of the evaluation or the calculation of the unified final evaluation in the process of evaluation and defence of the dissertation within 5 (five) calendar days after the notification of the relevant evaluation or decision officially, including in electronic form. A substantiated complaint will be submitted to the university president.

38.2. The academic content of the dissertation, the professional or academic judgment of the reviewers and the dissertation committee are not subject to appeal. The subject of appeal can be only:

- a) Violation of the procedure defined by this regulation in the process of reviewing, evaluating or defending the thesis;
- b) non-use, incorrect or inconsistent use of predetermined evaluation criteria;
- c) incorrect calculation of the unified final assessment based on the points assigned by reviewers and/or members of the dissertation committee;
- d) improper or insufficient justification of assessment;
- e) creation of unequal or unfair conditions for the doctoral student;
- f) conflict of interest or violation of the requirement of impartiality;
- g) other essential procedural circumstance that influenced or might influence the outcome of the evaluation or defence of the thesis.

38.3. The appeal must specify the appealed assessment or procedural decision, the specific grounds for the appeal, the relevant factual circumstances, and the request of the doctoral student. The complaint, if any, must be accompanied by relevant evidence.

38.4. After receiving the complaint, its admissibility is checked by the president of the university or an authorized person designated by him. A complaint is admissible if:

- a) submitted within the period specified by clause 38.1 of this article;
- b) meets the requirements established by paragraph 38.3 of this article;
- c) refers to the issue defined by clause 38.2 of this article.

A complaint submitted in violation of the deadline may be accepted if the doctoral candidate substantiates the missed deadline with a valid reason.

38.5. A written and substantiated decision is made on declaring the complaint inadmissible, which is notified to the doctoral student, including in electronic form, within 3 (three) working days after the decision is made.

38.6. An admissible complaint is considered by the appeal commission consisting of at least 3 (three) members, whose composition is approved by the president of the university upon the submission of the dean of the law school.

The members of the appeal commission must have a doctorate in law or equivalent academic degree and relevant scientific competence. At least one member of the commission must be a representative of another higher educational or scientific-research institution, who does not hold an academic or administrative position in the Caucasus University.

The appeals commission elects the chairman and the secretary from among its members.

38.7. A member of the appeal commission cannot be a person who participated:

- a) in the supervision or co-supervision of the appealed thesis;
- b) in reviewing the dissertation work;
- c) in the public defence or evaluation of the thesis;
- d) in making the appealed procedural decision.

The member of the appeal committee must not have a conflict of interest with the doctoral student, his/her supervisor/co-supervisor, reviewer or member of the dissertation committee. In case of such circumstances, the member is obliged to apply for self-exclusion.

The doctoral student is entitled to request the dismissal of the member of the appeal commission, based on the relevant circumstances. The issue of expulsion is decided by the president of the university or the person authorized by him.

38.8. The Appeals Committee does not evaluate the academic content of the thesis, does not re-review or score the thesis, and does not replace the professional and academic judgment of the reviewers and the thesis committee with its own judgment.

The appeal commission checks:

- a) compliance of the review, assessment and protection process with this provision;
- b) the correctness and consistency of the use of predetermined assessment criteria;
- c) the correctness of the calculation of the unified final assessment;
- d) properly justifying the assessment;

- e) protection of procedural equality and justice;
- f) existence of conflict of interest or other circumstances hindering impartiality.

38.9. The Appeals Commission is authorized to:

- a) to request the necessary documents for the review of the complaint, including the thesis, reviews, evaluation forms, defence protocol, audio or video recording of the defence, if any, and other relevant material;
- b) to receive written explanations from the doctoral candidate, supervisor/co-supervisor, reviewers, members of the dissertation commission and other relevant persons;
- c) to invite the doctoral candidate and other relevant persons to the appeal commission session and give them the opportunity to present their opinions;
- d) for the proper consideration of the case, to carry out other actions that do not contradict the current legislation and this provision.

38.10. The appeals commission will consider the appeal within 10 (ten) working days from the notification of its admissibility. In case of the complexity of the case or the need to obtain additional materials, the mentioned term can be extended by a reasoned decision of the university president for no more than 10 (ten) working days, about which the doctoral candidate will be notified, including in electronic form.

38.11. The Appeals Commission is authorized to make one of the following decisions:

- a) to leave the complaint unconsidered, if the reason for its inadmissibility was revealed during the review process;
- b) not to satisfy the complaint;
- c) fully or partially satisfy the complaint and cancel the appealed assessment or procedural decision;
- d) in case of essential procedural violation detected during the reviewing process, cancel the appealed assessment and hand over the thesis to a new reviewer or new reviewers for re-reviewing;
- e) in the case of such an essential procedural violation revealed during the public defence process, which influenced or may have influenced the result of the defence and which cannot be corrected by other means, cancel the appealed assessment and determine the conduct of a repeated public defence before the dissertation commission of a new composition;
- f) to return the issue to the relevant authorized body or person for reconsideration and decision-making, with mandatory instructions.

38.12. The Appellate Commission directly changes the unified final assessment only in case of correcting an obvious technical or arithmetical error.

In other cases, the assessment can be changed only as a result of re-review, repeated public defence or re-examination of the issue specified in this article.

The satisfaction of the complaint by itself does not lead to repeated public protection. Repeated public protection is prescribed only in the case defined by subsection "e" of clause 38.11 of this article.

38.13. The decision of the appeal commission must be written and substantiated. The decision should indicate:

- a) the subject of the complaint and the request of the doctoral student;
- b) established factual circumstances;
- c) considered evidence and opinions;
- d) legal and factual bases of the decision;
- e) The decision made and the manner of its execution.

38.14. The decision of the appeal commission is notified to the doctoral candidate, including in electronic form, within 3 (three) working days after its receipt.

The decision of the appeal commission is final and is not subject to further appeal within the internal legal mechanisms of the university.

38.15. Filing an appeal does not suspend the action of the appealed assessment or decision, unless the university president, taking into account the interests of the doctoral student, the possible consequences and the circumstances specified in the appeal, makes a decision to temporarily suspend its action.

Article 39. Awarding of the academic degree of doctor

39.1. The documentation of the defence of the thesis will be submitted to the Dissertation Board of the school within 20 (twenty) working days after the defence of the thesis. The secretary of the Dissertation Board of the school is obliged to hand over the documentation to the members of the council before making a decision on the awarding of the academic degree of Doctor.

39.2. The Dissertation Board of the school will review the documentation of the defence of the dissertation no later than 30 (thirty) working days after determining the unified final assessment of the dissertation.

39.3. The Dissertation Board of the school grants the doctoral student the academic degree of doctor, if:

- a) the doctoral student has fulfilled the requirements stipulated by the doctoral educational program;
- b) The thesis was evaluated positively and the doctoral candidate received at least 60 points;
- c) the procedures for submission, review, admission to defence and public defence of the dissertation defined by this regulation are followed;
- d) complete documentation necessary for awarding the degree is presented;
- e) The deadline for appealing the evaluation and protection results has passed and the appeal has not been submitted or the review of the appeal has been completed.

39.4. When considering the issue of awarding the academic degree of doctor, the Dissertation Board of the school checks only:

- a) fulfillment of the requirements of the doctoral educational program by the doctoral candidate;
- b) compliance with the procedures for submission, review, admission to defence and public defence of the thesis;
- c) completeness and proper execution of protection documentation;
- d) To fulfill the formal prerequisites defined by the legislation, doctoral educational program and this regulation for awarding the degree.

39.5. The Dissertation Board of the School does not evaluate the academic content of the thesis, does not re-review or score the thesis, and is not authorized to change or revise the evaluation of the reviewers and the defence committee in its own academic judgment.

39.6. The decision to award the academic degree of Doctor is made by open voting. The board is authorized to make a decision if more than half of the board members are present at the meeting. The decision is considered adopted if it is supported by more than half of the members present. The Secretary of the Protection Commission attends the meeting of the Council.

39.7. In case of fulfillment of the prerequisites specified in paragraph 39.3 of this article, the Dissertation Board of the school makes a decision on awarding the academic degree of doctor to the doctoral student. Voting by a member of the Council shall be based only on the results of the examination of the issues specified in Clause 39.4 of this Article.

39.8. If a correctable documentary or procedural error is identified, the School's Dissertation Board shall suspend consideration of the matter, set a reasonable time limit for correcting the error, and re-examine the matter after the error has been corrected.

39.9. The Dissertation Board of the school refuses to award the academic degree of Doctor only if:

- a) the doctoral candidate has not fulfilled the mandatory requirements of the doctoral educational program;
- b) the thesis did not receive a positive evaluation defined by this regulation;
- c) an essential and irremediable procedural violation was detected;
- d) there is no document necessary for awarding the degree or submission of incorrect or falsified data has been confirmed;
- e) other mandatory prerequisites for awarding the degree determined by the legislation, the doctoral educational program or this regulation have not been fulfilled.

39.10. The decision to refuse to grant the academic degree of doctor must be written and justified. The decision shall indicate the specific factual and legal basis for the refusal, the relevant evidence and the procedure for appealing the decision.

39.11. The doctoral candidate has the right to appeal the decision to refuse the award of the academic degree of doctor to the president of the university within 5 (five) working days from the date of notification, including in electronic form.

39.12. The complaint will be considered by a commission consisting of at least 3 (three) members created by the president of the university. A member of the commission cannot be a person who participated in making the appealed decision or who has a conflict of interest with the doctoral student, his supervisor or a person participating in the evaluation process.

39.13. The appeal review committee does not evaluate the academic content of the thesis and does not change the academic evaluation of the reviewers and the defence committee. The commission checks the compliance of the appealed decision with the legislation, the doctoral educational programme and this regulation and considers the appeal within 10 (ten) working days.

39.14. The complaint review commission is authorized to:

- a) not to satisfy the complaint;
- b) fully or partially satisfy the complaint, annul the appealed decision and return the matter to the Dissertation Board of the school for reconsideration;
- c) in case of detection of a rectifiable technical, documentary or procedural defect, determine the procedure for its correction and reconsideration of the issue.

39.15. The decision to grant or refuse to grant the academic degree of doctor is formed by the minutes of the meeting of the Dissertation Board of the school.

39.16. Minutes of the meeting of the Dissertation Board of the School and documentation of the defence of the dissertation are kept at the school for 6 (six) years after the awarding of the academic degree of Doctor, after which they are transferred to the University Archives.

Article 40. Diploma confirming the academic degree of doctor

40.1. The academic degree of doctorate is confirmed by the diploma signed by the president of the university and the dean of the school and certified by the seal of the university, with a standard attachment.

40.2. Before the awarding of the diploma, the doctorate candidate may be issued a notice of awarding the academic degree.

