

Caucasus University School of Law
Regulations of the Master's Program
Chapter I

General Provisions

Article 1. Scope of Regulation of Provisions

This provision has been developed in accordance with the Law of Georgia on "Higher Education" and regulates the principles and rules of the functioning of the Master's program at the School of Law of Caucasus University, as well as the minimum standards necessary for the implementation of the Master's program and the awarding of the academic degree of Master at the School of Law of Caucasus University.

Article 2. The Purpose and Objective of the Master's Program

1. The Master's program at the School of Law of Caucasus University is a second-level academic higher education educational program that includes educational, scientific research, and practical components.
2. The Master's program at the School of Law of Caucasus University aims to deepen the knowledge of law graduates in the field in general or in its specific directions, as well as to prepare researchers.

Chapter II
Studying in the Master's Program

Article 3. Master's Educational Programme in Law

1. The Master's educational programme in law comprises a total of 120 ECTS credits. The programme consists of two consecutive parts, each comprising 60 ECTS credits.
2. The first part of the programme comprises the study, specialisation, professional and practical components defined by the programme. Upon full completion of the requirements of the first part of the programme and accumulation of 60 ECTS credits, the student is awarded the qualification of Master of Laws (LL.M.).
3. The second part of the programme comprises the research and analytical components defined by the programme, including preparation and defence of a master's thesis. Upon full completion of the requirements of the second part of the programme, accumulation of an additional 60 ECTS credits and successful defence of the master's thesis, the student is awarded the qualification of Master of Research in Law.
4. Completion of the first part of the programme is a prerequisite for continuing studies in the second part, except in the case provided for by these Regulations where a person has achieved the learning outcomes and obtained the credits corresponding to the first part of the programme at another higher education institution.
5. The structure, components, learning outcomes, allocation of credits, admission prerequisites and forms of assessment for each part of the programme are determined by the relevant educational programme.

Article 4. Admission Prerequisites for the Programme

1. Admission to the relevant part of the Master's educational programme in law is conducted on a competitive basis, within the number of places announced in advance.
2. The prerequisites for admission to the first part of the programme are:
 - a) possession of a Bachelor's degree in law or an equivalent academic degree;
 - b) successful completion of the Common Master's Examination, except in cases provided for by the legislation of Georgia;
 - c) confirmation of English-language proficiency at no lower than B2 level;
 - d) successful completion of an examination and/or interview organised by the University;
 - e) satisfaction of any other prerequisites defined by the educational programme.
3. After completing the first part of the programme, a student is entitled to continue studies in the second part without retaking the Common Master's Examination, provided that five years have not elapsed since the student's admission to the first part and the student satisfies the other prerequisites for admission to the second part.
4. After expiry of the five-year period specified in paragraph 3 of this Article, a person wishing to enrol in the second part of the programme must pass the Common Master's Examination and satisfy the other prerequisites defined by the educational programme.

5. Where the first 60 ECTS credits of the same or a relevant Master's educational programme comprising at least 120 credits have been obtained at another higher education institution, admission to the second part of the programme is permitted on the basis of passing the Common Master's Examination, recognition of the credits obtained and satisfaction of the other prerequisites defined by the educational programme.

6. English-language proficiency is confirmed by an appropriate international certificate, an internal examination organised by the University, or another document defined by the educational programme and the University's internal legal acts. A person who has completed an appropriate higher education programme or part of a programme in English and can confirm this by an appropriate document is exempt from the English-language examination.

7. In cases provided for by the legislation of Georgia, admission to the programme without passing the Common Master's Examination is conducted in accordance with the procedure established by legislation and the University's internal legal acts.

8. A student's admission to the relevant part of the programme and acquisition of student status are carried out in accordance with the legislation of Georgia and the University's internal legal acts.

Article 5. Submission of Documents

1. A person wishing to study in the relevant part of the Master's programme in law must submit the following within the period determined by the University:

- a) an application addressed to the President of the University;
- b) a copy of an identity document;
- c) certified copies of the document confirming a Bachelor's or equivalent academic degree and its supplement;
- d) a photograph in electronic form;
- e) for a person subject to military registration — a document confirming military registration;
- f) a certificate confirming successful completion of the Common Master's Examination or a printout of the scores obtained in the Common Master's Examination;
- g) a document confirming English-language proficiency, where submission of such a document is required under Article 4 of these Regulations;
- h) any other document required by the University where the necessity of its submission arises from the legislation of Georgia or the University's internal legal acts.

2. In addition to the documents specified in paragraph 1 of this Article, a person wishing to study in the second part of the programme must submit a document and academic transcript confirming accumulation of at least 60 ECTS credits and achievement of the relevant learning outcomes within the first part of the programme, unless that information or documentation is already held by the University.

3. Where a person wishing to study in the second part of the programme completed the first part at another higher education institution, the person must additionally submit information on the relevant educational programme, completed study components, accumulated credits, grades received and learning outcomes achieved, as necessary to determine the correspondence of the credits and learning outcomes.

4. Where a document confirming education received abroad is submitted, the person must also submit a document confirming recognition of that education in Georgia, except in cases provided for by the legislation of Georgia. Foreign-language documents must be submitted together with a Georgian translation certified in accordance with the procedure established by law.

5. Where necessary, the University is entitled to require the person to present the originals or duly certified copies of submitted documents and to verify the information contained therein.

6. Where the submitted documentation is incomplete or contains a remediable defect, the person is granted a reasonable period determined by the University to complete the documentation or remedy the defect. Failure to remedy the defect within the prescribed period may constitute grounds for leaving the application without consideration.

7. A document or information already held by the University or available to the University through an electronic system provided for by law need not be submitted again.

Article 6. Admission to Interview

1. A candidate who submits the required documentation within the established period and satisfies the admission prerequisites defined by the programme is admitted to the interview for the relevant part of the programme.

2. A person wishing to enrol in the first part of the programme undergoes an interview organised by Caucasus University School of Law. The interview assesses the candidate's subject knowledge and understanding of legal issues, analytical and critical thinking, legal argumentation and oral communication skills, as well as motivation to study on the programme and professional goals.

3. A person wishing to continue studies or enrol in the second part of the programme undergoes a subject-specific interview with the Master's Admissions Commission of Caucasus University School of Law. The

interview assesses the candidate's achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme, subject knowledge, research and analytical skills, readiness to prepare a master's thesis and understanding of the principles of academic integrity.

4. A person wishing to enrol in the first or second part of the programme who has neither confirmed English-language proficiency at no lower than B2 level by the relevant document defined by the programme nor has grounds for exemption from the English-language examination must take an internal English-language examination organised by the University.

5. The internal English-language examination verifies that the candidate possesses English-language proficiency at no lower than B2 level. The examination includes tasks assessing reading, writing and language competence. The procedure for conducting and assessing the examination is determined by the relevant legal act of the University.

6. The examination and/or interview is conducted by an Admissions Commission established by the relevant legal act of the University. Each member of the Commission independently assesses the candidate on the basis of predetermined criteria and completes an individual assessment form.

7. The assessment criteria, allocation of points and assessment indicators for the interview of a person wishing to enrol in the first part of the programme are determined by Part 1 of Annex No. 6 to these Regulations; those for the subject-specific interview of a person wishing to continue studies or enrol in the second part are determined by Part 2 of Annex No. 6.

8. The candidate's final assessment is determined on the basis of the arithmetic mean of the points awarded by the Commission members and rounded to two decimal places. The examination and/or interview is deemed successfully completed if the candidate receives at least 51 points on a 100-point assessment scale and, where applicable, satisfies the additional minimum requirement established by the relevant annex to these Regulations.

9. Where the difference between the highest and lowest scores awarded to a candidate by members of the Commission is 30 points or more, the Commission reconsiders the candidate's assessment. The outcome of the reconsideration and the reasons for the decision are recorded in the Commission's summary minutes.

10. The interview results, the candidate's final assessment and the Commission's decision are recorded in the summary minutes of the Admissions Commission.

Article 7. Admission to the Programme and Continuation of Studies in the Second Part

1. A candidate is entitled to enrol in the relevant part of the programme or continue studies in the second part if the candidate satisfies the admission prerequisites defined by the programme and successfully completes the examination and/or interview provided for by Article 6 of these Regulations.
2. Where there is competition, the right to enrol in the relevant part of the programme or continue studies in the second part is obtained in accordance with the ranking compiled on the basis of candidates' final assessments, within the number of places announced in advance.
3. Completion of the first part of the programme at Caucasus University does not automatically confer the right to continue studies in the second part. The student must satisfy all prerequisites for admission to the second part of the programme.
4. A person's admission to the first or second part of the programme, as well as continuation of studies in the second part, is formalised by the relevant individual legal act of the University.
5. A study agreement is concluded between the University and the student.
6. The student enjoys the rights granted by the legislation of Georgia and the University's internal legal acts and must fulfil the obligations established by the legislation of Georgia, the educational programme, the study agreement and the University's internal legal acts.

Article 8. Semester Registration, Cancellation of Registration

Passing semester registration by the master's student indicates the student's readiness to participate in the educational process. A request for cancellation of semester registration or change of the selected subject is allowed within two weeks from the start of the educational process. After this period, the student loses the right to a refund of the paid amount and/or the right to use this amount in the next semester. Registration for the research component is not canceled.

Article 9. Suspension of Student Status

The grounds for the suspension of student status for a master's student are defined by the regulation on student status.

Article 10. Termination of Student Status

The termination of student status is defined by the regulation on student status.

Article 11. Development and Presentation of the Master's Programme

1. The development of the master's program is carried out:
 - a. by a person or group of persons designated by order of the President of the University;**
 - b. together with a partner university.**
2. The master's program is led (co-led) by a professor, associate professor of the School of Law at Caucasus University.
3. The project of the master's program and the candidacy of the program director (co-director) will be submitted for consideration to the council of the School of Law by the dean of the School of Law. In case of a positive conclusion from the council of the School of Law, the program and the candidacy of the program director (co-director) will be sent for expertise to the Department of Quality Assurance and, in case of a positive conclusion, will be submitted for approval to the president of Caucasus University.
4. The master's program must include syllabi of the courses defined by the master's program.
5. The following may participate in the implementation of the master's program:
 - a. University academic staff;**
 - b. A researcher with a PhD in law from a partner educational or research institution;**
 - c. An invited specialist with the relevant academic degree specified in the master's program.**
6. The master's program must include:
 - a. The name of the master's program;**
 - b. The academic degree to be awarded;**
 - c. Information about the master's program directors;**
 - d. a qualification profile of the Master's programme (the purpose and relevance of the programme, expected outcomes, the graduate's field-specific qualification, knowledge, competences and skills, and areas of employment);**
 - e. prerequisites for admission to the Master's programme;**
 - f. the structure of the Master's programme;**
 - g. a detailed description of the research component;**
 - h. information on the programme's material, technical and financial resources;**
 - i. information on the personnel implementing the programme.**
7. When developing the program with the participation of the partner university, in addition to point 6 of this article, the partner university must be indicated in the program and a contract regarding the implementation of the joint master's program with the partner university must be attached.