Article 41. Obligation to publish the thesis

The school is obliged, after awarding the academic degree of doctor, within one month to hand over one printed copy of the thesis and its electronic version to the university library, the National Library of the Parliament of Georgia, as well as the National Scientific Library.

Chapter IX. Final Provisions

Article 42. Invalidity of the academic degree of doctor

42.1. According to the decision of the doctoral (dissertation) council of the school, the doctor will be deprived of the academic degree of doctor in the case of submission of incorrect data, falsification of data, plagiarism and violation of other norms of academic honesty during the dissertation process.

42.2. If plagiarism or falsification of the thesis documentation is detected at any time after the defence of the thesis, the Dissertation Board is obliged to invalidate the awarded academic degree and revoke the corresponding diploma, on which the relevant order of the university president will be issued.

42.3. The rules for checking the thesis for plagiarism are regulated by the "rules for checking students' work in the plagiarism detection and prevention program (Turnitin)".

Article 43. Final Provisions

43.1 The requirements of this provision apply to all doctoral students of the Law School of the Caucasus University.

43.2 The Council of the Law School has the right to propose changes and additions to this provision. In case of a positive decision, the Dean of the School of Law will submit the decision made by the School Council to the President of the Caucasus University for approval.

43.3 This provision shall enter into force upon the issuance of the relevant order of the President of the Caucasus University.

Application Form for Doctoral Candidacy – School of Law

To the president of Caucasus University	
Applicant: -----	

Name	Surname
Identification Number	
Factual Address: -----	

Email:-----	Tel: -----

Required documents (in accordance with Article 11 of the Regulations): ☐ Copy of an identity document or passport; where a document is in a foreign language, a Georgian translation certified in accordance with applicable legislation; ☐ Duly certified copies of the diploma and diploma supplement confirming the academic qualification specified in Article 9 of the Regulations; ☐ If the diploma has not yet been issued — a certificate confirming the award of the academic degree and an official academic record confirming full completion of the programme and accumulation of at least 120 ECTS credits; ☐ Where the Master’s Programme in Law was implemented in two parts — a document confirming full completion of both parts, accumulation of at least 120 ECTS credits, successful defence of the master’s thesis, and award of the academic degree of Master of Research in Law; ☐ In the transitional case provided for by Article 9.3 — a Master of Laws diploma and documents confirming enrolment in, before 1 September 2026, and full completion of a Master’s Programme in Law comprising at least 120 ECTS credits; ☐ In the case of education received abroad — a recognition document issued by the LEPL National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement and, where applicable, a document confirming equivalence of the qualification to a master’s degree; ☐ Evidence of English language proficiency at not less than B2 level: IELTS $\geq$ 6.0, TOEFL $\geq$ 78, another internationally recognised B2 certificate, a valid certificate issued by the National Assessment and Examinations Center, or evidence of completion of an English-medium programme within the preceding two years; in the absence of such evidence — the University’s internal examination; ☐ For a candidate whose native language is not Georgian — a certificate confirming Georgian language proficiency at not less than B2 level or the result of the University’s internal examination; ☐ Curriculum Vitae (CV); ☐ Recommendations from two specialists holding a doctoral degree in law in the field selected by the candidate; ☐ Motivation letter;

- ☐ Evidence of at least one prior scientific paper/publication, participation in a scientific-research project or scientific event, or at least two years of professional experience in the relevant field;
- ☐ Doctoral research project — research proposal (Annex No. 2);
- ☐ Photograph in the form prescribed by the University's records-management rules;
- ☐ Copy of a military registration document, where required by the legislation of Georgia;
- ☐ In the case of mobility — a copy of the legal act on enrolment, an official academic record, syllabi of completed learning/research components or other official documents confirming their content, and other required documentation.

The candidate may additionally submit documents evidencing teaching, professional or scientific experience or any other documents relevant to assessing the candidate's experience and capabilities. The University may request the original of a document or additional information.

At Caucasus University, the application you submit titled "**Regarding Personal Data Protection**" may include personal data, including data of a special category, in accordance with the **Law of Georgia on Personal Data Protection**. Please be informed that your personal data will be processed by the University for the purpose of deciding on the establishment of a contractual relationship with you. In this process, some of your data may be disclosed or transferred to third parties, provided that there is a relevant legal basis for doing so.

If you agree with the above, please circle "**I agree**" and confirm with your signature.

I agree Signature:

By completing this application form, I confirm the accuracy of the information provided. Please consider my application for admission to the **Doctoral Program in Law**.

Full Name (in block letters):

.....

Signature:

.....

Date:

.....

Attachments:

.....

Doctoral Research Project Proposal Form

Annex No. 2

Research Proposal Form

1. Motivation for Continuing Studies in the Program

(Describe your area of research interest and your motivation for continuing studies in the program.)

Maximum word count: 150

2. Research Topic / Problem

(Define your research topic or problem and justify its relevance.)

Maximum word count: 150

3. Literature Review

(Provide a brief review of the literature that outlines the existing knowledge on the topic/problem and the need for generating new knowledge.)

Maximum word count: 500

4. Research Objective, Research Question(s) and/or Hypothesis

(Define the objective of your research, the research question(s), and the hypothesis, if applicable.)

Maximum word count: 150

5. Research Methodology

(Describe the research methodology that will be used to achieve the research objective, address the research question(s), and confirm or reject the hypothesis.)

Maximum word count: 300

6. Tentative Structure of the Dissertation

(Provide an outline of the anticipated structure of the dissertation.)

7. Expected Research Outcomes

(Define the anticipated scientific contribution of the research and/or the potential practical implications of the research results.)

Maximum word count: 300

Applicant's Full Name:

.....

Signature:

.....

Date:

.....

Doctoral Research Proposal Evaluation Form

Annex No. 3

Evaluator (Name, Surname – Member of the Subject-Specific Committee):

.....

Applicant's Full Name:

.....

Title of the Doctoral Research Proposal:

.....

The applicant's doctoral research proposal is evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. **Motivation for Continuing the Program** – clarity in articulating the applicant's research interests and motivation for pursuing the doctoral program;
2. **Research Topic / Problem** – clarity and precision in defining the research topic or problem; strength, consistency, and adequacy of the justification of its novelty, innovativeness, and relevance;
3. **Literature Review** – coherence of the review; appropriate selection of sources; how well the review reflects existing knowledge on the topic and the necessity of generating new knowledge;
4. **Research Objective, Research Question(s) and/or Hypothesis** – clarity and correctness in formulating the objective; clarity and appropriateness of the research question(s) and/or hypothesis (if applicable);
5. **Research Methodology** – suitability and clarity of the chosen methodology; whether the methodology is described fully and clearly;
6. **Tentative Structure of the Dissertation** – logical coherence and relevance of the proposed structure;
7. **Expected Research Outcomes** – clarity in articulating the expected scientific value of the research and/or its potential practical implications;
8. **Language and Style of the Proposal** – coherence of argumentation and reasoning; adherence to academic language and style conventions.

Each criterion is assessed on a **five-point rating scale**, except for **Research Objective, Research Question(s), and/or Hypothesis**, which is evaluated on a **ten-point scale**.

The five-point scale ranges from the highest (5 points – *Excellent*) to the lowest (0 points – *Unacceptable*).

The total average score of the proposal is calculated as the **arithmetic mean** of the scores assigned to each criterion.

1. **Maximum overall rating:** 5.00
2. **Minimum passing threshold:** 3.00

Doctoral Research Proposal Evaluation Criteria	40						
Motivation for Continuing the Program	5						
Research Topic / Problem	5						
Literature Review	5						
Research Objective, Research Question(s), and/or Hypothesis	10						
Tentative Structure of the Dissertation	5						
Expected Research Outcomes	5						
Language and Style of the Proposal	5						

Doctoral Research Proposal Evaluation Criteria – Detailed Descriptors

1. **Motivation for Continuing the Program:**
How clearly are the applicant's research interests and motivation for pursuing the program articulated?
2. **Research Topic / Problem:**
How clearly is the research topic or problem defined?
How well are its novelty, innovativeness, and relevance justified—accurately, coherently, and sufficiently?
3. **Literature Review:**
How coherent is the literature review?
Are the sources appropriately selected, and does the review sufficiently reflect the current state of knowledge on the research topic, including the need to generate new knowledge?
4. **Research Objective, Research Question(s), and/or Hypothesis:**
How clearly and accurately is the research objective formulated?
How clearly and logically are the research question(s) and/or hypothesis articulated?
5. **Research Methodology:**
How appropriate is the chosen methodology?
Is the methodology described in a complete and clear manner?
6. **Tentative Structure of the Dissertation:**
How logically consistent and well-organized is the proposed structure of the dissertation?
7. **Expected Research Outcomes:**
How clearly are the expected outcomes of the research formulated?
What is the scientific value and/or potential practical significance of the results?
8. **Language and Style of the Proposal:**
How coherent is the argumentation and reasoning?
To what extent does the proposal adhere to the standards of academic language and style?



Candidate Evaluation Form

Annex No. 4

First and last name of the committee member						Academic Degree		
		Interview Maximum Points 100					Probable decision	
	Applicant	Academic performance in the Master's program (10 Points)	Research activity or work experience (30 Points)	Evaluation of the research proposal (40 Points)	Presentability (20 Points)	Total Points	yes	No
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								

Doctoral Thematic Seminar Evaluation Form

Scientific Supervisor

Thesis Title

Doctoral Student's Last Name, First Name

Relevance of the selected topic and problem	Maximum 5 Points	
Structure of the Thesis	Maximum 5 Points	
Research Methodology and Selected Scientific Literature	Maximum 5 Points	
Final Research Results	Maximum 10 Points	
Legally and Ethically Appropriate Use of Information, Academic Writing Culture	Maximum 5 Points	

Evaluator's Signature: -----

Date: -----

Note:

1. This form, completed and signed, must be submitted by the doctoral student to the school administration **prior to the scheduled date of the seminar defense.**



Annex No. 5.2

Doctoral Thematic Seminar Evaluation Form

----- Reviewer

----- Title

Relevance of the Selected Topic and Problem	Maximum 5 Points	
Structure of the Thesis, Legally Appropriate Use of Information, Academic Writing Culture	Maximum 5 Points	
Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature	Maximum 10 Points	
Final Research Results	Maximum 10 Points	

Evaluator's Signature: -----

Date: -----

Note:

1. This form, completed and signed, must be submitted by the doctoral student to the school administration **before the determination of the seminar defense date.**

Annex No. 5.3

Evaluation Form of the Doctoral Thematic Seminar by a Committee Member

Committee Member's Last Name, First Name

Title

Doctoral Student's Last Name, First Name

Relevance of the Selected Topic and Problem	Maximum Points	5	
Structure of the Thesis	Maximum Points	5	
Research Methodology and Selected Scientific Literature	Maximum Points	5	
Final Research Results	Maximum Points	10	
Legally and Ethically Appropriate Use of Information, Academic Writing Culture	Maximum Points	5	
Presentation Skills	Maximum Points	5	
Accuracy and Depth of Responses to the Reviewer's Comments and Recommendations, and to the Questions Raised by the Committee	Maximum Points	5	

Evaluator's Signature: -----

Date: -----

Scoring Breakdown of Evaluation Criteria for the Thematic Seminar Paper

Evaluation Criteria by the Thematic Seminar Supervisor:

Maximum Score: 30 Points

1. Relevance of the Chosen Topic and Problem – 5 Points	
10-9 Points	Relevance of the Chosen Topic and Problem – 5 Points
8-7 Points	The relevance of the research topic is logically explained and well-justified.
6-5 Points	The relevance of the research topic is logically explained but lacks clarity and/or sufficient justification.
4-3 Points	The relevance of the research topic is explained but not fully justified.
2-1 Points	The relevance of the research topic is formulated superficially and without adequate argumentation.
0 Points	The relevance of the research topic is formulated unprofessionally and without any justification.
The paper structure - 5 Points	
10-9 Points	Structure of the Paper
8-7 Points	The structure of the paper fully corresponds to the title of the topic.
6-5 Points	The structure of the paper corresponds to the title of the topic but requires refinement.
4-3 Points	The structure of the paper partially corresponds to the title of the topic.
2-1 Points	The structure of the paper is insufficiently developed and lacks thorough analysis.
0 Points	The structure of the paper lacks coherence and quality.
3. Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scholarly Literature – Maximum: 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The research methods are selected comprehensively, competently, and thoroughly. The chosen methodology will allow the student to successfully address the main research problem, and the selected material and scholarly literature fully align with the research requirements.
8-7 Points	The research methods are selected competently. The chosen methodology will enable the student to address the main research problem, and the selected material and scholarly literature are relevant to the research but require further supplementation.
6-5 Points	The research methods are only partially appropriate. The selected methodology will not fully allow the student to address the main research problem, and the selected material and scholarly literature only partially meet the research requirements.
4-3 Points	The selected methodology is outdated and unsuitable for the topic. The student will not be able to address the main research problem, and the selected material and scholarly literature are insufficiently developed and analyzed.
2-1 Points	The research methods are selected unprofessionally, and the selected material and scholarly literature are random, lacking relevance and academic quality.

0 Points	No research methods are selected, and the selected material and scholarly literature do not correspond to the research requirements at all.
4. Final Research Outcomes – Maximum: 10 Points	
10-9 Points	The doctoral candidate has logically justified the expected final research outcomes. The results are likely to have high theoretical and practical value.
8-7 Points	The doctoral candidate has logically justified the expected final research outcomes. The results are likely to have academic and practical significance.
6-5 Points	The doctoral candidate has logically justified the expected final research outcomes. The results are likely to have educational significance.
4-3 Points	The doctoral candidate has provided limited logical justification for the expected outcomes. The results require further clarification.
2-1 Points	The doctoral candidate has not logically justified the expected outcomes. The likelihood of achieving meaningful results is questionable.
0 Points	The doctoral candidate demonstrates no clear understanding of the expected outcomes. Achieving any valuable results appears impossible.
5. Legal and Ethical Use of Information, Academic Writing Standards – Maximum: 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The information used in the text is within a legal framework, and excerpts and quotations from other authors' works are properly and ethically cited. The linguistic structure of the paper is well-organized, and the ideas are logically coherent. The paper is free from errors and appropriately uses subject-specific terminology.
	Excerpts and quotations from other authors' works are properly and ethically cited. The paper is written without grammatical or stylistic errors, is coherent, and the ideas are presented logically. Terminology is used appropriately.
8-7 Points	A small portion of the information lacks proper citation, but quotation practices are ethically appropriate. The paper contains minor errors, is coherent, and ideas are logically presented. Terminology is used correctly.
6-5 Points	A significant portion of the information lacks clear sources, and some quotations are improperly cited. Grammatical errors in the text hinder readability, the structure is weak, and terminology usage contains errors.
4-3 Points	The sources of the information are questionable, and quotations are presented without proper citation. The text contains numerous terminological and logical errors, making its content difficult to understand.
2-1 Points	The information used is of unclear and questionable origin, and quotations are presented inappropriately and without sources. The text is vague, the terminology is incorrect, and the overall content is virtually incomprehensible.
0 Points	The information used in the text is within a legal framework, and excerpts and quotations from other authors' works are properly and ethically cited. The linguistic structure of the paper is well-organized, and the ideas are logically coherent. The paper is free from errors and appropriately uses subject-specific terminology.

Reviewer Evaluation Criteria:

30 Points

1. Relevance of the Selected Topic and Research Problem – 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is logically explained and well-justified.
8-7 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is logically explained but lacks clarity or full justification.

6-5 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is explained, but the justification is incomplete.
4-3 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is presented superficially and without adequate argumentation.
2-1 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is formulated unprofessionally and without any justification.
0 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is not addressed at all.
2. Structure of the Thesis, Legal Use of Information, and Academic Writing Standards – 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The structure of the thesis fully corresponds to the topic. The information used in the text is within the legal framework, and excerpts and citations from other works are correctly referenced. The thesis is written without errors and is coherent.
8-7 Points	The structure of the thesis corresponds to the topic but requires refinement. Excerpts and citations from other works are properly and ethically referenced. The thesis is written without errors, and appropriate terminology is used.
6-5 Points	The structure of the thesis partially corresponds to the topic. A small portion of the information lacks citation, but the citations provided are ethically sound. The thesis is written with minor errors, and terminology is appropriately used.
4-3 Points	The structure of the thesis is insufficiently developed and analyzed. A significant portion of sources is not cited, and some citations are referenced unprofessionally. Grammatical errors in the text impede readability, and the structure lacks clarity.
2-1 Points	The structure of the thesis lacks coherence and quality. Citations are presented without sources; the text contains numerous terminological and logical errors, making comprehension difficult.
0 Points	The structure of the thesis does not meet research standards at all. The information used is of dubious origin, citations are unsourced, terminology is incorrect, and the overall content is practically unintelligible.
3. Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature – Maximum 10 Points	
10-9 Points	The research methods have been selected in a comprehensive, qualified, and thorough manner. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will be able to successfully address the main research problem, and the selected materials and scientific literature fully meet the research requirements.
8-7 Points	The research methods have been selected in a qualified manner. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will be able to address the main research problem; however, the selected materials and scientific literature, while relevant, require further supplementation.
6-5 Points	The research methods have been selected incompletely. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will not be able to fully address the main research problem, and the selected materials and scientific literature only partially meet the research requirements.
4-3 Points	The selected methodology is outdated and irrelevant to the topic. The master's student will not be able to address the main research problem, and the selected materials and scientific literature are not adequately reviewed or analyzed.
2-1 Points	The research methods have been selected unprofessionally. The selected materials and scientific literature are random, lacking both relevance and quality.
0 Points	No research methods have been selected at all, and the chosen materials and scientific literature do not meet the research requirements in any way.

4. Expected Research Results – Maximum: 10 Points	
10-9 Points	The doctoral candidate has justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The results are likely to have significant theoretical and practical implications.
8-7 Points	The doctoral candidate has justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The results are likely to have educational and practical applications.
6-5 Points	The doctoral candidate has justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The results are likely to have educational relevance.
4-3 Points	The doctoral candidate has only partially justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. Further clarification is required to substantiate the anticipated outcomes.
2-1 Points	The doctoral candidate has not sufficiently justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The achievement of meaningful outcomes is doubtful.
0 Points	The doctoral candidate demonstrates no clear understanding of the expected research outcomes. The possibility of obtaining meaningful results is unlikely.

Thematic Seminar Paper Evaluation Criteria by the Defense Committee Members:**40 Points**

1. Relevance of the Chosen Topic and Problem – 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The relevance of the research topic is logically explained and well-justified.
8-7 Points	The relevance of the research topic is logically explained, but lacks clarity and/or justification.
6-5 Points	The relevance of the research topic is explained, but it is not fully justified.
4-3 Points	The relevance of the research topic is formulated superficially and without justification.
2-1 Points	The relevance of the research topic is formulated unprofessionally, without any justification.
0 Points	The relevance of the research topic is not formulated.
1. The structure of the paper - 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The structure of the paper fully corresponds to the topic title.
8-7 Points	The structure of the paper corresponds to the topic title but requires clarification.
6-5 Points	The structure of the paper partially corresponds to the topic title.
4-3 Points	The structure of the paper is not sufficiently developed or analyzed.
2-1 Points	The structure of the paper lacks coherence and quality.
0 Points	The structure of the paper does not correspond to the research requirements at all.
3. Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature – Maximum: 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The research methods are selected comprehensively, competently, and thoroughly. The chosen methodology enables the master's student to successfully address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature fully correspond to the research requirements.
8-7 Points	The research methods are selected competently. The chosen methodology enables the master's student to address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature correspond to the research requirements but require supplementation.
6-5 Points	The research methods are partially selected. The chosen methodology does not fully enable the master's student to address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature only partially meet the research requirements.

4-3 Points	The selected methodology is outdated and irrelevant to the topic. The master's student cannot address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature are not sufficiently processed and analyzed.
2-1 Points	The research methods are selected unprofessionally. The selected material and scientific literature are random, lacking relevance and quality.
0 Points	No research methods are selected, and the selected material and scientific literature do not correspond to the research requirements at all.
4.Final Research Results – Maximum: 10 Points	
10-9 Points	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to achieve results of high theoretical and applied significance.
8-7 Points	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to achieve results with educational and practical significance.
6-5 Points	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to achieve results with educational significance.
4-3 Points	The doctoral student has provided limited justification for the final research results through logical reasoning. Achieving the results requires further clarification.
2-1 Points	The doctoral student has not justified the final research results through logical reasoning. The achievement of the results is doubtful.
0 Points	The doctoral student has no clear view regarding the final research results. It is not possible to achieve any meaningful outcomes.
5. Legal and Ethical Use of Information, Academic Writing Culture – Maximum: 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The information used in the text is within a legal framework, and excerpts and citations from other works are properly referenced; the linguistic structure of the paper is coherent, and the logical flow is consistent. The paper is written without errors and is well-structured. Appropriate terminology is used correctly.
	Excerpts and citations from other works are properly referenced; the paper is written without grammatical or stylistic errors, is coherent, and ideas are presented consistently. Relevant terminology is used appropriately.
8-7 Points	A small portion of the information lacks citation, though the citations are ethically correct; the paper is written with minor errors, is coherent, and ideas are consistently presented. Relevant terminology is used appropriately.
6-5 Points	A considerable portion of the information lacks citation; some citations are referenced inadequately. Grammatical errors hinder readability, the text lacks structural coherence, and there are terminological mistakes.
4-3 Points	The information is questionable, and citations are presented without sources; the text contains numerous terminological and logical errors, making it difficult to understand.
2-1 Points	The information used is of unclear and questionable origin, and citations are included inappropriately and without sources; the text is vaguely written, the terminology is incorrect, and the content is virtually incomprehensible.
0 Points	The information used in the text is within a legal framework, and excerpts and citations from other works are properly referenced; the linguistic structure of the paper is coherent, and the logical flow is consistent. The paper is written without errors and is well-structured. Appropriate terminology is used correctly.
6. Presentation Skills - Maximum 5 Points	