Article 12. Volume and Structure of the Master's Educational Programme

1. The volume of the Master's educational program at the School of Law is 120 ECTS credits. The program consists of two consecutive parts, each with a volume of 60 ECTS credits. The standard duration of the program is two academic years, while the standard duration of each part is one academic year.
2. Despite the structure consisting of two consecutive parts, the Master's educational program in law represents a unified educational program. The parts of the program ensure the gradual, sequential, and interrelated development of learning outcomes and corresponding competencies.
3. The student's study load during one academic year typically amounts to 60 ECTS credits and should not exceed 75 ECTS credits. One ECTS credit is equivalent to 25 hours and includes both the student's contact load and the time allocated for independent work.
4. The first part of the program – the professional and specialization part – includes theoretical, professional, and practical components. It focuses on the student's specialization in one or more areas of law, the development of professional and practical competencies, and the formation of the ability to analyze and solve complex legal problems.
5. As part of the first part of the program, the student is required to:
 - a) complete the mandatory courses specified by the program;
 - b) choose a module in private law, criminal law, or public law and complete one mandatory and at least two elective courses from the chosen module;
 - c) complete one course from the English-language component of international law;
 - d) complete a practical module of 15 ECTS credits, in accordance with this provision and the rules specified by the program;
 - e) accumulate the remaining credits by completing courses specified for the chosen specialization module, other modules, or free credits.
6. The second part of the program – the research and analytical part – includes a research and methodological component of 30 ECTS credits and a scientific research component of 30 ECTS credits – the completion and defense of a master's thesis. The second part of the program is focused on the development of the student's in-depth theoretical and analytical knowledge, research competencies, and the ability to independently analyze and solve complex legal problems.
7. After the standard period of the first part of the program – one academic year – has expired, in the case of full non-fulfillment of the relevant components, the student has the right to complete the first part of the program additionally, for no more than two semesters.

8. After the standard period of the second part of the program – one academic year – has expired, in the case of full non-fulfillment of the relevant educational or research components, the student has the right to complete the second part of the program additionally, for no more than four semesters.

9. During the additional semesters provided for in paragraphs 7 and 8 of this article, the student retains student status. The tuition fee for each additional semester is determined according to the number of credits to be earned in the semester, proportionally to the annual tuition fee established for the program.

Chapter IV

Practical Component

Article 13. Practical Module

1. The practical module is a compulsory component of the first part of the Master's educational programme in law and comprises 15 ECTS credits.
2. The purpose of the practical module is to apply the theoretical knowledge acquired by the student in practice and develop the skills necessary for professional activity.
3. The practical module is implemented through completion by the student of one of the following study components:
 - a) clinical education in a public, private or non-entrepreneurial (non-commercial) organisation that is a partner of Caucasus University School of Law;
 - b) clinical education in a law clinic operating within Caucasus University;
 - c) the “Practical Course in the Professional Processing of Legal Texts (Alternative to Internship)”.
4. Clinical education is a practice-oriented study component under which the student participates, in a real professional environment or one approximating it as closely as possible, in the consideration of legal cases, identification and resolution of legal problems, retrieval and analysis of legal information, legislation and case law, formulation of a substantiated legal position, preparation of legal documents and professional communication.
5. A student is entitled, instead of clinical education, to take the “Practical Course in the Professional Processing of Legal Texts (Alternative to Internship)”. This course provides for the professional processing, preparation and analysis of various types of legal texts and documents; retrieval, evaluation and use of relevant legal sources and case law; formulation of a substantiated legal position; and development of professional legal communication skills.
6. The 15 ECTS credits assigned to the practical module are awarded to the student on the basis of fulfilment of the requirements and achievement of the learning outcomes defined by the syllabus of the study component selected by the student.
7. The conditions for implementation of each study component of the practical module, the student's workload, practical assignments to be completed, learning outcomes, assessment forms, components and criteria are determined by the relevant syllabus.

Article 14. Assessment of the Practical Module

Within the framework of the practical module, the student's assessment is carried out in accordance with the assessment forms, components, and criteria defined in the syllabus of the chosen study component.

The assessment is based on the practical assignments completed by the student and the legal products prepared, and it determines the extent to which the student has achieved the learning outcomes defined by the corresponding study component.

The prerequisite for the allocation of 15 ECTS credits provided by the practical module is the successful completion of the corresponding educational component and the achievement of the learning outcomes defined in its syllabus.

Chapter V

Approval of the title of the master's thesis

Article 15. Purpose and Elements of the Research Component

1. The purpose of the research component of the master's educational program is to develop the student's ability to independently conduct research in the selected field, present the results achieved, and publicly argue their reasoning.
2. The research component of the master's educational program includes the completion and defense of the master's thesis as mandatory elements.

Article 16. Selection of the Master's Thesis Topic and Supervisor

1. The master's student selects the topic and supervisor (co-supervisor) of the master's thesis within the framework of the relevant master's program, after completing the first part of the program and being admitted to the second part. The topic of the master's thesis must correspond to the direction of the master's program and the thematic focus of one of the special modules provided by the program.

2. The master's student selects the topic of the master's thesis in agreement with the supervisor and presents it to the academic manager of the master's program:
 - a) The application for the master's thesis topic, which includes the title of the topic and the proposed structure of the thesis, according to Appendix No. 1;
 - b) The CV of the supervisor;
 - c) The recommendation letter of the supervisor.
 If there is a co-supervisor, the CV and recommendation letter of the co-supervisor must also be submitted.
3. The documents provided for in paragraph 2 of this article must be submitted:
 - a) for the autumn semester — from September 1 to September 10;
 - b) for the spring semester — from February 1 to February 10.

Article 17. Supervisor/Co-supervisor of the Master's Thesis

1. The supervisor/co-supervisor of the master's thesis of the master's student may be:
 - a. a University professor, associate professor or assistant professor holding a doctoral degree in law;**
 - b. a holder of a doctoral degree in law from a partner educational or research institution;**
 - c. an invited specialist holding an academic degree.**
2. The co-supervisor of the master's thesis can be a specialist in the field who has at least three years of practical experience in the subfield/narrow specialty in which the master's thesis is being completed.
3. The supervisor of the master's thesis must have published a scientific paper/article in the subfield in which the master's thesis is being completed within the last five years.
4. If the supervisor of the master's thesis refuses to supervise, he is obliged to submit a reasoned and substantiated statement to the head of the master's program, but no later than one month after the approval of the topic.
5. The master's student has the right to submit a reasoned and substantiated statement to the head of the master's program regarding the change of the master's thesis supervisor, but no later than one month after the approval of the topic. Master's thesis supervisor
6. With a joint substantiated request from the master's student and the master's thesis supervisor, the topic of the master's thesis may be changed within the same master's program no later than one semester before the defense of the master's thesis. In this case, the student is obliged to go through the necessary procedures for re-registering the master's thesis topic.
7. The master's thesis supervisor (co-supervisor) is obliged to assist the student in selecting the topic, preparing the plan, and processing the bibliography, to gradually check the process of working on the topic, to express comments, and in case of misdirection of the research, to assist the author in its correction, and to periodically provide developmental feedback;
8. After the completion of the thesis, the master's thesis supervisor (co-supervisor) prepares a written conclusion, which must include:
 - a. the title of the thesis;**
 - b. the author's identity;**
 - c. a brief overview of the thesis;**
 - d. the identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis with appropriate notes and recommendations;**
 - e. the reasons for recommending or not recommending the thesis for defence;**
9. The supervisor cannot be a member of the defense commission and does not participate in the evaluation of the master's thesis score and the decision-making of the commission. The supervisor is authorized to attend the public defense and, at the request of the commission, provide factual information related to the thesis execution process.
10. When preparing the conclusion on the thesis, the evaluation criteria defined by Annex No. 2 of this provision are used.

Article 18. Master's Student Mentor

1. From the registration for the research component until the public defense of the master's thesis, the master's student has the right to consult with a mentor on issues related to the preparation of the thesis.
2. A person with a doctoral or master's degree in law, who has experience in academic or scientific research activities and a proper knowledge of legal research methods, academic writing, and citation rules, may be selected as a mentor.
 1. The decision on the selection of mentors and the involvement of graduate students in advisory activities is made by the Dean of the Caucasus School of Law.
 2. The mentor conducts no fewer than three one-hour advisory meetings during the semester. The schedule and format of the meetings are determined in agreement with the mentor by the program's administrative director.
 3. The mentor provides consultation to the graduate student on issues related to the research topic, thesis design and structure, research methods, sourcing and evaluation of resources, academic writing, citation, and academic integrity.

4. The mentor is required to act impartially, uphold professional ethics, maintain confidentiality, and respect the academic independence of the graduate student, and in the event of a conflict of interest, inform the Dean of the school about it.
5. The mentor does not replace the supervisor of the master's thesis and does not participate in the decision-making process regarding admission to the thesis defense, reviewing, evaluation, and defense committee decisions.
8. Consulting with the mentor is the right of the graduate student. Absence from the consultation cannot be a basis for ineligibility for the thesis defense or a reduction in evaluation.

Chapter VI

Preparation, submission, and defense of the master's thesis

Article 19. Master's Thesis

1. The research component involves the independent research conducted by the master's student in the relevant field, the results of which are reflected in the master's thesis formatted in the required manner. The master's thesis should represent the results of the master's student's independent scientific-research work.
2. During the defense of the thesis, the master's student must present the work they have completed and demonstrate the ability to participate in the discussion.
The master's thesis must be completed in the Georgian language, with orthographic, stylistic, and In accordance with the form and rules established by the present provision, without grammatical omissions.
3. The volume, format, style, and other technical specifications of this master's thesis are determined by the present regulation.

Article 20. Submission, Verification and Admission of the Master's Thesis to Public Defence

1. The student will submit the initial electronic version of the master's thesis, along with the written conclusion of the supervisor, to the authorized person of the law school within the established deadlines:
 - (a) In the fall semester - from January 8 to January 15;
 - b) In the spring semester — from May 20 to May 31. Include.
2. The authorized person of the law school checks the formal and technical compliance of the submitted master's thesis and the attached documentation with the requirements defined by this provision. This verification does not include a substantive or academic assessment of the thesis.
3. If the master's thesis or accompanying documentation is presented with formal or technical defects, an authorized person from the law school will notify the student and set a reasonable deadline for correcting the defect. A violation of the formal or technical requirements defined by this provision regarding the formatting, format, completeness of documentation, or technical submission requirements is considered a formal or technical defect. Correcting the defect cannot involve substantive or essential revisions to the content of the master's thesis.
4. After fulfilling the requirements set forth in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this article, the student uploads the master's thesis to the plagiarism detection program within the timeframe specified by the administration.
5. The plagiarism check of the master's thesis is carried out in accordance with the "Rules for Checking Students' Work in the Plagiarism Detection and Prevention Program ('Turnitin') in effect at the university. The results of the check are reviewed by the supervisor, who provides the relevant information to the authorized person of the law school.
6. The master's thesis must be accompanied by a written conclusion from the supervisor, reflecting the periodic developmental assessment given to the student during the process of working on the thesis, and it is prepared in accordance with the criteria specified in Annex No. 2.
7. A positive written conclusion from the supervisor, the results of the plagiarism check, and the fulfillment of other requirements defined by this provision are prerequisites for the subsequent evaluation of the master's thesis and admission to the public defense.
8. After fulfilling the prerequisites defined in paragraph 7 of this article, the student submits the final electronic version of the master's thesis in PDF format and one bound printed copy to the administrative director of the law master's educational program.
9. After fulfilling the requirements set forth in this article, the master's thesis is submitted to the reviewer or reviewers for the purpose of preparing a written evaluation and review.
10. After reviewing the master's thesis, the reviewer prepares a written review based on the criteria defined by this provision. The scoring of the master's thesis is carried out after the public defense is completed, according to the rules defined in Article 24 of this provision.
11. In the case of a negative written conclusion from the supervisor, the master's thesis will not be allowed for further evaluation and public defense, except in cases provided for by this article.
12. If the student disagrees with the supervisor's negative conclusion, they have the right to appeal the conclusion officially, including in electronic form, within 5 working days of receiving it.
13. The student shall submit a reasoned complaint to the president of the university, clearly indicating the specific grounds for appealing the supervisor's conclusion.