5 Points	The content and format of the presentation are complete, and audience engagement is high. The topic is clearly stated and thoroughly conveyed, a deep analysis is conducted, and well-argued conclusions are presented. The visual design of the project is excellent, and the doctoral candidate fully engages with the audience and demonstrates in-depth knowledge when responding to all questions.
4 Points	The content and format are complete, and audience engagement during the presentation is high. The topic is clearly stated and thoroughly conveyed, deep analysis is conducted, and well-argued conclusions are made. The visual design of the project is excellent, and the doctoral candidate engages with the audience but does not demonstrate in-depth knowledge in response to all questions.
3 Points	The content is complete, but the format is insufficient. Audience engagement during the presentation is low. The topic is clearly stated but not thoroughly conveyed. The doctoral candidate struggles to engage with the audience and fails to demonstrate deep knowledge in response to most questions.
2 Points	Both the content and format are incomplete, and audience engagement during the presentation is low. The topic is clearly stated but not fully conveyed. The visual design is mediocre. The doctoral candidate struggles to engage with the audience and shows limited knowledge.
1 Points	Both the content and format are insufficient. Only a few points are conveyed. The candidate fails to present the material.
0 Points	The presentation is ineffective, and the candidate speaks about topics unrelated to the subject.
7. Accuracy and depth of responses to the reviewer's comments and recommendations, as well as to questions posed by the committee – Maximum: 5 Points	
5 Points	The student responds convincingly and with well-founded arguments to the committee's questions and demonstrates a deep understanding of the reviewer's comments and recommendations.
4 Points	The student responds convincingly to the committee's questions, although some answers lack sufficient argumentation. The student demonstrates an understanding of the reviewer's comments and recommendations.
3 Points	The student answers the committee's questions; however, the responses lack persuasiveness and argumentation. Not all answers to the reviewer's comments and recommendations are well-understood.
2 Points	The student's answers to the committee's questions are unconvincing and lack argumentation. The student has not understood the reviewer's comments and recommendations and fails to respond to them persuasively.
1 Points	The student is unable to provide well-reasoned answers to the questions posed by the committee. The responses to the reviewer's comments and recommendations are incorrect.
0 Points	The student is unable to answer the questions posed by the committee and has no responses to the reviewer's comments and recommendations.

Regulation

On the Formatting, Presentation, and Evaluation of the Thematic Seminar by Doctoral Students of the Caucasus School of Law

Chapter I

General Provisions

Article 1. Scope of Regulation

This regulation is developed in accordance with the “Regulation of the Doctoral Studies and Dissertation Board of the Caucasus School of Law at Caucasus University” approved by the order of the President of Caucasus University and defines the rules for formatting, presenting, and evaluating the thematic seminar by a doctoral student of the Caucasus School of Law.

Article 2. Thematic Seminar

2.1. The standard version of the thematic seminar prepared by a doctoral student of the Caucasus School of Law must be formatted on A4 size paper, accompanied by a title page bearing the original signature. It must be printed in four copies and submitted to the school administration in a bound format.

2.2. The doctoral student prepares two thematic seminars and defends them before the committee.

2.3. The doctoral student selects the topic of the thematic seminar, writes, and defends it in agreement and consultation with the academic advisor. The title of the topic agreed upon with the advisor must be submitted in the form of an application no later than two weeks after the beginning of the semester following registration. The head or administrative director of the doctoral program reviews it and validates its relevance.

2.4. The thematic seminar topic must not constitute a part of the dissertation topic.

Chapter II

Formatting the Thematic Seminar

Article 3. Volume and Structure of the Thematic Seminar

3.1. The thematic seminar must be no less than 50 and no more than 65 pages in length, formatted in accordance with the provided instructions. The page count includes all bound pages.

3.2. The thematic seminar must be written in Georgian, free of orthographic, stylistic, and grammatical errors.

3.3. The structure of the thematic seminar is determined by the author based on the topic.

3.4. The thematic seminar must be printed on A4 size (297×210 mm), 80 g/m² density paper, with a vertical orientation. Printing must be single-sided. Photographs and other special-purpose tables may be printed on A4 photographic paper. For larger format sheets (e.g., for tables), any format is allowed, but such pages must not be bound together with the main text.

3.5. Page margins must be set as follows: top and bottom – 2 cm; left – 3 cm; right – 1.5 cm.

3.6. The main text of the thematic seminar must be written in Sylfaen font, size 12. A larger font size must be used for chapter and subchapter titles. Chapter titles must be in 14 pt bold; subchapter titles – 12 pt bold. Chapter titles must be separated from the text by a 3-line space; subchapter titles must be separated from both the chapter title and the text by a 2-line space. Condensed font types are not

accepted. Text must be printed using a laser printer or a comparable quality device.

3.7. All pages of the thematic seminar must be numbered consecutively. Leaving blank spaces or pages is not permitted, nor is page duplication. The minimum font size for page numbers is 10 pt. Introductory pages, excluding the title page, must be numbered in lowercase Roman numerals (I, II, III, etc.) in the bottom right corner. The remaining parts of the work must be numbered using Arabic numerals. Page numbers must be placed 1.3 cm from the bottom edge and 2.5 cm from the right edge of the page.

3.8. Line spacing for the main text is 1.5. For shorter sections (table of contents, list of tables, abstract, footnotes, notes, etc.), single spacing is used. Paragraphs must be separated by one line space; tables and figures must be separated from the text by two line spaces.

3.9. All chapter and subchapter titles must be included in the table of contents. Each chapter must begin on a new page, while subchapters may continue on the same page.

3.10. When using abbreviations in the dissertation, they must be written out in full at first mention, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses, which will then be used throughout the document (e.g., Civil Code of Georgia (hereinafter – CCG)); the same principle applies to frequently repeated titles, except when the abbreviation creates an unusual combination of characters.

3.11. Footnotes in the dissertation must be placed at the bottom of the page, in 10 pt font size, and numbered with Arabic numerals.

Bibliographic footnotes in the main text must follow the “footnote” principle.

Article 4. Rules for Formatting Footnotes

4.1. When referencing a legal act, the full title, the source of publication, as well as the date and page number must be indicated in the footnote.

4.2. When referencing literary sources, it is necessary to indicate:

- For books – the author’s surname, first name initial, book title (without quotation marks), part or volume number (if needed), place of publication, year, and page number (without “p.”).
- - b. For articles in collections – the article author’s surname, first name initial, article title (without quotation marks), name of the collection (without quotation marks), editor (if applicable), part or volume number (if needed), place of publication, year, and page number (without “p.”).
 - c. For journal articles – the article author’s surname, first name initial, article title (without quotation marks), abbreviated periodical name (e.g., *journ.*, *newsp.*), title (in quotation marks), number, year (month, day), and page number (without “p.”); all bibliographic elements of foreign sources must be indicated in the original language or in the language known to the author (with the reference to the official translation).
 - d. A uniform citation system must be maintained in the footnotes: the author’s name and the title of the work must be distinguished by different font styles (e.g., author’s name in italics, the remaining information in regular font; all referenced surnames, such as editors’, also in italics).

All components (except for surname and initial) must be separated by commas, and a period must follow at the end of the footnote.

✓ Ivanidze M., *Alternative Sentences, Trends of Liberalization in Criminal Legislation in Georgia*. Tbilisi, 2016, 342.

✓ Shalikashvili M., Mikhanadze G., Khasia M., *Penitentiary Law (Textbook)*, Tbilisi, 2014, 472.

e. For materials obtained via the internet, the relevant webpage and the date of last update must be indicated. In the case of an article, the author's surname, article title, website, and date must be provided. The electronic address is enclosed in angle brackets (<....>), and the last update date in square brackets ([....]).

f. For decisions of international and foreign courts:

Court of Justice

e.g., Case 16/62, *Van Gen en Loos*, [1963] ECR 95.

European Court of Human Rights

e.g., *Kostovski v. The Netherlands*, [1990] ECHR (Ser. A.), 221.

International Court of Justice

e.g., *Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions Between Qatar and Bahrain*, [1995] ICJ Report.

In the main text, case names and decisions are written in Georgian; the full citation in the original language may be added in parentheses or footnotes in the following order: Party v. Party, year, reporting source, page number, court.

e.g., for British courts: *Argyll v Argyll* (*Arggyll v Argyll*, [1967] 1 Ch 302, 324, 332).

for U.S. courts: *Brown v Board of Education* (*Brown v Board of Education*, 347 US 483 (1954)).

g. For decisions of national courts, the official national style must be maintained. In the absence of a unified national approach, the author must follow the general rule: in referencing Georgian court decisions, it must be clarified whether the decision is 1. published, 2. available via an official online source, or 3. accessible only in court archives – and must develop a consistent citation style.

h. The citation style of documents of international organizations must follow the format officially used by the respective organization (see official websites).

i. Conventions and international treaties must be cited as follows: e.g., 1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer.

j. Foreign terms and expressions must be explained in footnotes unless the objective of the paper is to trace the origin of the term.

k. For Georgian text, use Georgian-style opening and closing quotation marks („...“); for foreign texts, use international-style quotation marks (“...”).

l. Punctuation marks at the end of cited text—period, colon, semicolon, question mark, and exclamation mark—must appear before the closing quotation mark if they complete the sentence; or after the quotation mark, depending on context, if the quotation is part of a phrase or word.

When quotation mark, punctuation, and footnote reference come together, the order should be:

1. quotation mark, 2. punctuation mark, 3. footnote indicator. At the end of a quoted sentence: 1.

punctuation mark, 2. quotation mark, 3. footnote indicator. Double quotation marks should not be written consecutively. Different forms of brackets may be used as needed.

When Referring to the Same Source in Footnotes

In cases where the same source is cited in the footnotes:

1. If referring to the exact same source cited in the immediately preceding footnote, the term "ibid." must be used. After "ibid.," if necessary, different details (such as volume, year, page) must be indicated.
2. If referring to a previously cited, but not immediately preceding, source, the full citation must be provided along with the relevant page number.

Article 5. Components of the Thematic Seminar

5.1. The mandatory components of the thematic seminar are:

- a. Formal section:
 - a.a. Title page;
 - a.b. Signature page;
 - a.c. Copyright page;
 - a.d. Abstract in Georgian and English;
 - a.e. Table of contents.
- b. Substantive section:
 - b.a. Introduction;
 - b.b. Main text;
 - b.c. Conclusion.
- c. Bibliography.

5.2. Additional components of the thematic seminar are:

- a. List of tables;
- b. Appendices.

Article 6. Title Page of the Thematic Seminar

The title page (outer cover) must follow a standard format. It must include the title of the thematic seminar, the author's and the scientific supervisor's first and last names. It must also contain the text "Caucasus University," "Tbilisi, 0102, Georgia." The page must also indicate the month and year when the seminar presentation is scheduled. The page number is (I), although it is not displayed.

Article 7. Copyright Page of the Thematic Seminar

The copyright page (page II) must follow a standard format. The original of the standard version of the thematic seminar must contain the author's original signature. This page grants Caucasus University the right to disseminate (for non-commercial purposes), reference, and otherwise manage the work. It must include the text: "Caucasus University," the year of submission to the school administration, the author's last name, first name, title of the work, name of the school, and the academic degree sought. It must also contain the following standard statements: "The author grants Caucasus University the right to copy and disseminate this thematic seminar, in whole or in part, for non-commercial purposes upon request from individual persons or institutions," and "The author retains all other publishing rights. Reproduction of the full work and/or its components by any means is not allowed without the author's written consent. The author affirms that

the use of all copyrighted material in the work is properly authorized (excluding short quotations requiring only proper citation, as commonly accepted in academic writing), and assumes full responsibility for their use.”

Article 8. Abstract of the Thematic Seminar

The abstract must include a concise overview of the thematic seminar. It must clearly present a summary of the work completed and the main findings. The abstract must not include footnotes, tables, diagrams, or other visual elements. Its length must be between 200 and 400 words. Line spacing must be set to single.

Article 9. Content of the Thematic Seminar

The thematic seminar must include a table of contents listing the introduction, all chapters and subchapters, conclusion, and bibliography. Line spacing must be set to 1. Font size must be 12 pt. The spacing between paragraphs must be 6–12 pt. Page numbers must be placed in the right margin. It is permissible to fill the space between headings and page numbers with symbols such as “.”, “–”, or “_”.

Article 10. Main Text of the Thematic Seminar

9.1. The main text of the paper must be divided into chapters and various levels of subchapters. It must include the introduction, main body, and conclusion.

9.2. The introduction is the general part of the thematic seminar in which the research problem is presented, the relevance of the study is justified, the aim and objectives are defined, and the hypothesis is formulated (a scientific assumption by the author, expected to be proven through the research). It must also include the methodology (justifying the relevance of the research methods used and indicating the specific purpose of each method in relation to the study). The introduction must not exceed 5% of the total length of the main text.

9.3. The main body is divided into chapters and subchapters. It must cover the theoretical framework and literature review relevant to the topic, conflicting ideas and controversial issues in the sources, a detailed description of the conducted research, its findings, the author’s original scientific contributions, and new perspectives and approaches.

9.4. The structure for the analysis of the results of the thematic seminar depends on the topic and may be presented in a format preferred by the author. There is no restriction on the number of subchapters.

9.5. The conclusion briefly summarizes the research findings, highlights the theoretical and practical significance of the paper, presents its scientific novelty, and outlines recommendations with regard to the scope and effectiveness of implementation.

Article 10. Rules for Compiling the Bibliography

10.1. The bibliography in the thematic seminar must be presented in a consolidated and numbered format.

10.2. First, Georgian normative materials must be listed (indicating the date of adoption), followed by Georgian-language academic literature in alphabetical order. Georgian academic sources must be followed by Georgian court decisions (from the most recent to the oldest). After the Georgian sources, the same order must be followed for foreign-language materials: first, foreign normative materials, then foreign academic sources, electronic links, and foreign court decisions. At the end of each academic source, relevant page numbers must be indicated. If the same source is used multiple times in the paper with references to different pages, the source must be listed only once in the bibliography along with all page numbers cited in the work.

Article 11. Additional Components of the Thematic Seminar

11.1. If the thematic seminar includes a list of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations, it must be placed in the introductory section of the paper, after the table of contents. Line spacing must be 1.5. If a paragraph exceeds one line, the spacing must be set to 1. Font size must be 12. Page numbers must be placed at the right margin. It is permissible to fill the space between the title and the page number with symbols such as “.”, “–”, “_”.

11.2. The content, placement, and formatting of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations are determined by the specifics of the paper. When using tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations taken from other literary sources, copyright must not be violated. Tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, and schemes must be produced in black and white; the use of color diagrams and illustrations is also permissible.

11.3. Titles of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations must be placed directly above or below them. Font size must be one point smaller than the main text font size. The use of bold font is allowed. Line spacing must be set to 1.

11.4. Tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, illustrations, and their titles may be placed either within the main text or on separate individual pages as appendices. Tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations must be distanced from the main text by 1.5–2 cm. If necessary, horizontal page orientation is allowed. The margin and page numbering of horizontal pages must correspond to that of vertical pages.

11.5. If the thematic seminar includes appendices in the form of data tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations, they must be placed after the bibliography. At the same time, numbering of the data tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations within the main text must be continuous. Numbering of such elements in the appendices starts anew.

11.6. For abbreviations used in the thematic seminar that are not commonly accepted, it is advisable for the author to provide a list and explanation to facilitate comprehension. The list of abbreviations must be included in the introductory section of the paper, after the table of contents or the list of tables.

11.7. At the author's discretion, the paper may include an alphabetical index. The index must be placed in the introductory section of the paper, after the table of contents, list of tables, or list of abbreviations used.

Article 12. Electronic Version of the Thematic Seminar

The thematic seminar must be saved in PDF format on a CD-ROM or memory card. The disc must be labeled with the author's name and the title of the thematic seminar.

Chapter III

Presentation of the Thematic Seminar

Article 13. Submission and Review of the Thematic Seminar

1. If registration takes place during the fall semester, the deadline for submission of the thematic seminar is December 20; for the spring semester – May 20.
2. The thematic seminar must be submitted to the school administration in 4 (four) printed and bound copies and 1 electronic version.

3. The thematic seminar must be accompanied by the advisor's evaluation form, a written review, and a statement confirming that no plagiarism was detected during the Turnitin review.
4. A thematic seminar will not be admitted for defense without the documents specified in paragraph 13.3.
5. The School of Law sends the submitted paper for review to a qualified expert holding a doctorate in law or an equivalent academic degree in the relevant field. The reviewer must submit the evaluation form and written review within 10 days.
6. A prerequisite for admission to the public defence of the thematic seminar is meeting the minimum competency threshold of 59% of the maximum interim assessment score. The interim assessment is calculated by adding the scores awarded by the thematic seminar supervisor and the reviewer and amounts to a maximum of 60 points.
7. If the thematic seminar fails to meet the minimum interim evaluation threshold (59%), the student must re-register for this component.

Article 14. Thematic Seminar Committee

- 14.1. The Dean of the School of Law appoints the seminar defense committee at least 15 days prior to the scheduled defense.
- 14.2. The committee shall consist of 5 members holding a doctoral degree in the relevant field or an equivalent academic degree. The thematic seminar supervisor and the reviewer shall not participate in determining the final assessment; they may attend the committee meeting in an advisory capacity, without voting rights.
- 14.3. The committee is chaired by the head of the doctoral program.
- 14.4. A quorum for the committee session is three members present.

Article 15. Thematic Seminar Defense Procedure

- 15.1. The thematic seminar shall be defended at a public meeting of the committee. The date, time and venue of the defence, or, where held remotely, the relevant electronic access information, shall be published in advance on the University website.
- 15.2. The electronic version of the presentation (slides) must be submitted to the doctoral academic manager two days before the defense. Two bound copies of the paper are submitted to the university library after successful defense.
- 15.3. The defense takes place in an orderly environment. Nameplates indicating the surname, first name, and academic title of each committee member must be prepared.
- 15.4. The session is opened and chaired by the committee chair. The advisor and the reviewer present their written reviews; in their absence, the chair presents them. The reviews are attached to the session minutes and must include a recommendation on whether to admit the work for defense.
- 15.5. The floor is then given to the doctoral student, who presents the research results both verbally and via slides. The length of the presentation is determined by the committee.
- 15.6. After the presentation, the committee chair initiates a scientific discussion (question-answer format). Following the discussion, the advisor is given the floor. Other committee members and the chair may speak at their discretion.
- 15.7. The doctoral student is given the opportunity to deliver final remarks. Thereafter, at the request of the chair, the audience leaves the room, and the committee members begin evaluation in the prescribed format (by completing score sheets).
- 15.8. The final points of the seminar evaluation are announced in the presence of the doctoral student.

15.9. A protocol of the defense session must be completed, including the seminar's proceedings and final evaluation. The protocol, the electronic version of the presentation, and the paper must be submitted to the Dean of the School of Law within 7 days of the defense.

Article 16. Evaluation of the Thematic Seminar

16.1. The thematic seminar shall be deemed completed if the doctoral student separately meets the minimum competency thresholds established for the interim and final assessments and obtains a total score of at least 60 points from the combined interim and final assessments. The unified final assessment is calculated by adding the interim and final assessment scores.

16.2. The thematic seminar is assessed on a 100-point scale. Within the interim assessment, the thematic seminar supervisor assesses the paper with a maximum of 30 points (Annex No. 5.1), and the reviewer with a maximum of 30 points (Annex No. 5.2). The sum of their scores constitutes the interim assessment, with a maximum of 60 points. Within the final assessment, the committee assesses the public defence with a maximum of 40 points (Annex No. 5.3); the arithmetic mean of the scores awarded by committee members constitutes the final assessment. The minimum competency threshold for the final assessment is 24 points. Detailed assessment criteria and scoring descriptors are set out in Annex No. 5.4. The thematic seminar comprises 20 ECTS credits — 500 hours, including: preparation and presentation of the paper — 25 hours; consultations with the supervisor — 30 hours; independent research work — 445 hours.

16.3. Cases and consequences of a negative assessment of the thematic seminar shall be determined as follows: (a) where the doctoral student fails to meet the minimum competency threshold established for the interim assessment, the student shall not be admitted to the public defence and shall re-register for the relevant learning component; (b) where the doctoral student receives between 41% and 59%, inclusive, of the maximum final assessment score at the public defence, the student shall be entitled to submit the paper once for an additional public defence, in accordance with the procedure and academic calendar established by the relevant legal act of the University; (c) where the doctoral student receives between 0% and 40%, inclusive, of the maximum final assessment score at the public defence, the student shall be assigned an F grade and shall lose the right to continue working on the same paper.