14. The admissibility of the complaint is verified by the president of the university or an authorized person designated by them. The complaint is admissible if it is submitted within the deadline and the grounds for appealing the supervisor's conclusion are reasoned and substantiated.
15. A reasoned decision on the inadmissibility of the complaint will be communicated to the student in writing.
16. In the case of recognizing the complaint as admissible, the president of the university or an authorized person designated by them, based on the submission of the dean of the law school, appoints a specialist in the relevant field.
17. The field specialist must be independent and impartial. They cannot be the supervisor, co-supervisor, or reviewer of the master's thesis, nor can they be a person who has a conflict of interest with the student, supervisor, co-supervisor, or the subject under consideration.
18. In the event of a conflict of interest, the field specialist is obliged to declare self-exclusion. In such cases, another field specialist is appointed in accordance with the procedure defined by this article.
19. The master's thesis and the supervisor's conclusion are provided to the field specialist in such a way as to ensure the confidentiality of the identities of the student and the supervisor as much as possible.
20. The field specialist prepares a reasoned written conclusion within 10 working days from the receipt of the relevant documentation.
21. If the negative conclusion of the master's thesis supervisor remains in force as defined by this article, the master's student will not be allowed to have the master's thesis reviewed and publicly defended, and will not receive a final assessment of the research component in the current semester. The master's student is obliged to retake the relevant research component and revise the master's thesis in accordance with the rules defined by this provision and the educational program.
22. If the conclusion of the field specialist is positive and differs from the negative conclusion of the supervisor, the master's thesis will be allowed for further evaluation and public defense in accordance with the rules defined by this provision.
23. In the case provided for in paragraph 22 of this article, the supervisor has the right to attend the meeting of the defense commission with advisory voting rights, but he does not participate in the evaluation of the master's thesis score.

Article 21. Review of the Master's Thesis

1. Following submission of the master's thesis and receipt of the supervisor's positive conclusion provided for by Article 17 of these Regulations, the Dean of the School of Law, in agreement with the Head of the Master's educational programme, decides on the appointment of a reviewer no later than 10 calendar days after submission of the thesis.
2. The reviewer may be a person holding a doctoral or equivalent academic degree who has published, during the preceding five years, a scholarly work related to the field of the relevant Master's educational programme. The reviewer may not be the supervisor or co-supervisor of the respective master's thesis.
3. The reviewer must prepare a written review and submit it to the administration of the School of Law within 20 calendar days after receiving the master's thesis.
4. Before the public defence, the reviewer prepares a written review on the basis of the criteria established by Article 24(4) and Annex No. 3 to these Regulations. No score is indicated in the written review. The review must include:
 - a) the title of the master's thesis;
 - b) a reasoned assessment of the thesis under each criterion;
 - c) the strengths and areas for improvement of the thesis, comments and recommendations;
 - d) a reasoned conclusion concerning submission of the master's thesis for public defence.
5. The reviewer assesses the written component of the master's thesis with a maximum of 40 points. This assessment forms part of the 100-point assessment of the master's thesis and is determined in accordance with Article 24 and Annex No. 3 to these Regulations.
6. The review must be confirmed by the reviewer's signature and indicate the date on which it was prepared.
7. Where, due to objective circumstances, including an accident, illness or another valid reason, the reviewer is unable to prepare the review within the prescribed period, the Dean of the School of Law, upon the recommendation of the Administrative Director of the Master's educational programmes and in agreement with the Head of the Master's educational programme, appoints a new reviewer. The period for submission of the review by the new reviewer is calculated from the date on which the master's thesis is delivered to that reviewer.
8. The review is sent to the master's student no later than seven calendar days after its submission. At the public defence, the master's student is entitled to present a reasoned response to the comments and assessments expressed in the review.
9. The reviewer's conclusion concerning submission of the master's thesis for public defence does not restrict the authority of the Defence Commission to assess the public defence independently in accordance with the procedure established by these Regulations.

Article 22. Master's Thesis Defence Commission

1. The date of the master's thesis defense, the composition of the defense commission, and the chairperson of the commission are determined by the president of the university based on the submission of the relevant school dean.
2. The master's thesis defense commission consists of no fewer than 3 and no more than 5 members.
3. A member of the master's thesis defense commission may be a professor or associate professor of the university, as well as another person with a doctoral or equivalent academic degree, who has been engaged in scientific research in the last 5 years.
4. The supervisor of the master's thesis and the reviewer cannot be members of the defense commission. The supervisor does not participate in the scoring of the thesis and the decision-making of the commission. The reviewer evaluates the thesis according to the provisions of this regulation and Annex No. 3 and writes the corresponding score, but does not participate in the evaluation of the thesis and the final decision-making by the defense commission. The supervisor and the reviewer are authorized to attend the public defense and provide information related to the issues under consideration at the request of the commission.
5. The activities of the defense commission are led by the chairperson of the commission, who conducts the public defense of the master's thesis and the closed concluding session of the commission, ensuring that the defense and evaluation are carried out in accordance with established procedures.
6. Each member of the defense commission evaluates the public defense individually. The evaluation of the public defense is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the scores given by the commission members. The commission makes decisions on organizational and procedural matters by a majority of the votes of the members present at the meeting.
7. A member of the commission is obliged to declare the existence of a conflict of interest regarding the relevant master's thesis. In the case of a conflict of interest, they do not participate in the defense and evaluation of this thesis. In the event of the absence of a commission member, the defense can only take place if the quorum defined in paragraph 6 of this article is present.

Article 23. Defence of the Master's Thesis

1. The master's student will be allowed to defend the master's thesis after the full completion of the educational and practical components. The defense of the master's thesis is public, and during its course, the master's student will present the results of the research conducted within the framework of the thesis.
2. The defense process includes the public presentation of the master's thesis by the master's student before the defense commission. Typically, the supervisor and the reviewer attend the public defense. The inability of the supervisor or reviewer to participate in the defense process does not hinder the conduct of the defense, provided that the requirements regarding the powers of the defense commission defined by this regulation are met.
3. The master's student who is abroad on the day of the thesis defense is entitled to submit a request to the president of Caucasus University and to present the master's thesis remotely via an electronic platform. In this case, the thesis is evaluated in full compliance with the assessment rules defined by this provision.
4. At the beginning of the commission meeting, the representative of the law school announces the identity of the master's student, the topic of the master's thesis, the names of the supervisor and the reviewer, and informs the audience about the procedure for defending the master's thesis.
5. During the presentation, the master's student briefly outlines the main provisions of the thesis, the object of the research, the methods used, the results obtained, and the conclusions. The duration of the presentation should be between 10 to 15 minutes.

After the presentation, the reviewer will publicly present the review. In the absence of the reviewer, the review will be presented publicly by the chairperson of the defense commission or an authorized representative of the law school. After this, the master's student responds to the comments and recommendations made in the review and explains whether they were taken into account. A discussion is then held, during which the master's student answers questions from the members of the defense commission and presents their own position.

Article 24. Assessment of the Master's Thesis

1. The master's thesis is evaluated on a 100-point scale. The final overall assessment consists of the written part of the master's thesis and the evaluations of the public defense.
2. The written part of the master's thesis is evaluated by the reviewer with a maximum of 40 points, while the public defense is evaluated by the defense committee with a maximum of 60 points.
3. The overall final assessment of the master's thesis is determined by summing the evaluations of the written part and the public defense.
4. The reviewer evaluates the written part of the master's thesis within a maximum of 40 points based on the following criteria:
 - a) Relevance of the research problem and clear formulation of the research aim and key issues — 5 points;

- b) Appropriateness of the research methodology and justification of its application — 5 points;
 - c) Identification, selection and proper use of national and international legal, scholarly and other relevant sources — 10 points;
 - d) In-depth and critical analysis of the issue, coherence of argumentation and substantiation of the author's independent position — 10 points;
 - e) Soundness of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations and their consistency with the research aim — 5 points;
 - f) Compliance with academic writing, professional terminology, citation and technical formatting requirements — 5 points.
5. The reviewer prepares a written conclusion before the public defense, which reflects the strengths and areas for improvement of the master's thesis, comments, and recommendations. The score for the written part of the master's thesis is not indicated in the reviewer's conclusion.
6. After the public defense, the reviewer evaluates the written part of the master's thesis based on the criteria defined in paragraph 4 of this article. The score assigned for each criterion and the overall assessment of the written part are reflected by the reviewer in the corresponding evaluation form.
7. Each member of the defense commission evaluates the public defense of the master's thesis based on the following criteria, with a maximum of 60 points:
- a) Clear presentation of the research objective, the research problem, and key issues — 10 points;
 - b) Justification of the research methodology and selection of sources used — 10 points;
 - c) Consistent and convincing presentation of the main results, conclusions, and recommendations of the research — 15 points;
 - d) Providing reasoned and complete answers to questions posed by members of the defense commission — 15 points;
 - e) Appropriate level of argumentation, professional terminology, and academic communication — 5 points;
 - f) Organization of the presentation, time management, and effective use of visual materials — 5 points.
8. The public defence assessment is determined as the arithmetic mean of the scores awarded by the members of the Defence Commission. The reviewer does not participate in the public defence assessment.
9. The overall final assessment of the master's thesis is expressed by the following system:
- a) (A) Excellent — 91–100 points;
 - b) (B) Very good — 81–90 points;
 - c) (C) Good — 71–80 points;
 - d) (D) Satisfactory — 61–70 points;
 - e) (E) Sufficient — 51–60 points;
 - f) (FX) Failed to pass — 41–50 points;
 - g) (F) Fail — 40 points or less.
10. A master's thesis is considered successfully completed and defended if the overall final assessment of the master's student is at least 60 points.
11. Despite the assessment range provided in subparagraph "e" of paragraph 9 of this article, a score of 51–59 points does not qualify the master's thesis as defended, as the master's student does not meet the minimum threshold defined in paragraph 10 of this article.
12. After the public defense is completed, the defense commission summarizes the scores awarded by the commission members in a closed concluding session and determines the assessment of the public defense. At this stage, the reviewer will present the assessment of the written part of the master's thesis. The overall concluding assessment of the master's thesis will be calculated and announced by the head of the research center of the law school by summarizing the assessments of the written part and the public defense.
13. If the master's student's final assessment is between 41 and 59 points, they have the right to submit a revised master's thesis during the next semester, according to the rules established by the university.
14. Where a master's thesis receives 40 points or less — an (F) 'Fail' grade — the master's student loses the right to resubmit the same master's thesis.
15. In the case provided for in paragraph 14 of this article, the master's student has the right to submit a request to the dean of the law school for the approval of a new master's topic within 15 calendar days from the announcement of the assessment results. If the dean's decision is positive, the master's student re-registers for the master's thesis component in the relevant semester, subject to the conditions specified in this regulation.
16. Where an (F) 'Fail' grade is received, one copy of the master's thesis, the reviewer's conclusion, the reviewer's assessment form and the written assessments of the Defence Commission members are transferred to the University archive for safekeeping.
17. A protocol is established regarding the defense of the master's thesis and its results, which is signed by the secretary of the meeting and the members of the defense commission. The protocol will reflect the assessment of the written part of the master's thesis, the assessment of the public defense, and the final overall assessment. The protocol is kept in the master's student's personal file.