Annex No. 7

Instruction

On the Volume, Format, Style, and Other Technical Specifications of the Doctoral Dissertation for the Doctoral Program at Caucasus School of Law

Chapter I

General Provisions

Article 1. Scope of the Instruction

This instruction is developed in accordance with the “Regulation of the Dissertation Board and Doctoral Studies of the Caucasus School of Law at Caucasus University,” approved by the order of the President of Caucasus University. It defines the rules regarding the volume, format, style, and other technical specifications of the doctoral dissertation submitted by a doctoral candidate of the Caucasus School of Law.

Article 2. The Doctoral Dissertation

2.1. A doctoral dissertation is the result of the doctoral candidate’s independent scientific research. It must present scientifically substantiated findings that contribute to the theoretical or practical development of the respective field.

2.2. The dissertation submitted for the award of a doctoral academic degree must be free from orthographic, stylistic, and grammatical errors and comply with the format and rules specified in this instruction.

2.3. The doctoral candidate submits four bound printed copies and an electronic version of the dissertation to the Dissertation Board, in accordance with the procedures and deadlines outlined in the regulation of the Dissertation Board and Doctoral Studies of the Caucasus School of Law.

Chapter II

Formatting the Doctoral Dissertation

Article 3. Volume and Structure of the Doctoral Dissertation

3.1. The dissertation must contain no fewer than 120 and no more than 200 pages, formatted in accordance with the current instruction.

3.2. The structure of the dissertation is determined by the author based on the topic.

3.3. The dissertation must be printed on A4-sized (297×210 mm), 80 g/m² paper, in vertical

orientation, single-sided. Photographs and special-purpose tables may also be printed on A4-sized paper. For larger format pages (e.g., diagrams), any size may be used, but such pages must not be bound with the main text.

3.4. Page margins: 2 cm on the top and bottom, 3 cm on the left, and 1.5 cm on the right.

3.5. The main text must be written in Sylfaen font, size 12. Chapter titles should be in 14 pt bold; subchapter titles in 12 pt bold. Chapter titles must be separated from the text by three line spaces; subchapter titles must be separated from both the chapter title and the main text by two line spaces each. Condensed fonts are not accepted. Printing must be done with a laser printer or equivalent quality.

3.6. All pages must be numbered sequentially. Blank spaces or unnumbered pages are not allowed. Duplicate page numbers are also not permitted. Minimum font size for page numbers is 10 pt.

Introductory pages, except for the title page, must be numbered in lowercase Roman numerals (I, II, III, etc.) at the bottom right corner. The rest of the document is numbered with Arabic numerals. Page numbers must be placed 1.3 cm from the bottom and 2.5 cm from the right edge of the page.

3.7. Line spacing for the main text is 1.5. For smaller sections (table of contents, list of tables, abstract, footnotes, notes, etc.), line spacing is 1. Paragraphs are separated by a single line space. Tables and figures are separated from the text by two line spaces.

3.8. All chapter and subchapter titles must appear in the table of contents. Each chapter begins on a new page; subchapters may continue on the same page.

3.9. When abbreviations are used, they must be spelled out in full the first time they appear, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses, which will then be used throughout the text (e.g., Civil Code of Georgia (hereinafter – CCG)). This principle applies to recurring titles as well, except when the abbreviation results in an unusual or unclear symbol combination.

3.10. Footnotes must be placed at the bottom of the page. Font size for footnotes is 10 pt. Footnotes must be numbered with Arabic numerals. In-text bibliographic citations must follow the "footnote" principle.

Article 4. Footnote Formatting Rules

4.1. When citing legal acts, the full title, the source of publication, date, and page number must be indicated in the footnote.

4.2. When citing literary sources, the following format must be used:

- a. For books – author's surname, initial of first name, title of the book (without quotation marks), volume or part number (if applicable), place of publication, year, and page number (without “p.”).
- b. For articles in collections – author's surname, initial of first name, title of the article (without quotation marks), title of the collection (without quotation marks), editor's name (if applicable), volume or part number (if applicable), place of publication, year, and page number (without “p.”).
- c. For journal articles – author's surname, initial of first name, title of the article (without quotation marks), abbreviated name of the periodical (e.g., *journ.*, *newsp.*), title (in quotation marks), issue number, year (month, day), and page number (without “p.”). All bibliographic elements of foreign sources must be presented in the original language or in a language understood by the author (with reference to the official translation).
- d. A consistent citation system must be maintained in footnotes: the author's name should be in italics; other information in regular font. All surnames, including editors', should be italicized. All components (except the surname and initial) must be separated by commas, and the footnote must end with a period.

✓ Ivanidze M., *Alternative Sentences, Trends of Liberalization in Criminal Legislation in Georgia*. Tbilisi, 2016, 342.

✓ Shalikashvili M., Mikhanadze G., Khasia M., *Penitentiary Law (Textbook)*. Tbilisi, 2014, 472.

e. For online sources, indicate the relevant webpage and the date of last update. In case of an article, include the author's surname, article title, website, and date. The URL must be placed in angle brackets (<...>), and the update date in square brackets ([...]).

f. For decisions of international and foreign courts:

Court of Justice

e.g., Case 16/62, *Van Gen en Loos*, [1963] ECR 95.

European Court of Human Rights

e.g., *Kostovski v. The Netherlands*, [1990] ECHR (Ser. A.), 221.

International Court of Justice

e.g., *Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions Between Qatar and Bahrain*, [1995] ICJ Report.

Court case names and decisions are written in Georgian in the main text; the original citation may appear in parentheses or in the footnote, in the following order: Party v. Party, year, publication, page, court.

e.g., for UK courts: *Argyll v Argyll* (*Arggyll v Argyll*, [1967] 1 Ch 302, 324, 332)).

for US courts: *Brown v Board of Education* (*Brown v Board of Education*, 347 US 483 (1954)).

g. For Georgian court decisions, official national citation style must be used. In the absence of a unified standard, the author should distinguish between:

1. Published decisions,
 2. Officially available electronic sources,
 3. Archive-only access,
- and develop a consistent approach.

h. Documents of international organizations must be cited according to the citation format officially used by the organization (see official websites).

i. Conventions and international treaties must be cited as follows: e.g., *1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer*.

k. Foreign terms and expressions shall be explained in footnotes unless the primary objective of the dissertation is to determine the origin of the term.

l. For Georgian-language texts, “lower and upper” Georgian quotation marks („...“) must be used; for foreign-language texts, “upper” quotation marks (“...”) must be used.

m. At the end of a cited text, punctuation marks (period, colon, semicolon, question mark, exclamation point) must be placed *before* the closing quotation mark when completing a sentence, or *after* the quotation mark if the quotation is a single word or phrase within a sentence. When a word is followed by a quotation mark, punctuation, and a footnote mark simultaneously, the correct sequence is: 1. quotation mark, 2. punctuation mark, 3. footnote symbol. At the end of a cited sentence, the sequence should be: 1. punctuation mark, 2. quotation mark, 3. footnote symbol. Double quotation marks must not appear consecutively. For brackets, different types may be used.

n. When referencing a previously cited source in a footnote, the following cases must be distinguished:

1. If referring to the same source as the immediately preceding footnote, use “ibid.” After “ibid.”, if necessary, add new data (volume, year, page);
2. If referring to a previously used but not immediately preceding source, the full reference must be cited again along with the page number.

Article 5. Components of the Doctoral Dissertation

5.1. Mandatory components of the doctoral dissertation:

- a. Formal section:
 - a.a. Title page;
 - a.b. Signature page;
 - a.c. Copyright page;
 - a.d. Abstract in Georgian and English;
 - a.e. Table of contents.
- b. Main body:
 - b.a. Introduction;
 - b.b. Main text;
 - b.c. Conclusion.
- c. Bibliography.

5.2. Additional components of the doctoral dissertation:

- a. List of tables;
- b. Appendices.

Article 6. Formal Section of the Doctoral Dissertation

- 6.1. The title page (outer cover) must follow a standard format and include the title of the dissertation, the full names of the author and the scientific advisor, and the text “Dissertation submitted for the award of the academic degree of Doctor of Law,” “Caucasus University,” “Tbilisi, Georgia.” The page is numbered (I), but the number is not shown (Appendix 5).
- 6.2. The signature page (page II) must follow a standard format. All copies of the submitted version must include original signatures. This page must contain the following text: “Caucasus University,” “School of Law,” “We, the undersigned, confirm that we have reviewed the doctoral dissertation submitted by [full name] titled: [title], and recommend its submission to the Dissertation Board of the School of Law at Caucasus University for consideration toward the academic degree of Doctor of Law,” and the date. It must be signed by the scientific advisor and all reviewers.
- 6.3. The copyright page (page III) must follow a standard format. The original of the standard version must bear the author’s handwritten signature. This page grants Caucasus University Library non-commercial, educational rights to distribute and reference the dissertation. It must include: “Caucasus University,” the year of submission, author’s full name, title of the dissertation, name of the school, and the academic degree sought. It must also include the standard texts: “Caucasus University is granted permission to copy and distribute the above-mentioned dissertation for non-commercial purposes upon request by individuals or institutions,” and “The author retains all other copyright-related rights. The author affirms that permission has been obtained for all copyrighted materials used in the dissertation (except for minor quotations that require only proper bibliographic

referencing, as accepted in academic works), and assumes full responsibility for them.”

6.4. The abstract must briefly summarize the dissertation and clearly present the content of the completed work. It must not include footnotes, tables, illustrations, diagrams, or other figures. The abstract must be 500 to 800 words long. The Dissertation Board may distribute the abstract in both printed and electronic form. Line spacing must be single. The abstract must be written in both Georgian and English. If the dissertation is written in a different language, a Georgian abstract must be appended.

6.5. The table of contents must list the introduction, all chapters and subchapters, conclusion, and bibliography. Line spacing must be 1. Font size must be 12 pt. Spacing between paragraphs must be 6–12 pt. Page numbers must be aligned to the right margin. It is permissible to fill the space between headings and page numbers with symbols such as “.”, “–”, or “_”.

Article 7. Main Body of the Doctoral Dissertation

7.1. The dissertation text must include the introduction, main text, and conclusion.

7.2. The introduction outlines the general framework, presenting the research problem, the relevance of the study, its aims and objectives, the hypothesis (the author’s scientific assumption to be validated through research), and the methodology (justifying the relevance of the selected research methods and their application in the context of the dissertation). The introduction must not exceed 5% of the total length of the main text.

7.3. The main text must be divided into chapters and subchapters. It must cover the theoretical context of the study, conflicting ideas and debates, detailed research methodology, findings, original scientific insights, and new interpretations or approaches.

7.4. The structure of the analysis of the research findings depends on the dissertation topic, and the author may present it in any preferred format. There is no restriction on the number of subchapters.

7.5. The conclusion must summarize the findings, outline the theoretical and practical significance of the research, highlight scientific novelty and relevance, and provide recommendations, including implementation areas and expected effectiveness.

Article 8. Rules for Compiling the Bibliography

8.1. The bibliography must be presented in a consolidated and numbered format.

8.2. First list Georgian normative materials (with dates of adoption), followed by Georgian academic literature in alphabetical order, and then Georgian court decisions (from newest to oldest). Next, list foreign-language sources in the same order: normative materials, academic literature, online sources, and court decisions. At the end of each academic source, specify page references. If the same source is cited with different page numbers throughout the paper, it must appear once in the bibliography with all referenced page numbers listed.

Article 9. Additional Components of the Doctoral Dissertation

9.1. If the dissertation includes a list of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations, it must appear after the table of contents in the introductory section. Line spacing must be 1.5. For paragraphs longer than one line, spacing must be 1. Font size must be 12. Page numbers

must be aligned to the right margin. It is acceptable to use symbols like “.”, “–”, or “_” between titles and page numbers.

9.2. The content, placement, and formatting of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations depend on the specifics of the research. Use of such materials from other sources must not violate copyright. Tables, procedures, diagrams, and schemes must be black-and-white, although colored illustrations and diagrams are allowed.

9.3. Titles of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations must be placed directly above or below the item. Font size must be 1 point smaller than the main text. Bold font may be used. Line spacing must be single.

9.4. Tables, diagrams, etc., and their titles may be included in the main text or placed on separate appendix pages. They must be spaced 1.5–2 cm from the surrounding text. Horizontal page orientation is permitted if needed, and horizontal pages must follow the same margin and numbering format as vertical ones.

9.5. If tables, procedures, diagrams, schemes, or illustrations are included as appendices, they must follow the bibliography or list of used literature. Items in the main text must be numbered continuously, while appendix items start numbering anew.

9.6. For non-standard abbreviations used in the dissertation, the author should provide a list and definitions to ensure clarity. The list must follow the table of contents or the list of tables in the introductory section.

9.7. The dissertation may include an alphabetical index at the author’s discretion. It must follow the table of contents, list of tables, or list of abbreviations in the introductory section.

Article 10. Published Version of the Doctoral Dissertation

10.1. In case of a positive evaluation, the successfully defended doctoral dissertation must be published in printed form by the doctoral candidate.

10.2. The author has the right to optimize the dissertation in accordance with the requirements of the publishing house, provided that the fundamental structure of the work is not altered.

Article 11. Electronic Version of the Doctoral Dissertation

The doctoral dissertation must be saved in *.pdf format on a CD-ROM or USB flash drive. The author’s name and the title of the dissertation must be indicated on the disc.

Annex No. 8

Scientific Advisor's Review

On the Doctoral Dissertation of the PhD Candidate -----
of the Doctoral Program in Law at the Caucasus School of Law, Caucasus University,
titled: “-----”

1. The scientific advisor must evaluate the doctoral candidate based on the achieved learning and research outcomes — including academic and research components, as well as any scientific research visits/internships conducted for the research (if applicable), participation in local and international academic events (forums, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.), and publications related to the dissertation topic.
(Recommended word count: 400 words)
2. The review must confirm the relevance and significance of the dissertation, the novelty and innovation of the research, the scientific value of the findings, and/or the potential practical applicability of the research outcomes. It must also address any issues concerning plagiarism or falsified data.
(Recommended word count: 800 words)

Signature of the Scientific Advisor:

Date:

Dissertation Reviewer Evaluation Form

----- Reviewer

----- Title of the dissertation

Relevance and Novelty of the Selected Topic and Research Problem	Maximum 5 points	
Structure of the Dissertation, Legal Use of Information, and Academic Writing Culture	Maximum 5 points	
Research Methodology and Methods	Maximum 10 points	
Final Research Results	Maximum 10 points	

In addition to the scoring based on the aforementioned criteria, please provide your written conclusion, remarks/comments, and final position on whether the doctoral candidate deserves to be awarded the sought degree. Please also check the box corresponding to your decision.

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Reviewer's Evaluation Form: Score Distribution and Description (30 Points)

1. Relevance and Novelty of the Selected Topic and Research Problem - 5 Points	
5-4 Point	The relevance and novelty of the research topic are logically explained and justified.
4-3 Point	The relevance and novelty of the research topic are logically explained, but lack clarity/justification.
3-2 Point	The relevance and novelty of the research topic are explained, but not fully justified.
2-1 Point	The relevance and novelty of the research topic are formulated superficially and lack argumentation.
1-0 Point	The relevance and novelty of the research topic are formulated unprofessionally, without any justification.
0 Point	The relevance and novelty of the research topic are not formulated.
2. Structure of the Dissertation, Legal Use of Information, and Academic Writing Culture - 5 Points	
5-4 Point	The structure of the dissertation meticulously aligns with the topic. The information used in the text complies with the legal framework, and excerpts and citations from other works are properly referenced; the dissertation is written error-free and coherently.
4-3 Point	The structure of the dissertation responds to the topic but requires further clarification. Excerpts and citations from other works are referenced in good faith; the work is written error-free, and the appropriate terminology is used correctly.
3-2 Point	The structure of the dissertation partially responds to the topic; the source for a small portion of the information is not cited, while the citation process is ethically sound; the work is written with minor errors, and the relevant terminology is used correctly.
2-1 Point	The structure of the dissertation is not properly developed and analyzed; the sources for a fairly large portion of the information are unidentified, and the sources for certain citations are referenced unprofessionally; grammatical errors within the text hinder readability, and the text is structurally incoherent.
1-0 Point	The structure of the dissertation lacks coherence and quality. Citations are presented without sources; the text contains numerous terminological and conceptual errors, making its content difficult to understand.
0 Point	The structure of the dissertation does not align with the research requirements at all. The information used is of uncertain origin, citations are presented without sources; the terminology is incorrect, and its content is practically incomprehensible.
3. Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature - Maximum 10 Points	
5-4 Point	The research methods are comprehensively, professionally, and fully selected. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will successfully be able to address the primary research problems, and the selected material and scientific literature fully comply with the research requirements.
4-3 Point	The research methods are competently selected. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will be able to address the primary research problems, while the selected material and scientific literature comply with the research requirements, but require further elaboration.

3-2 Point	The research methods are incompletely selected. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will not be able to fully address the primary research problems, while the selected material and scientific literature only partially satisfy the research requirements.
2-1 Point	The selected methodology is outdated and irrelevant to the topic. The master's student will be unable to address the primary research problems, and the selected material and scientific literature are not properly developed and analyzed.
1-0 Point	The research methods are selected unprofessionally, and the selected material and scientific literature are random, lacking coherence and quality.
0 Point	The research methods are not selected at all, and the selected material and scientific literature do not comply with the research requirements at all.
4. Final Research Results - Maximum 10 Points	
5-4 Point	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to obtain results of high theoretical and applied significance.
4-3 Point	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to obtain results of educational and practical utility.
3-2 Point	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to obtain results of educational utility.
2-1 Point	The doctoral student has insufficiently justified the final research results through logical reasoning. Obtaining the results requires additional clarification.
1-0 Point	The doctoral student has not justified the final research results through logical reasoning. Obtaining the results is doubtful.
0 Point	The doctoral student has no conception regarding the final research results. It is impossible to obtain results of any utility.

Dissertation Public Defence Assessment Form for a Member of the Defence Committee

----- Committee Member's Full Name

----- Title of the dissertation

----- Doctoral Candidate's Full Name

Relevance and Novelty of the Selected Topic and Research Problem	Maximum 10 points	
Structure and Logical Sequence of the Thesis	Maximum 10 points	
Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature	Maximum 10 points	
Final Research Results and the Substantiation of Conclusions	Maximum 15 points	
Accuracy of Citation and Academic Writing Culture	Maximum 10 points	
Presentation Skills	Maximum 7.5 points	
Accuracy and Argumentation of Answers to the Reviewer's Comments and Committee's Questions	Maximum 7.5 points	

Evaluator's Signature: -----

Date: -----

Scoring Breakdown and Descriptors for the Dissertation Public Defence Assessment Form for a Member of the Defence Committee

The Defence Committee assesses the dissertation public defence with a maximum of 70 points according to the established criteria. Each member assesses the public defence individually and by secret ballot. The Defence Committee assessment is the arithmetic mean of the scores awarded by its members. The unified final dissertation assessment is calculated by adding the Defence Committee assessment (maximum 70 points) and the arithmetic mean of the reviewers' assessments (maximum 30 points).

1. Relevance and Novelty of the Selected Topic and Research Problem — Maximum 10 Points

10–9 points – The relevance and novelty of the topic are fully and logically substantiated; the essence of the problem is formulated with utmost clarity; the necessity and practical significance of the research are clearly demonstrated; arguments are consistent and tightly linked to the goals and objectives of the dissertation.

8–7 points – The relevance and novelty of the topic are described and substantiated, though certain sections lack clarity or precision in argumentation; the significance of the problem is demonstrated but requires further explanation or concretization.

6–5 points – The relevance and novelty of the topic are presented at a general level; the essence of the problem is only partially explained, and the necessity of the research is insufficiently demonstrated.

4–3 points – The relevance and novelty of the topic are discussed superficially; the argumentation is weak, and the connection to the research goals remains vague.

2–1 points – The relevance and novelty of the topic are mentioned purely formally and lack substantiated arguments.

0 points – The relevance and novelty of the topic are not presented at all or bear no relation to the content of the dissertation.

2. Structure and Logical Sequence of the Thesis — Maximum 10 Points

10–9 points – The structure of the thesis fully aligns with the topic and research goals; all chapters and subchapters are logically interconnected; the content is coherent, and the argumentation is sound.

8–7 points – The structure of the thesis is generally correct and aligns with the topic, though certain parts require adjustment or better structural homogeneity.

6–5 points – The structure of the thesis only partially aligns with the topic; certain chapters or subchapters lack sequential coherence and logical connection.

4–3 points – The structure of the thesis is unrefined; the thematic sequence is disrupted, and the argumentation is not sufficiently sound.

2–1 points – The structure of the thesis is flawed, and its connection to the essence of the topic is weakly expressed; the text lacks a logical sequence.

0 points – The structure of the thesis does not align with the dissertation goals and research requirements at all.

3. Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature — Maximum 10 Points

10–9 points – The applied methodology fully aligns with the goals and objectives of the research; the selected methods are well-coordinated and ensure the reliability of the results; the literature and sources are of high quality, purposefully selected, and comprehensively reflect the research topic and goals.

8–7 points – The applied methodology aligns with the research goals and objectives, though it requires clarification of certain elements or the inclusion of more diverse sources. The utilized material is mostly relevant and reflects the research content and goals.

6–5 points – The selected methods only partially align with the research topic and goals; the utilized literature and sources are insufficient and fail to ensure the full reliability of the research; the methodological section requires refinement and substantial revision.