Article 25. Appeal of the Master's Thesis Assessment

1. A student is entitled to appeal the assessment of the master's thesis within five calendar days after being officially notified of the assessment result, including by electronic means. A reasoned appeal must be submitted to the President of the University.
2. The subject of the appeal may be a violation of the procedure defined by this provision during the assessment and defense process of the master's thesis, the inappropriate application of pre-established assessment criteria, the incorrect calculation of the final score, inadequate justification of the assessment, the creation of unequal or unfair conditions for the student, a conflict of interest, or any other circumstance that may have had a substantial impact on the assessment result.
3. The appeal must specify the contested assessment or procedural action, the specific grounds for the appeal, relevant circumstances, and the student's request. The appeal should be accompanied by relevant evidence, if available.
4. After receiving the appeal, its admissibility is verified. The appeal is admissible if it is submitted within the timeframe specified by this article, meets the requirements established in paragraph 3 of this article, and pertains to the issues defined in paragraph 2 of this article. An appeal submitted after the deadline may only be accepted if the student justifies the delay with a valid reason.
5. The appeal shall be reviewed by an appeals commission consisting of no less than three members, whose composition is approved by the university president upon the recommendation of the school dean. The commission must include a specialist in the relevant field. If necessary, a representative from another educational program, school, university, or relevant professional field may be invited as a member of the commission.
6. A member of the appeals commission cannot be a person who participated in the supervision, review, public defense, evaluation, or decision-making of the contested work. The commission member must not have a conflict of interest with the student, the supervisor of the work, the reviewer, or a member of the defense commission. In such circumstances, the member is obliged to declare self-exclusion. The student is entitled to request the exclusion of a commission member by indicating the relevant circumstances, and the decision is made by the university president.
7. The appeals commission does not conduct a re-evaluation of the master's thesis and does not replace the professional judgment of the defense commission. It checks the compliance of the evaluation and defense process with this provision, the correctness of the application of evaluation criteria, the calculation of the final score, the justification of the evaluation, procedural fairness, and the existence of a conflict of interest.
8. The Appeals Commission is authorized to request documents and written explanations necessary for the consideration of the case, to summon the student, the supervisor of the work, the reviewer, a member of the defense commission, or other relevant persons, and to provide them with the opportunity to present their opinions. The commission will consider the complaint within 10 (ten) working days from the date of its admissibility. Due to the complexity of the case, this period may be extended by the decision of the university president for no more than 10 (ten) working days, of which the student will be informed.
The Appeals Commission is authorized to:
 - a) leave the complaint unexamined if a basis for its inadmissibility is identified;
 - b) not satisfy the complaint;
 - c) fully or partially satisfy the complaint, annul the contested assessment or relevant procedural decision, and return the issue for reconsideration;
 - d) determine the conduct of a re-evaluation or public defense by a new composition of the defense commission in case of a substantial violation.
9. The Appeals Commission only directly changes the assessment in the case of correcting obvious technical or arithmetic errors.
10. The decision of the Appeals Commission must be in writing and substantiated. It should indicate the established factual circumstances, the issues considered, the grounds for the decision, and the outcomes. The decision will be communicated to the student, including in electronic form, within 3 (three) working days from its adoption. The decision of the Appeals Commission is final and is not subject to further appeal within the internal legal mechanisms of the university.

Article 26. Award of Academic Qualifications

1. Upon full completion of the requirements of the first part of the Master's educational programme in law and accumulation of 60 ECTS credits, the student is awarded the qualification of Master of Laws (LL.M.).
2. Upon full completion of the requirements of the second part of the Master's educational programme in law, accumulation of an additional 60 ECTS credits and successful defence of the master's thesis, the student is awarded the qualification of Master of Research in Law.
3. After completion of each part of the programme and award of the relevant qualification, the graduate is issued the appropriate diploma with a standard supplement.
4. The basis for awarding the qualification is the student's full completion of the requirements of the relevant part of the programme, as confirmed by the appropriate documentation prepared by the School of Law.
5. The award of the qualification and issuance of the diploma are formalised in accordance with the procedure established at the University, on the basis of the decision of the relevant authorised body and a legal act of the President of the University.
6. A diploma with honours is issued in compliance with the conditions and procedure established by the relevant internal legal act of the University.

Chapter VII
Volume, Format, Style and
Other Technical Specifications

Article 27. Volume and Structure of the Master's Thesis

1. The volume of the master's thesis must be no less than 50 and no more than 60 pages. The volume includes the introduction, the main part of the thesis, and the conclusion. The title page, application page, annotations, table of contents, list of used literature, and appendices are not included in this volume.
2. The structure of the master's thesis consists of the following sections:
 - 2.1. Title page;
 - 2.2. Application page;
 - 2.3. Annotation (in Georgian and English);
 - 2.4. Contents (Table of Contents);
 - 2.5. List of tables, graphs, and other illustrations (if available);
 - 2.6. Introduction;
 - 2.7. Main body of the text;
 - 2.8. Conclusion;
 - 2.9. List of references used (bibliography);
 - 2.10. Appendices (if available).
3. The optional components of the master's thesis are:
 - 3.1. List of tables, graphs, and other illustrations;
 - 3.2. List of abbreviations used;
 - 3.3. Appendices.
4. The master's thesis must be completed on A4 format (210 × 297 mm) paper with a density of at least 80 g/m². The page orientation should be vertical, and printing should be single-sided. Photographs, tables, diagrams, and other illustrations are usually placed on A4 format pages. If it is necessary to use a larger format, the relevant material may be attached to the thesis as a separate appendix.
6. The main text of the master's thesis must be written in Sylfaen font, size 12 points. The title is formatted in bold font, size 14 points, while the subtitle is in bold font, size 12 points. There should be three spaces between the title and the text, and two spaces between the subtitle and the preceding and following text. The use of condensed fonts is not allowed. The thesis must be printed with a printer of appropriate quality.
7. All pages of the master's thesis must be numbered consecutively. The title page is included in the overall numbering, but the page number is not indicated on it. The introductory parts of the thesis are numbered with lowercase Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc.), while Arabic numerals are used from the introduction to the conclusion of the thesis. The font size for the page number must be at least 10 points. The page number is placed in the lower right part of the page, 1.3 cm from the bottom edge of the sheet and 2.5 cm from the right edge. Repetition or omission of page numbering is not allowed.
8. The line spacing in the main text of the master's thesis should be 1.5. In the table of contents, lists of tables, graphs, and other illustrations, annotations, footnotes, and endnotes, single spacing is used. No additional spacing is used between paragraphs. Tables, graphs, and other illustrations are separated from the text by double spacing.
10. When an abbreviation is first used in the master's thesis, the full name should be provided, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses, which will be used in the subsequent text (for example: Civil Code of Georgia (hereinafter referred to as — CCG)). The use of an abbreviation is not mandatory if the full name appears only once in the text or if its abbreviation creates an unusual and incomprehensible combination of symbols for the reader.
11. Footnotes are placed at the bottom of the corresponding page and are numbered with Arabic numerals, continuously from the beginning to the end of the thesis. The text of the footnote is formatted in 10-point font size and single spacing. The citation of sources used and the formatting of footnotes are carried out in accordance with the rules defined in Article 28 of the present provisions. If necessary, a footnote may contain explanations or additional information related to the main text.

Article 28. Footnote Formatting Rules

1. When using a legal act, it is necessary to indicate its full name and the source in which it was published, as well as the date.
2. When using literary sources, it is necessary to indicate:
 - a. for a book — the author's/authors' surname and first-name initial, the title of the book (without quotation marks), part and volume number (where applicable), place of publication, year and page (without 'p.');**
 - b. for an article in a collection — the author's/authors' surname and first-name initial, the title of the article (without quotation marks), the title of the collection (without quotation marks), the editor, part and volume number (where applicable), place of publication, year and page (without 'p.');**

c. for a journal article — the author's/authors' surname and first-name initial, the title of the article (without quotation marks), the abbreviated name of the periodical, number, year (month and date) and page (without 'p. '); all bibliographic details of a foreign-language source must be provided in the original language or in a language known to the author, with reference to the corresponding official translation;

d. a uniform system must be maintained in footnotes: the author and title of the work must be distinguished by different italicisation; all surnames used, including an editor's surname, must likewise be italicised; units other than the surname and initials must be separated by a semicolon, and a full stop must be placed at the end of the footnote.

- ✓ Ivanidze M., *Alternative Punishments, Trends in the Liberalization of Criminal Law Legislation in Georgia*. Tbilisi, 2016, 342.
- ✓ Shalikashvili M., Mikandadze G., Khasia M., *Law of Execution of Sentences (Manual)* Tbilisi, 2014, 472.

e. material obtained through the Internet requires an indication of the relevant website and the date of the last update; for an article, the author's surname must also be indicated;

f. for decisions of international courts and courts of other countries:

- Court of Justice
For example, Case 16/62, Van Gen en Loos, [1963] ECR 95.
- European Court of Human Rights
For example, Kostovski v. The Netherlands, [1990] ECHR (Ser. A.), 221.
- International Court of Justice
Example: Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions Between Qatar and Bahrain, [1995] ICJ Report.
- In the text of cases and their decisions, it is used in Georgian, but the original language can be noted there or referenced in a footnote in the following order: party against party, year, publishing body, page, court.
Example for the courts of Great Britain: case of Argyll v Argyll ([1967] 1 Ch 302, 324, 332).
- For courts of the United States: Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

g. decisions of national courts must follow the official national citation style. In the absence of a uniform national approach, the author should use the style prevailing in the relevant country;

h. documents of international organisations must be cited in the style officially used by the relevant international organisation (see its official website);

i. conventions and international treaties are cited, for example: 1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer;

j. foreign terms and expressions must be translated in a footnote unless the direct purpose of the work is to determine the origin of the term;

k. Georgian text must use Georgian-style quotation marks, while foreign-language text must use the quotation marks appropriate to that language;

l. at the end of quoted text, punctuation marks — a full stop, colon, semicolon, question mark and exclamation mark — are placed before or after the closing quotation mark in accordance with the applicable language rules.

No. When citing the same source in a footnote that has already been used, the following cases must be distinguished:

- Instead of the source indicated in the previous footnote, "ibid." is referenced. After "ibid." (if necessary), different data (volume, year, page) may be indicated;
- When using a source that was cited earlier but is not the immediate preceding source, the full title of this source must be indicated on the corresponding page.

Article 29. Components of the Master's Thesis

1. The essential components of a master's thesis are:

a. Formal Part:

- 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 Part:

- b.a. Introduction;
- b.b. Main Text;
- b.c. Conclusion.

c. Bibliography.

2. Additional Parts of the Master's Thesis are:

a. List of Tables;

b. Appendices;

Article 30. Formal Part of the Master's Thesis

1. The title page of the master's thesis (cover) must be in standard form. It must include the title of the master's thesis, the name and surname of the author and the supervisor of the master's thesis, as well as the text "The master's thesis is submitted for the academic degree of Master of Law," "Caucasus University," "Tbilisi, Georgia." The number of this page is (I), but it is not indicated (Appendix 5).
2. The title page is filled out according to the rules outlined below:
 - Below the logo, "Caucasus University" must be indicated
 - (font size: 14);
 - 2-3 cm apart, the school is indicated; (font size: 14);
 - 2-3 cm apart, the master's student's name and surname are written in the nominative case (font size: 14);
 - In the middle section, the title of the master's thesis is written (font size: 16; the word "theme" is not to be included and does not need to be placed in quotation marks);
 - After the title, the name of the master's program is written (font size: 14);
 - The academic degree awarded under the title of the master's program, for which the submitted thesis is presented for defense (font size: 14);
 - On the lower right side of the title page, the name, surname, scientific degree, and academic position of the master's thesis supervisor, co-supervisor are written;
 - At the bottom of the title page, in the middle section, the place of completion of the master's thesis, city and year; (e.g., Tbilisi - 2022; font size: 14);
 - (see sample appendix #5)
3. The signature page of the master's thesis (page (II)) must be in standard form. Each copy of the version of the thesis to be presented must have original signatures. This page must include the following text: "Caucasus University", "School of Law", "We, the undersigned, confirm that we have reviewed the master's thesis by [Last Name First Name] titled: [Title] and recommend its consideration by the Council of the School of Law of Caucasus University for the award of the academic degree of Master of Law", date. It must be certified by the signature of the master's thesis supervisor and all reviewers.
4. The copyright page of the master's thesis (page (III)) must be in standard form. The original of the standard version of the master's thesis must have the author's original signature. This page is intended to grant the Caucasus University Library the right to targeted disposal (non-commercial educational purposes for dissemination and referencing). This page must include the text: "Caucasus University", the year of its presentation to the school council, the author's last name, first name, title of the topic, name of the school, the academic degree sought, and the date of the session. It must also include the standard texts "The right to copy and disseminate for non-commercial purposes has been granted to Caucasus University for the purpose of familiarization with the work titled above upon request by individuals or institutions" and "The author retains the remaining copyright-related rights." The author certifies that the necessary permissions have been obtained for the copyrighted materials used in the thesis (except for the small size quotations that require only specific references in the citation of literature, as accepted in the execution of scientific works) and takes responsibility for all of them.
5. The master's thesis summary should include a brief overview of it. It should clearly convey a short content of the completed work. The summary does not contain footnotes, tables, drawings, schemes, and others. The volume of the summary should be between 500 and 800 words. The school council has the right to distribute the summary in both printed and electronic form. The line spacing should be set to single. The summary must be completed in both Georgian and English languages. If the master's thesis is written in another language, then the summary should be attached in Georgian. It is necessary to indicate the name and surname of the master's student on the right side of the English summary, while the exact title of the topic should be placed in the middle section.
6. The master's thesis must contain a table of contents that reflects the exact titles of all chapters and paragraphs of the full text of the master's thesis, sequentially indicating their page numbers on the right side. Page numbering should start from the page following the table of contents, taking into account the number of pages for the title page, application, summary, and content. Pages are numbered at the bottom right corner, using Arabic numerals. The spacing should be 1. The font size should be 12 points. The spacing between paragraphs should be 6-12 points. It is permissible to fill the space between the title and the page number with symbols: " . ", " _ ", " _ ".

Article 31. Main Part of the Master's Thesis

1. The text of the master's thesis should include an introduction, the main text, and a conclusion.
2. The introduction is a general part of the master's thesis, in which the research problem should be presented, the relevance of the research should be defined, its goals and objectives should be established, a hypothesis should be formulated (the author's scientific assumption regarding what he expects to prove as a result of the research), and the methodology (justifying the relevance of the research methods used and showing the

purpose for which each specific method was used in relation to the thesis). The volume of the introduction should not exceed 5% of the volume of the main text.

3. The introduction should reflect:

- The relevance of the topic;
- The goals of the research;
- The objectives of the research;
- The research question/questions and, if necessary, the hypothesis;
- The subject and object of the research;
- The state of research on the problem (literature review);
- The theoretical framework of the research;
- The methodology and methods used for the research;
- The theoretical and practical significance of the paper;

What distinguishes this master's thesis from previous studies.

4. The main text should be divided into chapters/subchapters. Chapters will be numbered sequentially. Subchapters will be assigned their own numbers. The title of the chapter should be written in a 16/14-point font. The text may contain 3-6 chapters, each chapter having 2-5 subchapters. The introduction, each chapter, and the conclusion should start on a new page, while subchapters continue on the same page. The main text should reflect the theoretical context of the research and the conflicting ideas developed within it, controversial issues should be described in detail, the conducted research should be highlighted, its results should be identified, along with personal scientific findings, new perspectives, and approaches.

The structure for evaluating research results depends on the topic of the master's thesis, and the author has the right to present it in the format they prefer. It is not limited by the number of sections.

5. Conclusion – represents the part of the master's thesis that includes the main theoretical and practical results (up to 10% of the total volume of the thesis). The conclusion may include relevant recommendations. The concluding part summarizes the research results, highlights the theoretical and practical value of the thesis, presents scientific novelty, and defines recommendations by demonstrating the area of implementation and their effectiveness of use.

Article 32. Rules for Compiling the Bibliography

1. The bibliography must be presented in a consolidated form in the master's thesis and must be numbered.
2. First, the Georgian normative material (with the date of receipt indicated) should be placed, followed by Georgian scientific literature in alphabetical order. Georgian scientific sources should be followed by Georgian court decisions (from the most recent to the oldest). After the Georgian sources, in the same order, foreign normative material, foreign scientific sources, electronic links (with the date of verification indicated), and foreign court decisions should be placed first. At the end of the scientific literature, the relevant pages should be indicated. In the case of using the same source multiple times in the thesis with references to different pages, the bibliography should indicate the relevant source once and list all the pages that were used in the thesis.

Article 33. Additional Parts of the Master's Thesis

1. If the master's thesis is accompanied by a list of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations, it should be placed in the introductory part of the master's thesis after the table of contents. The interval should be 1.5. A paragraph that exceeds one line in length should have an interval size of 1. The font size should be 12. Page numbers should be placed on the right margin. It is permissible to fill the space between the title and the page number with symbols: ".", "-", "_".
2. The inclusion, location, and formatting of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations are determined by the specifics of the work. 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 should be created in black and white, and the use of colored diagrams and illustrations is also permitted.
3. The titles of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations should be placed directly above or below them. The font size used should be one point smaller than the font size of the main text. The use of bold font is permitted. The interval should be equal to 1.
4. Tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, illustrations, and their titles may be placed both in the main text and on separate individual pages as appendices. Tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations should be separated from the text by 1.5-2 cm. If necessary, horizontal orientation of the page is allowed. The margins and page numbering of horizontal pages should be similar to those of vertical pages.
5. If data tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations are attached to the master's thesis as appendices, they should be placed in the dissertation after the bibliography or list of used literature. At the same time, the numbering of data tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations present in the main text is done continuously. The numbering of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations in the appendix starts anew.

6. For abbreviations used in the master's thesis that are not widely accepted, it is advisable for the author to provide a list and explanation, which will make the thesis easier to understand. The list of used abbreviations should be placed in the introductory part of the master's thesis after the table of contents or list of tables.
7. According to the author's wish, an alphabetical index can be attached to the master's thesis. The alphabetical index should be placed in the introductory part of the master's thesis after the table of contents or the list of tables or the list of abbreviations used.
8. If the master's thesis uses material that is protected by copyright (for example, illustrations, spectra, drawings, etc.), then the author is obliged to obtain permission for its use from the relevant publisher or author. A corresponding letter of copyright permission must be attached to the thesis as an appendix.
9. Citation of sources used in the master's thesis and the formatting of the list of literature used is carried out in accordance with the rules defined by Article 28 of the present provisions.
10. Footnotes are placed at the bottom of the relevant page and are numbered with Arabic numerals, continuously from the beginning to the end of the thesis. Footnotes indicate the sources used, and if necessary, may contain text-related explanations and additional information.

Article 34. Plagiarism

1. The use of others' opinions, phrases, and sentences in the thesis in an improper manner (without citing the literary source) is called plagiarism.
2. Plagiarism (plagiatus in Latin) means something that has been seized. In science, plagiarism refers to the intentional or unintentional presentation of someone else's ideas as one's own. These "ideas" can be printed or electronic material, ranging from simple sentences to entire paragraphs; This may include statistical data, laboratory research results, art samples, etc.
In any case of plagiarism detection, disciplinary actions will be applied to the student, as provided by the university's academic integrity code.

Chapter VIII

Master's program with the participation of a partner university

Article 35. Agreement on the Implementation of the Master's Programme

1. Caucasus University is authorized to jointly implement the master's educational program with higher educational institutions authorized in Georgia and/or higher educational institutions recognized according to the legislation of foreign countries.
2. The implementation of the master's program with the participation of the partner university is regulated by the contract signed with this university and in accordance with the legislation of Georgia and the partner university.
3. Forms of inter-university cooperation are:
 - a. **Organization of joint teaching;**
 - B. **Co-supervision of the master's student;**
 - c. **Recognition of acquired education;**
 - d. **Joint degree awarding.**

Article 36. Application for Admission to the Master's Programme

If a partner university is involved, the candidate for enrollment in the master's program must meet the admission requirements of both universities, which are defined by the contract for the implementation of the joint master's program.

Chapter IX

Funding

Article 37. Sources of Funding

The funds necessary for the financial support of the Master's educational program in law are provided for in the budget of Caucasus University.

Chapter X

Mobility

Article 38. Mobility in the Master's Programme

1. Mobility, both external and internal, in the Master's Educational Program in Law is carried out in accordance with the legislation of Georgia and the internal legal acts established by the university.
2. The compatibility of the learning outcomes achieved by the person wishing to transfer and the recognition of the corresponding credits are determined in accordance with the legislation of Georgia and the internal legal acts of the university.
3. A student enrolled through mobility may continue their studies in the second part of the program only if they meet the admission requirements specified by the educational program and this regulation.

Chapter XI

Transitional and Final Provisions

Article 39. Transitional Provisions

1. These Regulations have no retroactive effect and do not apply to legal relations that arose and were completed before their entry into force. Credits obtained, grades received and study, practical or research components completed before these Regulations entered into force remain valid.
2. A new rule established by these Regulations may also be applied to a student enrolled before their entry into force where it improves the student's legal position, does not conflict with the legislation of Georgia or the requirements of the educational programme, and does not prejudice the rights and legitimate interests of other persons.
3. The updated structure of the educational programme applies to a student enrolled before these Regulations entered into force in the cases and according to the procedure provided for by the legislation of Georgia. In other cases, application of the updated structure is permitted with the student's consent, subject to full recognition of the credits obtained, grades received and learning outcomes achieved by the student.

Article 40. Final Provisions

1. These Regulations, as well as amendments and additions thereto, are approved by an individual administrative act of the President of Caucasus University.
2. The Dean of the School of Law or any member of the School of Law Council is entitled to submit a proposal for amendments or additions to these Regulations. A reasoned proposal is considered by the School Council at its next meeting. If a positive decision is made, the Dean of the School of Law submits the decision adopted by the School Council to the President of Caucasus University for consideration.
3. These Regulations shall enter into force upon signature of the order bringing them into effect.

Appendix No. 1

Caucasus University School of Law Application for a Master's Thesis Topic and Supervisor/Co-supervisor

Master's Programme	
Specialisation Module	☐ Private Law ☐ Criminal Law ☐ Public Law
Student's full name	
Master's thesis title	
Supervisor's full name	
Supervisor's academic degree/position	
Supervisor's status	☐ Academic staff member of Caucasus University ☐ Invited specialist ☐ Representative of a partner institution
Co-supervisor's full name (if applicable)	
Co-supervisor's qualification/practical experience	

Provisional structure of the topic:

Supervisor's consent

☐ I agree to supervise the student during the process of preparing the master's thesis.

Supervisor's signature		Date	____ / ____ / ____
------------------------	--	------	--------------------

Co-supervisor's consent (if applicable)

☐ I agree to co-supervise the student during the process of preparing the master's thesis.

Co-supervisor's signature		Date	____ / ____ / ____
---------------------------	--	------	--------------------

Student's signature: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / ____

Appendix No. 2

**Caucasus University
School of Law**

Conclusion of the Master's Thesis Supervisor/Co-supervisor

Author of the thesis	
Master's thesis title	
Supervisor	
Co-supervisor (if applicable)	

1. Brief overview of the thesis

2. Periodic formative feedback provided to the student during the thesis preparation process

3. Strengths of the thesis

4. Areas for improvement, comments and recommendations

5. Reasoned conclusion concerning submission for public defence

- ☐ I recommend that the master's thesis proceed to further assessment and public defence.
☐ I do not recommend that the master's thesis proceed to further assessment and public defence.

Reasoning:

Supervisor's full name	
Supervisor's signature	
Co-supervisor's full name and signature (if applicable)	
Date of conclusion	____ / ____ / _____

Note: The supervisor's/co-supervisor's conclusion does not include a numerical score.

Caucasus University
School of Law
Master's Thesis Reviewer's Conclusion and Written Component Assessment Form

Author of the thesis	
Master's thesis title	
Reviewer	

I. I. Written Review (completed before the public defence)

1. Relevance of the research problem and clear formulation of the research aim and key issues

2. Appropriateness of the research methodology and justification of its application

3. Identification, selection and proper use of national and international legal, scholarly and other relevant sources

4. In-depth and critical analysis, coherence of argumentation and substantiation of the author's independent position

5. Soundness of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations and their consistency with the research aim

6. Compliance with academic writing, professional terminology, citation and technical formatting requirements

Main strengths of the thesis

Deficiencies, comments and recommendations

Reasoned conclusion concerning submission for public defence

- ☐ Submission of the thesis for public defence is recommended.
☐ Submission of the thesis for public defence is not recommended.

Reasoning:

Reviewer's signature		Date of review	____ / ____ / ____
----------------------	--	----------------	--------------------

Note: No score is indicated in the written review.

II. II. Numerical Assessment of the Written Component of the Master's Thesis
(completed after the public defence)

Author of the Thesis	
Master's Thesis Title	
Reviewer	
Reviewer's Academic Degree/Position	

№	Assessment Criterion	Maximum Score	Score Awarded
1	1. Relevance of the research problem and clear formulation of the research aim and key issues	5	
2	2. Appropriateness of the research methodology and justification of its application	5	
3	3. Identification, selection and proper use of national and international legal, scholarly and other relevant sources	10	
4	4. In-depth and critical analysis, coherent argumentation and substantiation of the author's independent position	10	
5	5. Soundness of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations and their consistency with the research aim	5	
6	6. Compliance with academic writing, professional terminology, citation and technical formatting requirements	5	
	Total Score	40	
Reviewer's Signature		Assessment Date	___ / ___ / ___

Rubric for Assessment of the Written Component

- 1. 1. Relevance of the research problem and clear formulation of the research aim and key issues**
— maximum 5 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
5	The relevance of the problem is fully and convincingly substantiated; the aim and key issues are clear, precise and mutually consistent.
4	The relevance of the problem and the research aim are properly formulated, although one issue requires minor clarification.

3	The relevance and aim are generally discernible, but the reasoning or formulation of key issues is partially incomplete.
2	The relevance is addressed superficially; the aim or key issues are vague and insufficiently interconnected.
1	Only an individual element of the criterion is formally presented and lacks substantive justification.
0	The relevance of the problem, research aim and key issues are not formulated.

2. Appropriateness of the research methodology and justification of its application — maximum 5 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
5	The methodology fully corresponds to the research aim and issues; the use of each method is justified and consistently implemented.
4	The methodology is appropriate and largely justified; only a minor deficiency appears in the explanation or application of a method.
3	The methodology is generally appropriate, but the justification for its selection or its application is partially incomplete.
2	The methodology has limited consistency with the research aim and its application is insufficiently justified.
1	The methods are merely named or are applied inconsistently.
0	The research methodology is not presented or is wholly inappropriate.

3. Identification, selection and proper use of relevant sources — maximum 10 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
10	Relevant, diverse and reliable national and international sources are used; their identification, selection, critical appraisal and integration are exemplary.
9	The source base is diverse, reliable and relevant; sources are properly selected and integrated, with only one negligible deficiency.
8	Sufficient national and international sources are used and handled properly, although one important source or its critical appraisal should be added.
7	Sources are generally relevant and sufficient, but diversity or the quality of integration requires improvement in more than one part.
6	Core sources are used, but international or recent sources are limited and some are integrated superficially.
5	The source base is minimally sufficient; several important sources are omitted and the assessment of the material is mostly descriptive.
4	The source base is insufficient; important national or international sources are omitted and sources are used partly inappropriately or superficially.
3	Few relevant sources are used; selection is fragmented and does not fully support the thesis's principal reasoning.
2	Sources are mostly incidental, outdated or weakly related to the topic; proper integration is almost absent.
1	Only an isolated source is presented and is clearly insufficient for addressing the research issues.
0	Relevant sources have not been identified or used.

4. In-depth and critical analysis, coherent argumentation and independent position — maximum 10 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
10	The analysis is in-depth, critical and comprehensive; argumentation is coherent and convincing; the independent position is clearly and thoroughly substantiated.
9	The analysis is in-depth and critical; argumentation and the independent position are sound, although one line of reasoning requires minor clarification.
8	The analysis is of high quality and the independent position is clear; several arguments require further development or support from sources.
7	The analysis is largely critical and coherent, but descriptive discussion predominates in some parts or the independent position is incompletely developed.
6	The issues are analysed correctly, but critical assessment is uneven; argumentation and substantiation of the independent position partly lack depth.
5	The main analysis is present, but a significant part is descriptive; links between arguments and the independent position are only partly substantiated.
4	The analysis is superficial and fragmented; arguments are weakly connected and the independent position is insufficiently substantiated.
3	Expository discussion predominates; critical analysis is rare and the independent position is vague.
2	Only isolated attempts at analysis appear; argumentation is mostly contradictory or unsupported.
1	A negligible analytical element is present but does not amount to reasoned legal analysis.
0	Analysis, argumentation and an independent position are absent.

5. Soundness of findings, conclusions and recommendations and consistency with the research aim — maximum 5 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
5	The findings, conclusions and recommendations fully follow from the research, are substantiated and precisely correspond to the research aim.
4	The findings and conclusions are substantiated and consistent with the aim; one recommendation requires minor clarification.
3	The main findings and conclusions are discernible, but some are incompletely substantiated or their link to the aim is not fully clear.
2	The findings and conclusions only partly follow from the research; recommendations are general or insufficiently substantiated.
1	The conclusions are fragmented and only formally connected to the research aim.
0	Findings, conclusions and recommendations are not presented.

6. Academic writing, professional terminology, citation and technical formatting — maximum 5 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
5	The thesis is academically and linguistically sound; terminology is precise; citation and technical formatting requirements are fully observed.
4	The thesis is sound, with only negligible linguistic, citation or technical deficiencies.
3	Academic style and terminology are generally observed, although several recurring deficiencies are evident.
2	Numerous linguistic, terminological, citation or technical deficiencies partly impede comprehension.
1	Academic writing and citation rules are substantially breached and comprehension is significantly impeded.
0	The thesis does not meet the criterion.

Caucasus University
School of Law
Master's Thesis Public Defence Assessment Form

Student's Full Name			
Master's Thesis Title			
Full Name of Defence Commission Member			
Academic Degree/Position			
№	Assessment Criterion	Maximum Score	Score Awarded
1	Clear presentation of the research aim, research problem and key issues	10	
2	Justification of the choice of research methodology and sources used	10	
3	Coherent and convincing presentation of the principal findings, conclusions and recommendations	15	
4	Provision of substantiated and comprehensive answers to questions raised by Defence Commission members	15	
5	Appropriate level of argumentation, professional terminology and academic communication	5	
6	Presentation structure, time management and purposeful use of visual materials	5	
	Total Score	60	
Commission Member's Signature		Date	___ / ___ / ____

Public Defence Assessment Rubric

1. Clear presentation of the research aim, research problem and key issues — maximum 10 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
10	The research aim, problem and key issues are presented precisely, fully, clearly and as mutually interconnected.
9	All principal elements are presented clearly and coherently; only one negligible inaccuracy occurs.
8	The aim, problem and key issues are presented correctly, although one element requires minor clarification or development.
7	The principal elements are understandable and interconnected, but several issues are formulated with insufficient specificity.
6	The aim and problem are generally discernible, but some key issues are incomplete or their connection is not entirely clear.
5	The principal elements are presented, but a significant part is general, vague or inadequately interconnected.

Score	Assessment descriptor
4	The presentation is fragmented and superficial; the connection between the aim, problem and issues is weak.
3	Only some principal elements are presented clearly; the remainder are substantially incomplete or vague.
2	The aim, problem or key issues are named only partly and ambiguously.
1	Only one element defined by the criterion is formally presented.
0	The elements defined by the criterion are not presented.

2. Justification of the choice of research methodology and sources used — maximum 10 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
10	The selection of methodology and sources is fully, specifically and convincingly justified; their consistency with the research aim is clearly demonstrated.
9	The selection of methodology and sources is justified to a high standard; only one negligible aspect requires clarification.
8	The grounds for selection are clear and convincing, although justification of one method or group of sources requires further development.
7	The justification is generally sound, but the connection of several choices to the research aim is not fully explained.
6	The principal grounds for selecting methodology and sources are presented, but the justification is partly general or uneven.
5	The grounds for selection are only partly explained; the connection of the methodology or sources to the research aim is insufficiently evident.
4	The justification is superficial; reasons are presented fragmentarily and their connection to the research aim is weak.
3	Only isolated reasons for selecting the methodology or sources are named, without proper argumentation.
2	The methodology and sources are mostly merely listed; genuine justification is almost absent.
1	A method or source is formally mentioned, but its selection is not explained at all.
0	The selection of methodology and sources is not presented.

3. Presentation of the principal findings, conclusions and recommendations — maximum 15 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
15	The findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented fully, precisely, coherently and convincingly; their interrelationship is entirely clear.
14	The presentation is comprehensive and convincing; only one negligible matter requires clarification.
13	All main findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented soundly, although one aspect requires minor further development.
12	The presentation is coherent and substantiated; several minor inaccuracies do not materially affect the overall picture.

Score	Assessment descriptor
11	The main findings and conclusions are well presented, but some recommendations or interconnections require further substantiation.
10	The core content is presented, but coherence or substantiation is incomplete in several parts.
9	The findings and conclusions are generally clear, but recommendations are general or their interrelationship is shown unevenly.
8	Some principal findings are presented, but an important conclusion or recommendation is omitted or insufficiently substantiated.
7	The presentation is fragmented; the connection between findings, conclusions and recommendations is weak.
6	Only several main findings are clearly presented; conclusions and recommendations are incomplete.
5	Findings are presented superficially; conclusions are weakly substantiated and recommendations only partly relate to the research.
4	An isolated finding or conclusion is presented, but its significance and connection to the research are unclear.
3	Several fragmented views are presented and do not create a coherent picture of the research findings.
2	Only one finding or conclusion is mentioned and is insufficiently substantiated.
1	A finding or conclusion is referred to formally but cannot be substantively assessed.
0	The research findings, conclusions and recommendations are not presented.

4. Provision of substantiated and comprehensive answers to Commission questions — maximum 15 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
15	Every question is answered precisely, comprehensively and with substantiation, and is organically connected to the research.
14	Every question is answered correctly and with substantiation; only one negligible detail requires clarification.
13	The answers are comprehensive and reasoned, although one answer requires minor further development.
12	Almost every material aspect of the questions is addressed correctly; several minor inaccuracies occur.
11	The answers are largely correct and substantiated, but one answer is incomplete or requires an additional argument.
10	Most questions are answered correctly, although several answers are partly incomplete or insufficiently reasoned.
9	The principal questions are answered, but depth and connection to the research are uneven.
8	A significant part of the answers is correct, but answers to several material questions are vague or incomplete.
7	The answers are partly correct, but fragmented and weakly substantiated.
6	Some questions are answered correctly, but a material part is superficial or weakly connected to the research.
5	Correct answers are isolated; most answers are incomplete and insufficiently substantiated.

Score	Assessment descriptor
4	The answers are mostly inaccurate; only several relevant views are presented.
3	The answers are superficial, fragmented and often irrelevant to the question.
2	Only one question receives a partly relevant answer.
1	An attempt to answer is evident, but there is no substantively correct and reasoned answer.
0	The student is unable to answer the questions.

5. Argumentation, professional terminology and academic communication — maximum 5 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
5	Argumentation is coherent; terminology is precise; communication is academic, clear and professional.
4	The criterion is properly met, with only a minor deficiency.
3	Argumentation and communication are generally sound, although several inaccuracies or inconsistencies occur.
2	Argumentation is weak; terminological or communication deficiencies partly impede comprehension.
1	Argumentation is fragmented and the requirements of professional communication are substantially unmet.
0	The criterion is not met.

6. Presentation structure, time management and purposeful use of visual materials — maximum 5 points

Score	Assessment descriptor
5	The presentation is clearly structured; the 10–15-minute time limit is observed; visual materials are accurate and purposeful.
4	The presentation is sound, with only a minor deficiency in structure, time management or use of visual materials.
3	The structure is generally discernible, but time management or visual materials are partly ineffective.
2	The presentation is weakly structured; time or visual materials are used inconsistently.
1	The presentation is fragmented and substantially fails to meet the prescribed format.
0	No presentation is delivered.

Caucasus University
School of Law
Templates for the Standard Preliminary Pages of a Master's Thesis
I. Title Page Template

Caucasus University
School of Law
[Full title of the Master's Programme]

[Author's full name]
[Full title of the Master's Thesis]

Master's thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the academic degree
of Master of Law

Supervisor: [full name, academic degree, academic position]
Co-supervisor: [full name, qualification/position] (if applicable)

Tbilisi, Georgia
[Year]

II. Signature (Declaration) Page Template

Caucasus University School of Law

We, the undersigned, confirm that we have reviewed the master's thesis prepared by [author's full name], entitled “[title of thesis]”, and recommend its consideration by the Council of the School of Law of Caucasus University for the award of the academic degree of Master of Law.

Supervisor	Full name	Signature	Date
Co-supervisor (if applicable)			
Reviewer			
Reviewer (if applicable)			

III. Copyright Page Template
Caucasus University
School of Law

Author's full name	
Master's thesis title	
Master's Programme	
Academic degree to be awarded	Master of Law
Year of submission to the School Council	
Date of the meeting	

Where an individual or institution requests access to the above thesis, Caucasus University is authorised to copy and distribute it for non-commercial educational purposes.

The author retains all other copyright and related rights. The author confirms that the necessary permission has been obtained for copyrighted materials used in the thesis, except for short quotations permitted by law and academic citation rules, and accepts responsibility for the materials used.

Author's signature		Date	____ / ____ / ____
--------------------	--	------	--------------------

Caucasus University
School of Law

Individual Interview Assessment Form for an Applicant to the First Part of the Programme

Candidate's Full Name	
Personal Number	
Educational Programme	
Form of Assessment	☐ Examination ☐ Interview ☐ Examination and Interview
Assessment Date	___ / ___ / ____
Commission Member's Full Name	

Assessment Procedure

- Each member of the Commission independently assesses the candidate on a 100-point scale and indicates the score awarded under each criterion.
- Except for the motivation criterion, two-point score bands are used in the assessment criteria; for a criterion with an odd maximum score, 1 point, and for every criterion, 0 points, are set out as separate indicators. Under the motivation criterion, every possible score is assessed by a separate indicator. A Commission member awards a score on the basis of the relevant indicator.
- The final assessment is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the total scores awarded by the Commission members and rounded to two decimal places.
- The examination and/or interview is deemed successfully completed if the candidate's final assessment is at least 51 points and the candidate receives at least 15 points under the subject-knowledge criterion.

1. 1. Subject Knowledge and Understanding of Legal Issues — Maximum 30 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
30–29	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues fully, accurately and in depth. The response is coherent, clearly formulated and fully substantiated; no material deficiency is apparent.
28–27	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
26–25	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
24–23	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues at a good level. The main issues are presented correctly and with substantiation, although an individual aspect requires greater depth or clarification.
22–21	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
20–19	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.

Score	Assessment Indicator
18–17	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues at an average level. Some essential elements are presented correctly, although there is significant incompleteness or one material error.
16–15	The candidate partially demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
14–13	The candidate partially demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
12–11	The candidate partially demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
10–9	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
8–7	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
6–5	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues at a very weak level. The response is largely incorrect or irrelevant and contains only a few fragmentary and insufficient elements.
4–3	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
2–1	The candidate demonstrates subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
0	The candidate does not demonstrate subject knowledge and an understanding of legal issues; no response is provided or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 30

Comment: _____

2. Analytical and Critical Thinking — Maximum 25 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
25–24	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills fully, accurately and in depth. The response is coherent, clearly formulated and fully substantiated; no material deficiency is apparent.
23–22	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
21–20	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
19–18	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills at a good level. The main issues are presented correctly and with substantiation, although an individual aspect requires greater depth or clarification.
17–16	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
15–14	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills at an average level. Some essential elements are presented correctly, although there is significant incompleteness or one material error.

Score	Assessment Indicator
13–12	The candidate partially demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
11–10	The candidate partially demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
9–8	The candidate partially demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
7–6	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
5–4	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills at a very weak level. The response is largely incorrect or irrelevant and contains only a few fragmentary and insufficient elements.
3–2	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
1	The candidate demonstrates analytical and critical thinking skills only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
0	The candidate does not demonstrate analytical and critical thinking skills; no response is provided or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 25

Comment: _____

3. Legal Argumentation — Maximum 20 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
20–19	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills fully, accurately and in depth. The response is coherent, clearly formulated and fully substantiated; no material deficiency is apparent.
18–17	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
16–15	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills at a good level. The main issues are presented correctly and with substantiation, although an individual aspect requires greater depth or clarification.
14–13	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
12–11	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills at an average level. Some essential elements are presented correctly, although there is significant incompleteness or one material error.
10–9	The candidate partially demonstrates legal argumentation skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
8–7	The candidate partially demonstrates legal argumentation skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
6–5	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
4–3	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills at a very weak level. The response is largely incorrect or irrelevant and contains only a few fragmentary and insufficient elements.
2–1	The candidate demonstrates legal argumentation skills only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.

Score	Assessment Indicator
0	The candidate does not demonstrate legal argumentation skills; no response is provided or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score Awarded: _____ / 20

Comment: _____

4. Oral Communication — Maximum 15 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
15–14	The candidate formulates the response clearly, logically and generally coherently and uses professional legal terminology mostly accurately and in context. Isolated minor linguistic or structural deficiencies do not materially impede comprehension.
13–12	The candidate communicates the main idea intelligibly, although there are some deficiencies in the structure and coherence of the response; professional legal terminology is not always used accurately and in context, but the principal content is understandable.
11–10	The candidate communicates ideas only partly intelligibly; the response is fragmentary, inconsistent and insufficiently structured, and linguistic and terminological deficiencies significantly impede full comprehension.
9–8	The candidate communicates the main idea intelligibly, although the structure and coherence of the reasoning contain deficiencies and professional legal terminology is not always used accurately and in context.
7–6	The candidate communicates ideas only partly intelligibly; the response is fragmentary, inconsistent and insufficiently structured, while linguistic and terminological deficiencies significantly impede comprehension.
5–4	The candidate has difficulty formulating ideas clearly, logically and coherently; the response is substantially fragmentary and professional legal terminology is frequently used inaccurately, significantly impeding comprehension.
3–2	The candidate's response is substantially deficient and inconsistent; the structure of the reasoning is practically absent, and numerous linguistic and terminological errors make the main idea extremely difficult to understand.
1	The candidate communicates only isolated ideas that are not logically connected; the response lacks coherent reasoning and appropriate use of professional legal terminology and therefore does not sufficiently demonstrate communication skills.
0	The candidate provides no response, or the response does not permit assessment of written and/or oral communication skills.

Score: _____ / 15

Comment: _____

5. Motivation to Study on the Programme and Professional Goals — Maximum 10 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
10	The motivation is clear, specific and fully substantiated; the candidate precisely connects the programme content with their academic and professional goals, which are realistic and coherent.
9	The motivation is clear and convincingly substantiated; the connection between the choice of programme and the academic or professional goals is evident, with only a minor deficiency.
8	The motivation is well formulated; the choice of programme and the goals are largely substantiated, although an individual aspect requires greater specificity.
7	The motivation and goals are presented intelligibly and their connection with the programme is apparent, although the substantiation is partly general or incomplete.
6	The main grounds for motivation are presented; the connection with the programme and future plans is generally understandable, but the argumentation is insufficiently developed.
5	The motivation is partly substantiated; the goals are general and their connection with the choice of programme is only partly apparent.
4	The motivation is presented fragmentarily and superficially; the goals are vague and their connection with the programme is weak.
3	Only isolated elements of motivation are presented; the choice of programme and the goals are not properly substantiated.
2	The response is mostly general or irrelevant; only slight indications of motivation and goals are apparent.
1	Motivation is mentioned only formally; practically no substantive connection with the choice of programme or academic and professional goals is apparent.
0	Motivation and goals are not presented, or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 10

Comment: _____

Summary of Individual Assessment

Nº	Assessment Criterion	Max.	Awarded
1	Subject Knowledge and Understanding of Legal Issues	30	

2	Analytical and Critical Thinking	25	
3	Legal Argumentation	20	
4	Oral Communication	15	
5	Motivation to Study on the Programme and Professional Goals	10	
Total		100	

Verification of Additional Minimum Requirement

☐ At least 15 points have been obtained under the subject-knowledge criterion.

Commission Member's Conclusion:

☐ Positive ☐ Negative

Reasoning/Comment: _____

Commission Member's Signature: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / ____

**Caucasus University
School of Law**

**Individual Assessment Form for the Subject-Specific Interview of an
Applicant Wishing to Continue Studies or Enrol in the Second Part of the
Programme**

Candidate's Full Name	
Personal Number	
Educational Programme	
Form of Assessment	Subject-Specific Interview
Assessment Date	___ / ___ / ____
Commission Member's Full Name	

Assessment Procedure

- Each member of the Commission independently assesses the candidate on a 100-point scale and indicates the score awarded under each criterion.
- Except for the motivation criterion, two-point score bands are used in the assessment criteria; for a criterion with an odd maximum score, 1 point, and for every criterion, 0 points, are set out as separate indicators. Under the motivation criterion, every possible score is assessed by a separate indicator. A Commission member awards a score on the basis of the relevant indicator.
- The final assessment is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the total scores awarded by the Commission members and rounded to two decimal places.
- The interview is deemed successfully completed if the candidate's final assessment is at least 51 points, at least 15 points are obtained under the criterion concerning the learning outcomes of the first part and subject knowledge, and at least 8 points are obtained under the academic-integrity criterion.

**1. Learning Outcomes Corresponding to the First Part of the Programme and Subject Knowledge —
Maximum 30 Points**

Score	Assessment Indicator
30–29	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge fully, accurately and in depth. The response is coherent, clearly formulated and fully substantiated; no material deficiency is apparent.
28–27	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
26–25	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
24–23	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge at a good level. The main issues are presented correctly and with substantiation, although an individual aspect requires greater depth or clarification.
22–21	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
20–19	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
18–17	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge at an average level. Some essential elements are presented correctly, although there is significant incompleteness or one material error.
16–15	The candidate partially demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
14–13	The candidate partially demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
12–11	The candidate partially demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
10–9	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
8–7	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
6–5	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge at a very weak level. The response is largely incorrect or irrelevant and contains only a few fragmentary and insufficient elements.
4–3	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
2–1	The candidate demonstrates achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
0	The candidate does not demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes corresponding to the first part of the programme and subject knowledge; no response is provided or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 30

Comment: _____

2. Research and Analytical Skills — Maximum 25 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
25–24	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills fully, accurately and in depth. The response is coherent, clearly formulated and fully substantiated; no material deficiency is apparent.
23–22	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
21–20	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
19–18	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills at a good level. The main issues are presented correctly and with substantiation, although an individual aspect requires greater depth or clarification.
17–16	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
15–14	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills at an average level. Some essential elements are presented correctly, although there is significant incompleteness or one material error.
13–12	The candidate partially demonstrates research and analytical skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
11–10	The candidate partially demonstrates research and analytical skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
9–8	The candidate partially demonstrates research and analytical skills. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
7–6	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
5–4	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills at a very weak level. The response is largely incorrect or irrelevant and contains only a few fragmentary and insufficient elements.
3–2	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
1	The candidate demonstrates research and analytical skills only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
0	The candidate does not demonstrate research and analytical skills; no response is provided or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 25

Comment: _____

3. Readiness to Prepare a Master's Thesis — Maximum 20 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
20–19	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis fully, accurately and in depth. The response is coherent, clearly formulated and fully substantiated; no material deficiency is apparent.
18–17	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
16–15	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis at a good level. The main issues are presented correctly and with substantiation, although an individual aspect requires greater depth or clarification.
14–13	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
12–11	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis at an average level. Some essential elements are presented correctly, although there is significant incompleteness or one material error.
10–9	The candidate partially demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
8–7	The candidate partially demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
6–5	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
4–3	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis at a very weak level. The response is largely incorrect or irrelevant and contains only a few fragmentary and insufficient elements.
2–1	The candidate demonstrates readiness to prepare a master's thesis only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
0	The candidate does not demonstrate readiness to prepare a master's thesis; no response is provided or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 20

Comment: _____

4. Understanding of the Principles of Academic Integrity — Maximum 15 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
15–14	The candidate demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity fully, accurately and in depth. The response is coherent, clearly formulated and fully substantiated; no material deficiency is apparent.
13–12	The candidate demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity at a very high level. The response is coherent and convincingly substantiated; only a minor inaccuracy or omission is apparent.
11–10	The candidate demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity at a sufficient level. The principal requirements are met, although the response is partly incomplete and individual issues require further substantiation.
9–8	The candidate demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity at an average level. Some essential elements are presented correctly, although there is significant incompleteness or one material error.
7–6	The candidate partially demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity. The response is fragmentary; several essential components are presented incompletely or inaccurately.
5–4	The candidate demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity weakly. The response is mostly superficial, inconsistent or materially incomplete; only isolated elements are presented correctly.
3–2	The candidate demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity at a very weak level. The response is largely incorrect or irrelevant and contains only a few fragmentary and insufficient elements.
1	The candidate demonstrates understanding of the principles of academic integrity only minimally; the response is almost entirely incorrect, irrelevant or extremely incomplete and practically fails to meet the criterion.
0	The candidate does not demonstrate understanding of the principles of academic integrity; no response is provided or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 15

Comment: _____

5. Motivation, Professional Goals and Academic Communication — Maximum 10 Points

Score	Assessment Indicator
10	The motivation is clear, specific and fully substantiated; the candidate precisely connects the programme content with their academic and professional goals, which are realistic and coherent.
9	The motivation is clear and convincingly substantiated; the connection between the choice of programme and the academic or professional goals is evident, with only a minor deficiency.
8	The motivation is well formulated; the choice of programme and the goals are largely substantiated, although an individual aspect requires greater specificity.
7	The motivation and goals are presented intelligibly and their connection with the programme is apparent, although the substantiation is partly general or incomplete.

Score	Assessment Indicator
6	The main grounds for motivation are presented; the connection with the programme and future plans is generally understandable, but the argumentation is insufficiently developed.
5	The motivation is partly substantiated; the goals are general and their connection with the choice of programme is only partly apparent.
4	The motivation is presented fragmentarily and superficially; the goals are vague and their connection with the programme is weak.
3	Only isolated elements of motivation are presented; the choice of programme and the goals are not properly substantiated.
2	The response is mostly general or irrelevant; only slight indications of motivation and goals are apparent.
1	Motivation is mentioned only formally; practically no substantive connection with the choice of programme or academic and professional goals is apparent.
0	Motivation and goals are not presented, or the response is irrelevant to the subject of assessment.

Score: _____ / 10

Comment: _____

Summary of Individual Assessment

Nº	Assessment Criterion	Max.	Awarded
1	Learning Outcomes Corresponding to the First Part of the Programme and Subject Knowledge	30	
2	Research and Analytical Skills	25	
3	Readiness to Prepare a Master's Thesis	20	
4	Understanding of the Principles of Academic Integrity	15	
5	Motivation, Professional Goals and Academic Communication	10	
Total		100	

Verification of Additional Minimum Requirements

- ☐ At least 15 points have been obtained under the criterion concerning the learning outcomes of the first part and subject knowledge.
- ☐ At least 8 points have been obtained under the academic-integrity criterion.

Commission Member's Conclusion:

☐ Positive ☐ Negative

Reasoning/Comment: _____

Commission Member's Signature: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / ____

Appendix No. 7

**Caucasus University
School of Law
Minutes of the Master's Thesis Public Defence Meeting**

Date and venue of meeting	
Meeting format	☐ In person ☐ Remote
Composition of the Defence Commission	
Chair of the Commission	
Meeting secretary/authorised representative of the School of Law	
Student's full name	
Master's thesis title	
Supervisor/co-supervisor	
Reviewer(s)	

Declaration concerning conflicts of interest

- ☐ No member of the Commission has declared a conflict of interest.
- ☐ Conflict of interest declared by: _____; decision taken: _____.

Brief account of the public defence proceedings

Reviewer's assessment of the written component

Reviewer	Maximum score	Score awarded	Signature
	40		

Individual assessments by members of the Defence Commission

No.	Commission Member	Maximum Score	Score Awarded	Signature
1		60		

2		60		
3		60		
4		60		
5		60		
Public Defence Assessment — Arithmetic Mean of the Scores Awarded by Commission Members				
Written Component Assessment (Maximum 40 Points)				
Public Defence Assessment (Maximum 60 Points)				
Unified Final Assessment (Maximum 100 Points)				

Final result:

- ☐ Thesis defended — a score of at least 60 points has been obtained.
☐ Thesis not defended — a score of 59 points or less has been obtained.

Commission decision/comment:

Chair of the Commission	Full name	Signature
Meeting secretary/authorised representative		