4–3 points – The selected methodology is inappropriate for the topic or is outdated; the utilized literature is analyzed superficially and fails to establish a solid foundation for substantiating the research results.

2–1 points – The research methodology is selected unprofessionally; the utilized literature and sources are random and do not align with the research goals and thematic direction; the reliability and validity of the arguments are insufficient.

0 points – The research methodology is not defined at all; the utilized material is random and bears no relation to the goals, objectives, and content of the dissertation.

4. Final Research Results and the Substantiation of Conclusions — Maximum 15 Points

15–13 points – The research results fully align with the goals and objectives of the dissertation; the conclusions are clear, formulated with strong argumentation, and based on the logical progression of the research; the thesis presents results of significant theoretical and practical value, reflecting the doctoral candidate's independent research contribution.

12–10 points – The research results are logical and reflect the primary goals and objectives; the conclusions are substantiated, though certain parts require further clarification or more specific formulation; the theoretical or practical significance of the research is apparent but not fully realized.

9–7 points – The research results only partially align with the dissertation goals and objectives; the conclusions are general and insufficiently demonstrate the significance of the research; the argumentation is weak or presented fragmentarily.

6–4 points – The results are insufficiently substantiated and do not show a direct link to the research goals; the conclusions lack consistency and cause-and-effect logic; the research content requires substantial revision.

3–1 points – The results are presented purely formally, and the conclusions are not grounded in the research material; the candidate's analysis and substantiation are weakly expressed.

0 points – The research results and conclusions are not presented at all or bear no substantial relation to the topic of the dissertation.

5. Accuracy of Citation and Academic Writing Culture — Maximum 10 Points

10–9 points – Sources are selected purposefully and used effectively to substantiate the content and strengthen the argumentation of the thesis; all citations and references are presented with absolute accuracy; the text is well-formulated, the academic style is maintained, and terminology is used precisely.

8–7 points – The use of sources is ethically sound, though in some instances it lacks formal precision or uniformity in citation rules; the text is clear and logical.

6–5 points – A portion of the sources is cited incompletely or incorrectly; there are minor flaws in the citation format; the text contains minor grammatical or stylistic errors that do not hinder comprehension of the content.

4–3 points – A significant portion of the sources is unverified or incorrectly cited; citation standards are violated; the text contains grammatical and terminological flaws that make the thesis difficult to comprehend.

2–1 points – Sources are used without verification or, in most cases, without proper referencing; the text contains numerous grammatical and conceptual errors, and the rules of academic writing are violated.

0 points – The thesis violates the principles of academic integrity; the utilized material is not based on reliable sources or shows signs of falsification.

6. Presentation Skills — Maximum 7.5 Points

7–7.5 points – The presentation is clear and substantively sound. The doctoral candidate precisely and coherently conveys the essence of the main topic, presents the research results with strong argumentation, and communicates effectively with the committee and the audience. The presentation is distinguished by precision, effective time management, and high-quality visual materials.

6 points – The presentation is substantively sound, and the main parts of the topic are clearly presented. However, minor difficulties are observed in formulating arguments or managing time on certain issues. Contact with the audience is maintained, but not consistently.

4–5 points – The presentation is of average quality. The core content of the topic is conveyed, but the primary arguments are underemphasized. The flow of the presentation is inconsistent, and the candidate occasionally struggles to project the topic logically.

2–3 points – The presentation is insufficiently organized. The candidate struggles to fully convey the content of the topic and communicate with the audience. The argumentation is weak and disorganized, and the structure of the presentation is flawed.

1 point – The candidate reflects only a small fraction of the topic and fails to adequately present the content of the thesis. The delivery lacks focus, and the connection to the topic is weakly visible.

0 points – The presentation did not take place, or the delivered speech bears no relation to the topic of the dissertation.

7. Accuracy and Argumentation of Answers to the Reviewer's Comments and Committee's Questions — Maximum 7.5 Points

7.5–7 points – The doctoral candidate answers both the reviewer's comments and the committee members' questions precisely, logically, and convincingly; the responses demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and a profound understanding of the topic.

6 points – The candidate answers questions precisely and substantively, though in some cases the response is incomplete or requires additional explanation.

4–5 points – The candidate answers the questions, but some responses are superficial or insufficiently explained; in certain instances, the argumentation is flawed or fails to clearly illustrate the author's stance.

2–3 points – The candidate's answers are weak and fail to address the essence of the questions asked; the substantiation is insufficient, and the answers do not convey a solid command of the topic.

1 point – The candidate fails to answer the core questions of the committee, or the responses lack accuracy and sound argumentation.

0 points – The candidate does not answer the committee's questions, or the responses bear no relation whatsoever to the dissertation topic.

II. Evaluation Procedure

Each member of the Defence Committee fills out an individual form based on the criteria listed above. The final score is determined by the arithmetic mean of the scores awarded by the committee members. The overall score received and the corresponding evaluation shall be recorded in the official defense minutes.

Minutes of the Defence Committee (Form)

Doctoral Candidate of the Ph.D. Program in Law, Caucasus University Caucasus School of Law

(First Name, Last Name)

Minutes of the Defence Committee No. -----

Data, Tbilisi

- Attendees Present at the Session (Indicate the members of the Defence Committee, evaluators/reviewers, and scientific supervisor(s) [Last Name, First Name; Institution, Academic/Scientific Position]).
- Formulation of the Agenda (Defense of the dissertation titled "[Dissertation Title]" by [First Name, Last Name], Doctoral Candidate of the "[Name of Ph.D. Program]" Doctoral Educational Program at the Faculty of [Faculty Name]).
- Voting on the Approval of the Defence Committee's Agenda (Specify the number of members voting in favor).
- Decision of the Defence Committee on the Approval of the Agenda (Specify the number of members voting in favor).
- Information Regarding the Doctoral Candidate (Time limit – maximum 10 minutes; presented by the Committee Secretary).
- Presentation of the Dissertation by the Doctoral Candidate (Time limit – maximum 30 minutes; the Doctoral Candidate's speech shall be attached to the minutes).
- Report (Review) of the First Reviewer (Time limit – maximum 15 minutes; the review shall be attached to the minutes).
- Doctoral Candidate's Response to the First Reviewer's Report (Review) (Time limit – maximum 15 minutes; the Doctoral Candidate's response shall be attached to the minutes; the discussion shall be documented in the minutes).
- Report (Review) of the Second Reviewer (Time limit – maximum 15 minutes; the review shall be attached to the minutes).
- Doctoral Candidate's Response to the Second Reviewer's Report (Review) (Time limit – maximum 15 minutes; the Doctoral Candidate's response shall be attached to the minutes; the discussion shall be documented in the minutes).

- Scientific Discussion (time limit for each speaker — maximum 5 minutes).
- Statement of the Scientific Supervisor (maximum 10 minutes).
- Final remarks of the doctoral student (maximum 5 minutes).
- Dissertation public defence assessment procedure — members of the Defence Committee assess the public defence at a closed meeting, individually and by secret ballot, with a maximum of 70 points. The unified final assessment is calculated by adding the arithmetic mean of the reviewers' assessments and the arithmetic mean of the Defence Committee members' assessments.

Assessment results:

First reviewer's assessment: ____ / 30 points;

Second reviewer's assessment: ____ / 30 points;

Arithmetic mean of reviewers' assessments: ____ / 30 points;

Arithmetic mean of Defence Committee members' assessments: ____ / 70 points;

Unified final assessment: ____ / 100 points;

Verbal grade: _____;

Decision: Defended / Not Defended.

The minutes shall be certified by the signatures of the Chair of the Defence Committee and the Secretary of the Defence Committee.

Annex No. 11

Semester Report on Scientific-Research Activities

(in accordance with Articles 23.10–23.14 of the Regulations)

Doctoral student's full name	
Doctoral programme	
Title of the dissertation	
Scientific supervisor/co-supervisor	
Academic year and semester	
Reporting period	
Date of approval of the individual research plan	

I. Status of implementation of the individual research plan

No.	Planned activity	Completed work/result	Implementation status	Supporting document

II. Work performed and results obtained within the dissertation research

III. Status of thematic seminars and other research components

IV. Status of preparation and publication of scientific publications (title, authorship/co-authorship, journal, review/publication status, DOI/link, where available)

V. Participation in scientific conferences (event, date, venue, title of presentation and supporting document)

VI. Difficulties identified during the research process and measures planned to address them

VII. Activities planned for the following semester

VIII. Formative assessment and feedback of the scientific supervisor/co-supervisor

The assessment shall take into account implementation of the individual research plan, the volume and quality of completed work, consistency of research activities, and compliance with academic integrity requirements.

- ☐ Research progress is satisfactory
- ☐ Research progress is partially satisfactory and requires improvement
- ☐ Research progress is unsatisfactory

Identified deficiencies	
Activities requiring improvement	
Support required by the doctoral student	

Recommendations	
Deadline for completion/reassessment	
Result of reassessment (where applicable)	

Doctoral student's comments/position: _____

Doctoral student's full name and signature: _____ Date: _____

Scientific supervisor/co-supervisor's full name and signature: _____ Date: _____

Date submitted to the Head of the Doctoral Programme: _____

Date submitted to the Administrative Director: _____

Note: The signed report and the written formative assessment contained therein shall be retained in the doctoral student's personal file.

Annex No. 12

Professor Assistantship Assessment Form

(to be assessed by the Professor Assistantship Supervisor)

----- Professor Assistantship Supervisor
 ----- Doctoral Candidate's Last Name, First
 Name

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Scope	Earned Points	Notes
Substantive preparation of the teaching topics and academic demonstration of legal knowledge	Maximum 15		
Planning and conducting seminars under the supervisor's guidance, using modern teaching methods and academic communication	Maximum 15		
Preparation of learning and assessment tasks and relevant assessment criteria	Maximum 20		
Participation in the assessment of students' work and preparation of formative feedback under the supervisor's guidance	Maximum 20		
Overall cumulative evaluation	70		

Evaluator's signature:

Date:



Annex No. 13

Professor Assistantship Assessment Form

(to be assessed by the relevant administrative representative of the School)

Doctoral Candidate's Last Name, First Name

Administration Member's Last Name, First Name

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Scope %	Earned Points	Notes
Completeness and structure of the report, supporting evidence, and reflective assessment of the activities	Maximum 10		
Substantive and pedagogical analysis of the teaching activities carried out	Maximum 10		
Clear and professional presentation of the report and reasoned responses to questions	Maximum 10		
Overall Evaluation Score	30		

Overall Evaluation

Assessment calculation rule: the assessment of the Professor Assistantship Supervisor amounts to a maximum of 70 points, and the assessment of the relevant administrative representative of the School amounts to a maximum of 30 points. Award of credit requires at least 42 points in the interim assessment, at least 18 points in the final assessment, and at least 60 points in the unified final assessment.

Evaluator's Signature:

Date: