



Approved by: Order N01/01-73
(15.10.2025 წ.) by the President of the
University

Statute of Doctoral and Dissertation Board
School of Law, Caucasus University

Chapter I

General Provisions

Article 1. Scope of Regulation

This Statute is developed in accordance with the Law of Georgia on Higher Education and define the principles and procedures governing the activities of the Doctoral and Dissertation **Board** of the School of Law at Caucasus University. They also establish the minimum standards necessary for the implementation of the doctoral program and the awarding of the academic degree of Doctor within the School of Law at Caucasus University.

Article 2. Purpose and Objectives of the Doctoral Program

2.1 The Doctoral Educational Program is a third-cycle academic higher education program that combines both a teaching component and a scientific-research component. Its learning outcomes are aligned with the general learning outcomes defined at Level 8 of the National Qualifications Framework.

2.2 The objectives of the Doctoral Program are as follows:

- a) To create new knowledge and/or develop existing knowledge, and to support the dissemination and practical application of knowledge through original, contemporary, and innovative research;
- b) To prepare doctoral students for independent research and academic work by enhancing their research and transferable skills;
- c) To foster the intellectual growth of doctoral candidates and reinforce academic and ethical standards;

d) To promote the integration of doctoral students into the international academic community.

Chapter II

Doctoral and Dissertation Board of the School of Law Caucasus University

Article 3. Composition of the Doctoral and Dissertation Board

3.1. The Doctoral and Dissertation Board of the School of Law (hereinafter “the Board”) consists of the Dean of the School of Law, the academic head of the doctoral program, and all professors, associate professors, and assistant professors of the School who hold a doctoral or equivalent academic degree. By decision of the Board, additional members holding a doctoral or equivalent academic degree may also be included.

3.2. The composition of the Board shall be approved by the President of Caucasus University upon nomination by the Dean of the School of Law.

Article 4. Authority of the Board

4.1. The Board is authorized to:

- a) Approve doctoral programs and appoint program head(s);
- b) Approve the dissertation title and any subsequent amendments;
- c) Set the date for the dissertation defense;
- d) Decide on the relevance and appropriateness of the doctoral candidate’s published articles and conference participation;
- e) set up a dissertation committee and approve its composition, including the selection of its chairperson;
- f) Grant the academic degree of Doctor based on the dissertation committee’s resolution;
- g) Decide on the termination of doctoral status;
- h) Exercise any other powers conferred by internal university regulations and these provisions.

Article 5. Operating Procedures of the Board

5.1. The Board conducts its activities in accordance with this Statute.

5.2. Board meetings are held as needed but at least twice a year.

5.3. Decisions are made during official Board meetings. A meeting is considered valid if more than half of the total members are present.

5.4. A decision is deemed approved if it receives a two-thirds majority of the members present, unless otherwise stated in these Regulations. Each Board member has one vote. In the event of a tie, the Chairperson's vote is decisive. Members may also express their opinions and consent in writing (including via email), which will be considered in the decision-making process.

5.5. All decisions made by the Board must be documented in meeting minutes, signed by both the Chairperson and the Secretary. Any written opinions must be attached to the minutes.

5.6. The Secretary is responsible for preparing and maintaining the minutes of the Board meetings.

5.7. Any decision made by the Board or its Chairperson concerning a specific doctoral candidate must be communicated to the individual in writing (including by email, if applicable).

5.8. Between meetings, the activities of the Board are directed by the Chairperson.

5.9. In the Secretary's absence, the Chairperson may delegate the Secretary's responsibilities to any other Board member.

5.10. The right to initiate a Board meeting is held by the Dean of the School, the Chairperson, the head of the doctoral program, or any Board member. The first meeting of the Board, prior to the election of the Chairperson, is chaired by the eldest member.

Article 6. Chairperson and Secretary of the Board

6.1. The Board has a Chairperson and a Secretary.

6.2. The Chairperson is approved by the President of Caucasus University, along with the Board's composition, based on the nomination of the Dean of the School of Law.

6.3. The Secretary is elected by a majority vote of the members present at a Board meeting, following nomination by the Chairperson, through an open voting procedure.

Article 7. Powers of the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board

The Chairperson of the Dissertation Board shall:

- a) Convene and preside over Board meetings as necessary;
- b) Oversee the work of the Board between sessions;
- c) Prepare recommendations concerning the termination of a doctoral candidate's status;
- d) Ensure the organization of mandatory thematic seminars for doctoral candidates;
- e) Submit an annual report to the Board on activities carried out and planned future initiatives;
- f) Make decisions on changes to the doctoral dissertation topic within the same doctoral program;
- g) Make decisions regarding the change of a doctoral candidate's scientific supervisor;
- h) Approve the list of dissertation topics and any changes thereto;
- i) Exercise other powers defined by these Regulations.

Article 8. Secretary of the Dissertation Board

8.1. The Secretary of the Dissertation Board is responsible for the organizational management of the Board's activities and shall:

- a) Prepare and maintain minutes of Board meetings in accordance with the university's unified administrative procedures;
- b) Keep records of doctoral candidates' dissertation documentation;
- c) Assist the Chairperson in resolving organizational matters;
- d) Manage the Board's archiving and administrative records;
- e) Advise and assist doctoral candidates in preparing the required documentation before and after the dissertation defense;
- f) Ensure the timely publication of relevant information on the university website.

8.2. The Secretary of the Board shall formally communicate any decisions made by the Board or its Chairperson to the relevant recipients in writing, including via electronic mail.

Chapter III

Doctoral Studies

Article 9. Eligibility for Doctoral Studies

9.1.

Eligibility for doctoral studies at the School of Law of Caucasus University is granted to individuals who hold a Master's degree in law or an equivalent academic qualification. Eligibility may also be granted to graduates of foreign higher education institutions in accordance with Article 50 of the Law of Georgia on Higher Education, as well as to students who are currently enrolled in accredited doctoral programs in law in Georgia or abroad and seek admission via mobility.

Recognition of qualifications obtained abroad is possible if their equivalence to relevant Georgian academic qualifications is established. This determination considers the learning outcomes and awarded qualifications, even if the study duration differs. Recognition is carried out by the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement in accordance with Order No. 98/N of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia dated October 1, 2010.

Article 10. Admission Frequency

Admission to the doctoral program of the School of Law at Caucasus University is announced every two years, within the framework of the approved doctoral program.

Article 11. Application Submission

11.1. Candidates must submit an application to the Secretary of the Dissertation Board, addressed to the President of Caucasus University (Annex #1), specifying the doctoral program title. The application must include:

- a) A copy of a valid ID or passport (translated and notarized if the applicant is a foreign citizen);
- b) A notarized copy of a Master's diploma and transcript, or a confirmation of degree award if the diploma has not yet been issued. In case of mobility, an authenticated copy of the transfer order, syllabi and evaluations of completed courses, and, if applicable, documentation verifying the authenticity of a foreign diploma. Applicants must have completed an accredited higher

education program; mobility is only allowed from accredited doctoral programs.
Note: Diplomas obtained abroad, including those from English-language Bachelor's or Master's programs completed in the last 2 years, must be recognized by the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement.

c) Proof of English language proficiency at B2 level, either via international certificate (e.g., IELTS 6.0; TOEFL 78; other relevant B2-level certificates), a valid certificate issued by Georgia's National Assessment and Examinations Center, or a diploma from an English-language academic program completed in the past two years abroad (with recognition documentation).
Note: If the applicant does not possess a certificate or diploma as outlined, the university will assess English proficiency via an internal test.

d) CV detailing the applicant's education and professional background;

e) Four 3x4 cm photos (print and digital formats);

f) Two recommendations from law specialists holding a doctoral degree in the applicant's selected field;

g) A motivation letter;

h) For non-native Georgian speakers, proof of Georgian language proficiency at B2 level or completion of a university-administered internal language exam;

i) Previous publications and/or participation in research projects or events, or a minimum of 2 years of relevant work experience;

j) A doctoral research proposal (Annex #2);

k) A copy of military service documentation (for conscripts).

11.2. Applicants may additionally submit:

a) Documentation of relevant work experience;

b) Documentation of teaching experience;

c) Any other documents they believe relevant to demonstrating their qualifications and potential.

Article 12. Interview Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria

12.1. Candidates who submit all required documentation are eligible to attend the interview.

12.2. The interview is conducted by an admissions committee, the composition of which is approved by the President of Caucasus University upon nomination by the Dean of the School of Law. The approval order is published alongside the admission announcement.

12.3. The Secretary of the Dissertation Board presents the candidate's profile to the committee.

12.4. A candidate is considered admitted if their average score is no less than 51 points.

12.5. Committee members evaluate each candidate using a standardized assessment form (Annex #4). The doctoral research proposal (Annex #3) is an integral part of this evaluation.

12.6. The maximum overall score is 100 points.

12.7. In the case of competition, the committee may also consider additional materials submitted by the candidate beyond the mandatory documentation.

Article 13. Admission to the Doctoral Program

13.1. Candidates who successfully pass the interview will be admitted to the doctoral program of the School of Law.

13.2. Admission is formalized by order of the President of Caucasus University.

13.3. Within one week of the publication of the admission order, a contract is signed between the doctoral student and the University outlining the rights and obligations of both parties.

Article 14. Duration of Doctoral Studies

After the standard period of study (6 semesters), a doctoral student with academic debt is allowed to continue the program for an additional period not exceeding 4 semesters, while retaining student status, in order to complete the requirements.

Article 15. Suspension of Doctoral Student Status

15.1. A doctoral student gains the right to participate in academic activities and conduct scientific research only after completing the required administrative registration for the respective semester.

15.2. The doctoral student is obligated to register for courses within the deadlines announced by the University, sign the semester-based contract, and pay the tuition fee in accordance with the framework contract. Failure to register on time will result in placement under late registration status.

15.3. Administrative registration deadlines are determined by the academic calendar.

15.4. A doctoral student may be granted academic leave in accordance with applicable legislation and the rules established by the University.

Article 16. Termination of Doctoral Student Status

The grounds for the termination of student status are defined in the “Regulations on Student Status.”

Chapter IV

The Doctoral Program

Article 17. Development and Submission of the Doctoral Program

17.1. The doctoral program may be developed: (a) by academic staff of the School from the relevant field; (b) in cooperation with a partner university; (c) jointly with an educational or research institution based on a formal agreement concluded between the University and the institution.

17.2. The doctoral program is led by an affiliated professor or associate professor of Caucasus University. A co-supervisor may be a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor of the University.

17.3. The doctoral program is reviewed and approved by order of the President of Caucasus University.

17.4. The doctoral program must be accompanied by syllabi for each course defined therein.

17.5. The following individuals may participate in the implementation of the doctoral program: (a) professors, associate professors, and assistant professors of the University; (b) academic or research personnel from partner educational or scientific institutions; (c) invited specialists with the appropriate academic qualifications as defined by the program. The number of doctoral students to be admitted in a given academic year is determined by the University's Governing Board.

17.6. At least five affiliated academic staff members from the relevant field must be involved in the implementation of the doctoral program, including no fewer than three professors and/or associate professors.

17.7. Each professor, associate professor, or assistant professor may simultaneously supervise no more than three doctoral students. A 1:5 ratio between the supervisor and actively enrolled doctoral students is permitted only if a student with suspended status applies for reinstatement for the purpose of submitting a dissertation to be awarded an academic degree.

17.8. The qualifications of academic or research staff involved in the program must be substantiated by at least one peer-reviewed scientific publication in an internationally indexed journal or a practical project completed within the past three years that demonstrates their competence in the relevant field.

Article 18. Scope of the Doctoral Program

18.1. Doctoral studies at the School of Law are conducted within the framework of an approved doctoral program.

18.2. The duration of the doctoral program is not less than three years (six semesters). The instructional component comprises no more than 60 ECTS credits, while the research component must be carried out over a period of no less than two years.

18.3. The doctoral program consists of instructional and research components and culminates in the completion and defense of a dissertation.

Article 19. Instructional Component of the Doctoral Program

19.1. The instructional component aims to advance the doctoral student's subject-specific and methodological competencies, support the preparation of the dissertation, and prepare the student for future academic and research careers.

19.2. The instructional component includes the following mandatory lecture courses: (a) *Contemporary Standards of Academic Writing and Methods of Legal Research* – 10 ECTS credits; (b) *Innovative Teaching Methods* – 5 ECTS credits; (c) *Two Thematic Seminars* – 40 ECTS credits (20 + 20); (d) *Teaching Assistantship* – 5 ECTS credits.

Article 20. Structure of Instructional Courses

20.1. Courses defined by the doctoral program consist of lecture cycles, practical assignments, presentations, and written assessments.

20.2. A course is considered passed if the doctoral student receives at least 59% of the total score from interim assessments and at least 60% of the maximum final assessment score.

Article 21. Teaching Assistantship

21.1. The teaching assistantship is a mandatory component of the program and involves the doctoral student in the teaching process to support academic staff of the School of Law and to gain practical preparation for future pedagogical activity.

21.2. A doctoral student who is already engaged in teaching activities at Caucasus University is exempt from the teaching assistantship requirement; the course is recognized as completed.

21.3. In accordance with the assessment criteria outlined in the syllabus of the “Teaching Assistantship” course, the doctoral student is evaluated separately by the supervisor and the administration (see Annexes 11 and 12). For those doctoral students already engaged in teaching activities at the University, the evaluation is conducted by the program head and the administration.

Article 22. Thematic Seminar

22.1. Starting from the first semester of doctoral studies, the doctoral student is required to prepare and defend two thematic seminars before a committee. The thematic seminar topic shall not be a part of the dissertation topic.

22.2. The doctoral student selects, writes, and defends the thematic seminar topic in agreement and consultation with the dissertation supervisor. The student must submit the agreed topic title in the form of an official application no later than two weeks after the beginning of the semester following registration. The relevance of the topic is reviewed and approved by the head or administrative director of the doctoral program.

22.3. The rules for formatting, presenting, and evaluating the thematic seminar are defined in the relevant regulation (Annex #6).

22.4. Thematic seminars are assessed on a 100-point scale, with a minimum passing score of 59 points. Evaluation is conducted in three parts: (1) the content is evaluated by the seminar

supervisor (0–30 points, see Annex #5.1); (2) the reviewer assesses the seminar using the same criteria (0–30 points, see Annex #5.2); these two scores together comprise the interim assessment. (3) The public defense is evaluated by a committee (0–40 points, see Annex #5.3) composed of individuals holding a doctoral or equivalent degree in the relevant field. The committee may also include a practicing professional or judge, depending on the subject matter of the thematic seminar.

22.5. The date, building, and room number of the thematic seminar defense must be posted on the university website.

Article 23. Research Component of the Doctoral Program

23.1. The research component begins after the completion of the instructional component and continues for no less than two years. Following the completion of the instructional component, the doctoral student registers for the research component.

23.2. The research component includes the preparation and defense of the doctoral dissertation before the Dissertation Committee. During the preparation phase, the doctoral student must publish two scientific articles and present one conference paper. The publications and the presentation must be directly related to the dissertation topic.

23.3. In the first semester of registration for the research component, the doctoral student must submit the dissertation title for approval by the Dissertation Board.

23.4. Also in the first semester, the doctoral student, in agreement with the scientific supervisor (or co-supervisor), prepares an individual research plan. The plan must include a timeline for the completion of the dissertation as well as schedules for the publication of two articles and participation in one scientific conference.

23.5. Eligibility for defending the dissertation requires prior publication of two scientific articles and the delivery of one conference presentation.

23.6. Both scientific articles must be published in international journals or conference proceedings that meet the following criteria:

- Have an ISSN code;
- Are governed by an international editorial board or committee;
- Are internationally distributed and foster open global collaboration.

Additionally, at least one of the articles must be published in a peer-reviewed international journal indexed in the relevant field. The articles must be published in both Georgian and English. If published in a foreign (non-Georgian) journal, the Georgian version is not required. Both articles must reflect the core findings of the dissertation research.

23.7. If the doctoral student publishes the article in an English-language or foreign publication that meets the requirements of Article 23.6, the obligation to publish a Georgian version is waived. The article is considered published once it appears in the respective journal issue. Online peer-reviewed journals are also acceptable, provided the article is accessible on the official website of the journal.

23.8. The doctoral student shall deliver a scientific conference presentation addressing issues related to the dissertation topic.

23.9. Once the instructional component is completed and the student is registered for the research component, an individual research plan must be created.

23.10. The individual plan must be developed in coordination with the scientific supervisor (or co-supervisor) and must include: (a) biographical data of the doctoral student and supervisor; (b) title of the dissertation; (c) schedule and plan for completing the dissertation and fulfilling the publication and conference participation requirements.

23.11. The scientific supervisor is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the individual research plan.

23.12. At the end of each semester following registration for the research component, the doctoral student must submit a progress report using a standardized template (Annexes #1–11).

23.13. The report must clearly reflect the progress of the doctoral student's research activities and outcomes related to mandatory components, including dissertation work, publication of two scientific articles, and the conference presentation. The supervisor must confirm the fulfillment of obligations with a signature. The signed report must be submitted to the administrative director of the program.

Chapter V

Doctoral Supervision

Article 24. Scientific Supervisor of the Doctoral Student

24.1. The scientific supervisor of a doctoral student may be an academic staff member of Caucasus University, another higher education institution in Georgia, or a foreign higher education institution, holding a doctoral degree in law or an equivalent academic qualification. Based on the specificity of the dissertation topic, the supervisor is appointed by decision of the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board. The supervisor must possess prior research results related to the dissertation topic and have experience in scientific research within the relevant academic field.

24.2. In the case of appointing an external supervisor, the doctoral student is required to have a co-supervisor from among the professors of Caucasus University. The requirement to hold an academic position does not apply to international supervisors or co-supervisors.

24.3. Considering the specificity and development of the field, each doctoral supervisor must be equipped with up-to-date knowledge, possess academic qualifications and/or professional experience aligned with the dissertation topic and research problems, and have prior experience in supervision or co-supervision. They must also have completed relevant activities (such as training, seminars, or professional development courses) and have published at least one scientific paper within the last three years in a peer-reviewed international journal indexed as required by the Dissertation Board, with the publication being thematically related to the doctoral research.

24.4. To initiate the approval of a supervisor, the doctoral student must submit a written statement outlining their research interests (Annex #1–11).

24.5. The scientific supervisor is approved by the Dissertation Board upon recommendation of the Chairperson, within 90 days of the student's admission.

24.6. Upon a substantiated proposal by the Chairperson, the Board may approve two scientific supervisors (co-supervisors) for a single dissertation. One of the co-supervisors may represent a partner institution, provided there is a formal agreement between Caucasus University and the institution.

24.7. The scientific supervisor shall periodically monitor the doctoral student's progress in fulfilling the research component, provide formative assessment and feedback, and oversee the implementation of the student's individual research plan.

24.8. If the supervisor declines the appointment within one month of being assigned, they must submit a justified written statement to the Dissertation Board. After this deadline, the supervisor may no longer withdraw from the role.

24.9. Upon a justified request by the doctoral student, the supervisor may be changed within one month of appointment, subject to the approval of the Dissertation Board. After this deadline, the student may not request a change of supervisor.

24.10. The dissertation topic may be changed upon the joint justified request of the doctoral student and the supervisor, subject to approval by the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board.

24.11. Upon completion of the dissertation, the supervisor must submit a written evaluation in accordance with Annex #8.

Article 25. Responsibilities of the Scientific Supervisor

25.1. The scientific supervisor adheres to all rules and regulations in effect at the University.

25.2. The supervisor assists the doctoral student in selecting a research topic.

25.3. The supervisor monitors the student's fulfillment of both the instructional and research components.

25.4. The supervisor ensures that the doctoral student submits all research and instructional components within the prescribed deadlines and in the format established by the University.

25.5. The supervisor informs the doctoral student about the University's plagiarism policy and ensures its strict observance.

25.6. The supervisor ensures compliance with the University's ethical norms and procedural rules.

25.7. The supervisor holds regular meetings with the doctoral student concerning the dissertation, provides guidance throughout the research process, prepares the student for presentations of completed components, and monitors the progress of the qualifying research at different stages.

25.8. The supervisor ensures the student's involvement in various scientific activities.

25.9. If the supervisor decides to withdraw from the supervisory role at any stage of the program, they must submit a substantiated written notice to the Dissertation Board.

Article 26. Responsibilities of the Doctoral Student

- 26.1. The doctoral student adheres to all rules and regulations in effect at the University.
- 26.2. The doctoral student submits documentation to the Dissertation Board indicating the selected dissertation title and written consent from the appointed scientific supervisor.
- 26.3. The doctoral student completes the instructional and research components in accordance with the University's established procedures.
- 26.4. The doctoral student submits all components in the required format and within the designated deadlines.
- 26.5. The doctoral student strictly observes the institution's plagiarism policy, ethical standards, and procedural norms.
- 26.6. The doctoral student maintains regular meetings with the supervisor regarding the dissertation.
- 26.7. The doctoral student participates in various scientific activities and collaborates with the supervisor in preparation for the dissertation and presentations of program components.

Article 28. Requirements for the Doctoral Dissertation

- 28.1. The doctoral dissertation represents the result of the doctoral student's independent scientific research. It must present scientifically substantiated original findings derived from theoretical and/or empirical research, demonstrate academic novelty, and contribute to the development of the field.
- 28.2. For Georgian-language doctoral programs, the dissertation must be written in Georgian. A shortened version of the dissertation highlighting the main research objectives and findings must be submitted in both Georgian and English.
- 28.3. In Georgian-language doctoral programs, the decision to allow a dissertation to be written in English is made by the Dissertation Board. If the dissertation is written in English, the shortened version must be submitted in Georgian.
- 28.4. In English-language doctoral programs, both the dissertation and its shortened version must be written in English.

28.5. The shortened version must reflect all components of the dissertation. Its length shall be determined by the Dissertation Board and the doctoral program regulations, and as per the guidelines approved by the Board.

28.6. The doctoral dissertation must comply with the format defined in these Regulations (Annex #7) and meet established academic standards.

Article 29. Submission of the Doctoral Dissertation

29.1. The doctoral student must submit four printed copies of the dissertation and one electronic version in PDF format to the Dissertation Board.

29.2. Along with the dissertation, the doctoral student must submit the following documents to the Dissertation Board:

a) An official request addressed to the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board requesting the acceptance of the dissertation for review;

b) A signed declaration confirming that the submitted dissertation is the result of the student's independent research and complies with all standards of academic integrity.

Specifically, the work contains no plagiarism, falsified data, or other violations; it is original, and the views and sources of other authors are cited in accordance with academic conventions. Furthermore, the student confirms that the work was created by them and is not based on text or research generated by artificial intelligence;

c) An academic certificate issued by the Dean of the School confirming completion of the instructional component of the program;

d) Printed copies of scientific publications authored or co-authored by the doctoral student, reflecting the main findings of the dissertation and published in accordance with these Regulations;

e) Materials from scientific seminars, forums, and conferences where the main results of the dissertation were presented (participation in at least one international scientific conference is mandatory and must be documented with a certificate and published proceedings).

29.3. The submitted dissertation must be accompanied by a written evaluation from the scientific supervisor(s), stating not only the assessment but also confirming that the dissertation is ready for public defense.

29.4. A separate written recommendation must be submitted by the head of the doctoral program indicating that they have reviewed the dissertation and support its submission for public defense.

29.5. The dissertation must be submitted to the Dissertation Board during the final semester, before the end of the academic period.

29.6. Within one week of submission, the academic manager and director of the doctoral program review the technical format of the dissertation, the student's academic status, and all submitted documentation. The criteria and form for evaluating technical compliance and academic status are provided in Annexes #1–6.

29.7. If the requirements of Article 29.2 are satisfied, the administrative director of the doctoral program submits the dissertation for plagiarism screening.

29.8. The plagiarism check is conducted in accordance with the University's "Regulations for Detecting and Preventing Plagiarism Using Turnitin."

29.9. If the plagiarism check confirms originality, the administrative director forwards the dissertation to the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board.

Article 30. Abstract (Author's Summary)

30.1. The abstract is a condensed version of the doctoral dissertation.

30.2. It must be written in a way that allows interested readers to understand the main findings of the dissertation.

30.3. The abstract must include a title page and present the relevance of the topic, research objectives, subject and methods, key findings, scientific novelty, and information on the structure and volume of the dissertation. It must summarize the main findings chapter by chapter and present general conclusions.

30.4. The abstract must include only a list of publications authored by the candidate that are directly related to the dissertation and reflected in its content.

30.5. The abstract must also contain information on the presentation of the dissertation findings (e.g., at conferences, forums, symposiums, and seminars).

30.6. The abstract must be written in both Georgian and English.

30.7. The total length of the abstract (in both languages) must not exceed four printed pages.

Article 31. Reviewers of the Doctoral Dissertation

31.1. In order to evaluate the novelty of the dissertation and its readiness for public defense, the Dissertation Board, based on the Chairperson's proposal, appoints one local and one international reviewer. The selection and appointment process must be transparent, impartial, and objective. Reviewer anonymity must be preserved until the review is issued, ensuring unbiased and fair assessments. The identity of the reviewer must remain confidential to the doctoral student and supervisor(s) until the review is shared.

31.2. A local reviewer must be affiliated with a university, research institute, or center, or hold emeritus status. They must possess up-to-date knowledge of the field, be actively engaged in research, and have published at least one scientific paper in a peer-reviewed international journal indexed in the field within the last three years (or a creative/performance-based project for arts-related disciplines).

31.3. An international reviewer must be affiliated with a foreign university or research institute/center, or hold emeritus status, meet the same standards of scientific engagement, and have published at least one peer-reviewed article within the last three years relevant to the dissertation topic (or a creative/performance-based project, where applicable).

31.4. The appointment of an international reviewer is not required if the doctoral student has an international supervisor.

31.5. A reviewer may not be:

- a) The Chairperson or Secretary of the Dissertation Board;
- b) A co-author of any of the doctoral student's publications;
- c) A person in a hierarchical professional relationship with the student.

31.6. Within three working days of the reviewer's appointment, the Secretary of the Dissertation Board ensures the delivery of one printed copy of the dissertation to the reviewer.

31.7. The reviewer is obligated to assess the dissertation using the criteria set forth in these standards and issue a conclusion recommending or not recommending the dissertation for submission to the Dissertation Committee.

31.8. The reviewer must submit their evaluation to the Dissertation Board within 30 calendar days of receiving the dissertation (Annex #6).

31.9. If both reviewers give a positive evaluation, the dissertation is forwarded to the Dissertation Committee.

31.10. If one reviewer gives a negative evaluation, a new reviewer is appointed.

31.11. If the new reviewer also provides a negative evaluation, the Dissertation Board may decide not to permit the student to proceed with the defense. In this case, the student is granted the opportunity to revise the dissertation and resubmit it within a period determined by the Board, not exceeding two academic semesters.

31.12. If both reviewers give a negative evaluation, the student is not permitted to proceed with the defense and is likewise granted the opportunity to revise the dissertation and resubmit it within a maximum of two academic semesters, as determined by the Board.

Article 32. Evaluation of the Doctoral Dissertation by the Reviewer

32.1. The reviewer must submit a written evaluation of the doctoral dissertation to the Dissertation Board within 15 calendar days from the date of receiving the dissertation.

32.2. Based on specific evaluation criteria (Annex #9), the reviewer must submit an assessment of the dissertation, which must include one of the following recommendations:

- a) Unconditional positive evaluation and recommendation for defense;
- b) Positive evaluation and conditional recommendation for defense, subject to minor corrections;
- c) Negative evaluation and recommendation to reject the dissertation for defense.

32.3. The reviewer's report must conclude with a statement on whether the doctoral student is deemed worthy of being awarded the academic degree of Doctor.

32.4. The evaluation must be confirmed with the reviewer's signature.

32.5. If the reviewer is unable to submit the report due to objective circumstances (e.g., accident, illness), the Dean, upon recommendation by the head of the doctoral program, shall appoint a new reviewer.

32.6. The program's administrative director must notify the doctoral student in writing of the reviewer's decision and provide the full report.

32.7. Following this, the dissertation, along with the supervisor's report, the reviewer's evaluation, and other related documents, is forwarded to the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board, who, within ten days, decides on the composition of the Defense Committee and whether the dissertation is eligible for defense.

32.8. In case of rejection, one copy of the dissertation along with the written reviewer reports is archived in the School's Dissertation Board archive.

32.9. The doctoral student has the right to withdraw their dissertation from review at any stage. In such cases, the dissertation may be resubmitted for consideration within one year from the date of withdrawal.

Article 33. Procedure for Appealing a Negative Evaluation by the Supervisor

33.1. If the supervisor's report is negative and the doctoral student disagrees with it, the student has the right to file an appeal within 5 (five) working days of receiving the report (including electronically). The appeal, addressed to the President of Caucasus University, must contain detailed and reasoned justification for contesting the supervisor's evaluation.

33.2. Upon receipt, the appeal is examined for admissibility—whether the submission deadline was met and whether the content is sufficiently justified and substantiated.

33.3. If deemed admissible, the dissertation and the supervisor's evaluation are sent anonymously to an independent subject-matter expert within 10 (ten) working days. The expert is required to review the documents and submit their opinion within another 10 (ten) working days.

33.4. If the doctoral student does not appeal or if the independent expert also issues a negative evaluation, the student is assigned a final grade of "F" for the research component and forfeits the right to resubmit the same dissertation.

33.5. If the expert's evaluation differs from the supervisor's and is positive, the dissertation proceeds to defense following the procedures outlined in Article 28 of these Regulations. In such cases, the supervisor must be included in the committee with an advisory (non-voting) role.

Chapter VII

Procedures for Dissertation Evaluation and Defense

Article 34. Formation and Functioning of the Defense Committee

34.1. The doctoral dissertation is evaluated by a Defense Committee. For each dissertation, the Dissertation Board of the School, upon recommendation by its Chairperson, appoints the members of the Defense Committee, including the Chair and the Secretary.

34.2. The Defense Committee must consist of no fewer than five members. Members must hold a doctoral degree in the relevant field and possess qualifications and expertise sufficient to assess the originality and scholarly merit of the dissertation. At least two members must be representatives of either local or international higher education institutions with appropriate qualifications and expertise. Depending on the specifics of the field, members from the government, non-governmental organizations, or the labor market may also be included.

34.3. The doctoral supervisor or co-supervisor may not participate in the work of the Defense Committee.

34.4. The Defense Committee operates in accordance with these Regulations.

34.5. The Defense Committee is responsible for conducting the dissertation defense and evaluating the dissertation in compliance with applicable legislation and the procedures defined in these Regulations.

34.6. The Secretary of the Defense Committee manages the committee's organizational activities, keeps the official record of the defense, supports the Chairperson with administrative matters, oversees committee documentation, and submits all records to the Dissertation Board of the School.

Article 35. Procedures Prior to the Defense

35.1. The date of the defense is determined by the Chairperson of the School's Dissertation Board.

35.2. Within one week after the Defense Committee has been approved, the Secretary of the Dissertation Board ensures that copies of the dissertation are distributed to the committee members.

35.3. The Secretary must inform the doctoral student of the Chairperson's decision. The notification must include the date, time, and location of the defense. At least 30 days must elapse between the notice and the defense date (notification may be sent via email).

35.4. Based on the decisions of the Dissertation Board, the President of Caucasus University issues an order confirming the defense date at least 20 days prior to the defense. The order must specify:

- a) The title of the dissertation;
- b) The author of the dissertation;
- c) The composition of the Defense Committee;
- d) The names of the reviewers;
- e) The date, time, and location of the defense.

35.5. The dissertation defense is public and open to all. Information about the defense must be published on the university's (School of Law) website at least one week in advance.

35.6. A quorum of the Defense Committee is present if at least 3/4 of the voting members attend. If a reviewer is absent for valid reasons, their full written evaluation must be read aloud during the defense.

35.7. The supervisor must be present at the defense. If they are absent for valid reasons, they must submit a written statement and a professional reference for the doctoral student.

35.8. If the doctoral student is unable to attend the defense due to documented valid reasons, or if the committee lacks a quorum, or if the defense is postponed due to reasons beyond the student's control, a new defense date shall be scheduled within the same semester by the Dissertation Board.

35.9. Only one dissertation defense may be conducted during each session of the Defense Committee.

35.10. The minutes of the Defense Committee meeting must be signed by the Chairperson and the Secretary (Annex #7).

Article 36. Defense of the Doctoral Dissertation

36.1. At the beginning of the session, the Chairperson of the Defense Committee announces the identity of the doctoral candidate, the dissertation topic, and the names of the experts and reviewers. The Secretary presents the documents submitted by the doctoral student, the procedural outline for the defense, and a brief biographical summary of the candidate.

36.2. The defense procedure includes the presentation of the dissertation by the doctoral student, scientific discussion, evaluation of the dissertation, and announcement of the evaluation. The Defense Committee reasonably determines the structure and duration of each phase.

36.3. The dissertation presentation includes an oral report by the doctoral student, which typically must not exceed 30 minutes. The doctoral candidate presents the central theses and main findings of the dissertation, clearly articulating its scientific novelty, as proposed by the Chairperson of the committee.

36.4. During the presentation, the candidate must use visual aids such as slides, posters, video equipment, or other media.

36.5. Following the presentation, a scientific discussion takes place. The doctoral student answers questions from the audience, after which the Chairperson presents the preliminary evaluation of the dissertation. The reviewers engage in scholarly debate with the candidate, followed by remarks from the scientific supervisor(s), who provide a professional assessment of the candidate. A general discussion then follows, open to both committee members and audience participants.

36.6. Upon conclusion of the discussion, the doctoral candidate is given the opportunity to deliver a closing statement, which should not exceed 10 minutes.

36.7. Following the final statement, the voting members of the Defense Committee deliberate and make their decision in a closed session.

Article 37. Closed Session and Final Evaluation by the Defense Committee

37.1. The Defense Committee makes its final decision confidentially during a closed session.

37.2. During the closed session, members of the committee first individually evaluate the candidate's public presentation and participation in the scientific discussion.

37.3. The evaluation criteria for the public presentation and scientific discussion are defined by the Dissertation Board of the School and in accordance with these Regulations.

37.4. For the purpose of this evaluation, the Secretary of the Defense Committee calculates the arithmetic mean score (total points divided by the number of committee members).

37.5. After evaluating the public presentation and participation in the discussion, the committee then issues a comprehensive final score on a 100-point scale. This final assessment includes the reviewers' evaluations and the defense performance. The dissertation is evaluated either in the same semester in which the research is completed or the following one.

37.6. At the end of the session, the Chairperson publicly announces the committee's substantiated final decision.

Article 38. Dissertation Evaluation Criteria and Final Grade

38.1. Reviewers evaluate the dissertation based on criteria outlined in Annex #__, assigning up to 30 points.

38.2. Committee members individually and anonymously assess the dissertation during the defense. The Defense Committee evaluates the dissertation using criteria worth a maximum of 70 points (Annex #__).

38.3. The final score is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the points awarded by committee members (Annex #__).

38.4. The final dissertation score is the sum of the arithmetic mean of the committee members' scores (up to 70 points) and the arithmetic mean of the reviewers' scores (up to 30 points), totaling 100 points. Each member must sign the evaluation form (Annex #__).

38.5. The dissertation is considered successfully defended if the candidate achieves at least 60% of the maximum score.

38.6. If the final score is between 41–59 points, the candidate is permitted to take additional semester(s), retaining student status. The dissertation may be defended again within one

year. Financial obligations in such cases are governed by the student's agreement with the university or internal institutional policies.

38.7. The doctoral candidate must submit a written request to revise and re-defend the dissertation to the Dissertation Board within one month of receiving the evaluation result.

38.8. If the final score is below 40 points, the candidate forfeits the right to submit the same dissertation again. The final grade is recorded using the descriptive scale outlined below.

38.9. The evaluation of the dissertation includes five positive and two negative categories. Each corresponds to a specific numerical score range.

38.10. A positive evaluation (P – Pass) is awarded according to the following scale:

- a) Summa cum laude – Excellent dissertation (91–100 points);
- b) Magna cum laude – Very good, exceeds requirements (81–90 points);
- c) Cum laude – Good, exceeds requirements (71–80 points);
- d) Bene – Satisfactory, fully meets requirements (61–70 points);
- e) Rite – Acceptable, meets requirements despite minor flaws (51–60 points).

38.11. A negative evaluation (F – Fail) is awarded according to the following scale:

- a) Insufficenter – Does not meet requirements due to major flaws (41–50 points);
- b) Sub omni canone – Completely fails to meet academic standards (40 points or less).

38.12. The Chairperson of the Defense Committee publicly announces the final decision immediately after the session. The doctoral candidate has the right to review the committee's evaluation.

38.13. A defense protocol is prepared by the Secretary documenting the defense process and its final outcome, signed by all committee members.

38.14. The dissertation must be published on the university website within 30 calendar days of the defense. Both printed and electronic (PDF) versions must be submitted to the university library. The certificate of academic degree is not issued prior to the publication of the dissertation in print or electronic format.

Article 39. Appeal of the Defense Committee's Decision

39.1. If a doctoral candidate disagrees with the final evaluation of the Defense Committee or believes that procedural rules established by the defense regulations have been violated, they have the right to submit a written appeal to the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board of the School within 5 calendar days of the announcement of the evaluation.

39.2. The doctoral candidate's appeal must be substantiated, clearly identifying the subject of the appeal and the applicant's arguments. The grounds for appeal may include violations of procedural norms defined in the dissertation defense regulations.

39.3. If necessary, and based on the candidate's substantiated appeal, the President of the University may, upon recommendation of the Chairperson of the Dissertation Board, appoint an Appeals Committee.

39.4. The Appeals Committee must consist of no fewer than three members, including at least one member from Georgia and/or abroad who does not hold an academic position at the University.

39.5. The Appeals Committee elects its Chairperson and Secretary from among its members.

39.6. The members of the Appeals Committee individually evaluate the defense process according to established criteria.

39.7. For the purpose of evaluating the defense process, the Secretary of the Appeals Committee calculates the arithmetic mean of the scores (total score divided by the number of members).

39.8. The Appeals Committee evaluates the dissertation on a 100-point scale.

39.9. The School's Dissertation Board considers the arguments of the doctoral candidate as well as those of the Chairperson, Secretary, and members of the Defense Committee. If the Board finds sufficient grounds, it may annul the final evaluation and decide to appoint a new Defense Committee.

Chapter VIII. Award of the Academic Degree

Article 40. Award of the Degree

40.1. The documentation related to the dissertation defense must be submitted to the School's Dissertation Board within 20 working days following the defense. The Secretary is

responsible for distributing the materials to all members of the Dissertation Board before a decision is made on conferring the doctoral degree.

40.2. The School's Dissertation Board awards the academic degree of Doctor of Law in accordance with the doctoral program.

40.3. The Dissertation Board must review the dissertation documentation within 30 working days from the date of final evaluation.

40.4. The Board is authorized to award the doctoral degree if more than half of its members are present and a majority of those present vote in favor. The Secretary of the Defense Committee must be present at this meeting.

40.5. The decision on awarding the degree is made through an open ballot.

40.6. The meeting minutes and documentation related to the defense are retained by the faculty for six years from the date of awarding the degree and are then transferred to the University archives.

Article 41. Doctoral Diploma

41.1. The academic degree of Doctor is confirmed by a diploma signed by the President of the University and the Dean of the School and sealed with the University's official stamp, including the standard diploma supplement.

41.2. Prior to the issuance of the diploma, a certificate confirming the award of the academic degree may be issued to the doctoral candidate.

Article 42. Obligation to Publish the Dissertation

Following the award of the academic degree, the School is obligated to submit one printed and one electronic (PDF) copy of the dissertation to the University Library, the National Parliamentary Library of Georgia, and the National Scientific Library of Georgia within one month.

Chapter IX. Final Provisions

Article 43. Annulment of the Academic Degree

43.1. By decision of the School's Dissertation Board, the doctoral degree may be revoked in cases of submission of false information, data falsification, plagiarism, or other violations of academic integrity during the dissertation process. In such cases, an official order is issued by the President of the University.

43.2. If plagiarism or document falsification is discovered at any time after the defense, the Dissertation Board is obligated to annul the awarded academic degree and revoke the diploma by issuing an official order from the President of the University.

43.3. Procedures for verifying plagiarism are governed by the University's "Regulations for Detecting and Preventing Plagiarism Using the Turnitin Program."

Article 44. Concluding Provisions

44.1. The requirements of these Regulations apply to all doctoral students of the School of Law at Caucasus University.

44.2. The right to propose amendments or additions to these Regulations belongs to the School Council of the School of Law. If the Council makes a favorable decision, the Dean submits it to the President of the University for approval.

44.3. These Regulations shall enter into force upon issuance of the corresponding order by the President of Caucasus University.



Doctoral Candidacy Application

Annex #1

Application Form for Doctoral Candidacy – School of Law

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

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

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

Required Documents:

- **Original and a copy of an identity card or passport.** In the case of foreign nationals – a notarized copy of the passport translated into Georgian;
- **A notarized copy of the diploma and diploma supplement confirming a master's degree or an equivalent academic qualification.** For graduates of Caucasus University, the diploma and supplement must be certified by the relevant faculty. If the diploma has not yet been issued, a certificate confirming the awarding of a master's degree is acceptable.

In the case of transfer (mobility), a notarized copy of the enrollment order from the previous higher education institution must also be submitted, along with syllabi and evaluations of the completed courses. For foreign education, a document confirming the authenticity of the diploma must be presented. Applicants must have completed an accredited higher education program. Mobility is permitted only from another accredited doctoral program.

- **A notarized copy of an international English language proficiency certificate** (if available) or a valid certificate issued by the National Assessment and Examinations Center of Georgia (if available), or a diploma confirming the completion of an English-language academic program (bachelor's, master's, etc.) within the last two years;
- **Curriculum Vitae (CV)** detailing the applicant's educational background and professional experience;
- **Proof of military registration** (for male applicants only);
- **Two passport-size photos (3x4 cm)** and a digital copy on CD;
- **Prior work/publication in the relevant field and/or participation in scientific-research projects and events and/or at least two years of work experience in the relevant field;**
- **Doctoral research proposal.**

Notes:

1. A diploma confirming foreign education—including completion of an English-language bachelor's or master's program abroad within the past two years—must be recognized by the **LEPL – National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement** of Georgia.
2. A diploma awarded upon completion of an educational program of no less than five years must be recognized as equivalent to a master's degree, confirmed by a certificate issued by the **LEPL – National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement**.
3. Applicants to Georgian-language doctoral programs are exempt from the University's internal English language proficiency test if they provide proof of English language competence at a minimum **B2 level** through an internationally recognized certificate, such as:
 - **Cambridge ESOL Exams:**

- IELTS: minimum band score of **5.5**
- FCE: at least **Grade C**
- BEC Vantage: at least **Grade C**
- ILEC: **Pass with B2**
- BULATS: score of **65–69**
- TOEIC: score of **715–795**
- Aptis Test
- **TOEFL: minimum score of 46–49**

Alternatively, a **valid certificate issued by the National Assessment and Examinations Center of Georgia (CERTUS)** confirming B2-level English language proficiency will also be accepted.

4. Doctoral candidates who wish to enroll in Georgian-language doctoral programs and whose native language is not Georgian are additionally required to demonstrate **Georgian language proficiency at a minimum of B2 level**. This requirement can be fulfilled through:

- A certificate confirming at least **B2-level** proficiency in Georgian;
- A diploma confirming completion of a **Georgian-language academic program** (bachelor's, master's, etc.) within the last **two years**;
- Or successful performance on the University's **internal Georgian language placement test** assessing B2-level competence.

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

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

I agree Signature:

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

Full Name (in block letters):

Signature:

.....

Date:

.....

Attachments:

.....



Doctoral Research Project Proposal Form

Annex #2

Research Proposal Form

1. Motivation for Continuing Studies in the Program

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

Maximum word count: 150

2. Research Topic / Problem

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

Maximum word count: 150

3. Literature Review

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

Maximum word count: 500

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

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

applicable.)

Maximum word count: 150

5. Research Methodology

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

Maximum word count: 300

6. Tentative Structure of the Dissertation

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

7. Expected Research Outcomes

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

Maximum word count: 300

Applicant's Full Name:

.....

Signature:

.....

Date:

.....

Doctoral Research Proposal Evaluation Form

Annex #3

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

.....

Applicant's Full Name:

.....

Title of the Doctoral Research Proposal:

.....

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

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

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

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

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

- **Maximum overall rating:** 5.00
- **Minimum passing threshold:** 3.00

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

Doctoral Research Proposal Evaluation Criteria – Detailed Descriptors

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

- **Language and Style of the Proposal:**
How coherent is the argumentation and reasoning?
To what extent does the proposal adhere to the standards of academic language and style?



Annex # 5.1

Doctoral Thematic Seminar Evaluation Form

Scientific Supervisor

Thesis Title

Doctoral Student's Last Name, First Name

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

Evaluator's Signature: -----

Date: -----

Note:

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



Annex # 5.2

Doctoral Thematic Seminar Evaluation Form

----- Reviewer

----- Title

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

Evaluator's Signature: -----

Date: -----

Note:

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



Annex #5.3

Evaluation Form of the Doctoral Thematic Seminar by a Committee Member

Committee Member's Last Name, First Name

Title

Doctoral Student's Last Name, First Name

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

Recommendations, and to the Questions Raised by the Committee		
--	--	--

Evaluator's Signature: -----

Date: -----

Annex #5.4

Scoring Breakdown of Evaluation Criteria for the Thematic Seminar Paper

Evaluation Criteria by the Thematic Seminar Supervisor:
Maximum Score: 30 Points

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

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

Reviewer Evaluation Criteria:

30 Points

1. Relevance of the Selected Topic and Research Problem – 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is logically explained and well-justified.
8-7 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is logically explained but lacks clarity or full justification.
6-5 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is explained, but the justification is incomplete.
4-3 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is presented superficially and without adequate argumentation.
2-1 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is formulated unprofessionally and without any justification.
0 Points	The relevance of the selected topic and research problem is not addressed at all.
2. Structure of the Thesis, Legal Use of Information, and Academic Writing Standards – 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The structure of the thesis fully corresponds to the topic. The information used in the text is within the legal framework, and excerpts and citations from other works are correctly referenced. The thesis is written without errors and is coherent.
8-7 Points	The structure of the thesis corresponds to the topic but requires refinement. Excerpts and citations from other works are properly and ethically referenced. The thesis is written without errors, and appropriate terminology is used.
6-5 Points	The structure of the thesis partially corresponds to the topic. A small portion of the information lacks citation, but the citations provided are ethically sound. The thesis is written with minor errors, and terminology is appropriately used.
4-3 Points	The structure of the thesis is insufficiently developed and analyzed. A significant portion of sources is not cited, and some citations are referenced unprofessionally. Grammatical errors in the text impede readability, and the structure lacks clarity.
2-1 Points	The structure of the thesis lacks coherence and quality. Citations are presented without sources; the text contains numerous terminological and logical errors, making comprehension difficult.
0 Points	The structure of the thesis does not meet research standards at all. The information used is of dubious origin, citations are unsourced, terminology is incorrect, and the overall content is practically unintelligible.
3. Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature – Maximum 10 Points	
10-9 Points	The research methods have been selected in a comprehensive, qualified, and thorough manner. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will be able to successfully address the main research problem, and the selected materials and scientific literature fully meet the research requirements.
8-7 Points	The research methods have been selected in a qualified manner. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will be able to address the main research problem; however, the selected materials and scientific literature, while relevant, require further supplementation.

6-5 Points	The research methods have been selected incompletely. Through the chosen methodology, the master's student will not be able to fully address the main research problem, and the selected materials and scientific literature only partially meet the research requirements.
4-3 Points	The selected methodology is outdated and irrelevant to the topic. The master's student will not be able to address the main research problem, and the selected materials and scientific literature are not adequately reviewed or analyzed.
2-1 Points	The research methods have been selected unprofessionally. The selected materials and scientific literature are random, lacking both relevance and quality.
0 Points	No research methods have been selected at all, and the chosen materials and scientific literature do not meet the research requirements in any way.
4. Expected Research Results – Maximum: 10 Points	
10-9 Points	The doctoral candidate has justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The results are likely to have significant theoretical and practical implications.
8-7 Points	The doctoral candidate has justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The results are likely to have educational and practical applications.
6-5 Points	The doctoral candidate has justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The results are likely to have educational relevance.
4-3 Points	The doctoral candidate has only partially justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. Further clarification is required to substantiate the anticipated outcomes.
2-1 Points	The doctoral candidate has not sufficiently justified the expected research results through logical reasoning. The achievement of meaningful outcomes is doubtful.
0 Points	The doctoral candidate demonstrates no clear understanding of the expected research outcomes. The possibility of obtaining meaningful results is unlikely.

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

1. Relevance of the Chosen Topic and Problem – 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The relevance of the research topic is logically explained and well-justified.
8-7 Points	The relevance of the research topic is logically explained, but lacks clarity and/or justification.
6-5 Points	The relevance of the research topic is explained, but it is not fully justified.
4-3 Points	The relevance of the research topic is formulated superficially and without justification.
2-1 Points	The relevance of the research topic is formulated unprofessionally, without any justification.
0 Points	The relevance of the research topic is not formulated.
1. The structure of the paper - 5 Points	

10-9 Points	The structure of the paper fully corresponds to the topic title.
8-7 Points	The structure of the paper corresponds to the topic title but requires clarification.
6-5 Points	The structure of the paper partially corresponds to the topic title.
4-3 Points	The structure of the paper is not sufficiently developed or analyzed.
2-1 Points	The structure of the paper lacks coherence and quality.
0 Points	The structure of the paper does not correspond to the research requirements at all.
3. Research Methodology, Methods, and Selected Scientific Literature – Maximum: 5 Points	
10-9 Points	The research methods are selected comprehensively, competently, and thoroughly. The chosen methodology enables the master's student to successfully address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature fully correspond to the research requirements.
8-7 Points	The research methods are selected competently. The chosen methodology enables the master's student to address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature correspond to the research requirements but require supplementation.
6-5 Points	The research methods are partially selected. The chosen methodology does not fully enable the master's student to address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature only partially meet the research requirements.
4-3 Points	The selected methodology is outdated and irrelevant to the topic. The master's student cannot address the main research problem, and the selected material and scientific literature are not sufficiently processed and analyzed.
2-1 Points	The research methods are selected unprofessionally. The selected material and scientific literature are random, lacking relevance and quality.
0 Points	No research methods are selected, and the selected material and scientific literature do not correspond to the research requirements at all.
4. Final Research Results – Maximum: 10 Points	
10-9 Points	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to achieve results of high theoretical and applied significance.
8-7 Points	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to achieve results with educational and practical significance.
6-5 Points	The doctoral student has justified the final research results through logical reasoning. It is possible to achieve results with educational significance.
4-3 Points	The doctoral student has provided limited justification for the final research results through logical reasoning. Achieving the results requires further clarification.
2-1 Points	The doctoral student has not justified the final research results through logical reasoning. The achievement of the results is doubtful.
0 Points	The doctoral student has no clear view regarding the final research results. It is not possible to achieve any meaningful outcomes.
5. Legal and Ethical Use of Information, Academic Writing Culture – Maximum: 5 Points	

10-9 Points	The information used in the text is within a legal framework, and excerpts and citations from other works are properly referenced; the linguistic structure of the paper is coherent, and the logical flow is consistent. The paper is written without errors and is well-structured. Appropriate terminology is used correctly.
	Excerpts and citations from other works are properly referenced; the paper is written without grammatical or stylistic errors, is coherent, and ideas are presented consistently. Relevant terminology is used appropriately.
8-7 Points	A small portion of the information lacks citation, though the citations are ethically correct; the paper is written with minor errors, is coherent, and ideas are consistently presented. Relevant terminology is used appropriately.
6-5 Points	A considerable portion of the information lacks citation; some citations are referenced inadequately. Grammatical errors hinder readability, the text lacks structural coherence, and there are terminological mistakes.
4-3 Points	The information is questionable, and citations are presented without sources; the text contains numerous terminological and logical errors, making it difficult to understand.
2-1 Points	The information used is of unclear and questionable origin, and citations are included inappropriately and without sources; the text is vaguely written, the terminology is incorrect, and the content is virtually incomprehensible.
0 Points	The information used in the text is within a legal framework, and excerpts and citations from other works are properly referenced; the linguistic structure of the paper is coherent, and the logical flow is consistent. The paper is written without errors and is well-structured. Appropriate terminology is used correctly.
6. Presentation Skills - Maximum 5 Points	
5Points	The content and format of the presentation are complete, and audience engagement is high. The topic is clearly stated and thoroughly conveyed, a deep analysis is conducted, and well-argued conclusions are presented. The visual design of the project is excellent, and the doctoral candidate fully engages with the audience and demonstrates in-depth knowledge when responding to all questions.
4 Points	The content and format are complete, and audience engagement during the presentation is high. The topic is clearly stated and thoroughly conveyed, deep analysis is conducted, and well-argued conclusions are made. The visual design of the project is excellent, and the doctoral candidate engages with the audience but does not demonstrate in-depth knowledge in response to all questions.
3 Points	The content is complete, but the format is insufficient. Audience engagement during the presentation is low. The topic is clearly stated but not thoroughly conveyed. The doctoral candidate struggles to engage with the audience and fails to demonstrate deep knowledge in response to most questions.
2 Points	Both the content and format are incomplete, and audience engagement during the presentation is low. The topic is clearly stated but not fully conveyed. The visual design is mediocre. The doctoral candidate struggles to engage with the audience and shows limited knowledge.
1 Points	Both the content and format are insufficient. Only a few points are conveyed. The candidate fails to present the material.
0 Points	The presentation is ineffective, and the candidate speaks about topics unrelated to the subject.

7. Accuracy and depth of responses to the reviewer's comments and recommendations, as well as to questions posed by the committee – Maximum: 5 Points	
5 Points	The student responds convincingly and with well-founded arguments to the committee's questions and demonstrates a deep understanding of the reviewer's comments and recommendations.
4 Points	The student responds convincingly to the committee's questions, although some answers lack sufficient argumentation. The student demonstrates an understanding of the reviewer's comments and recommendations.
3 Points	The student answers the committee's questions; however, the responses lack persuasiveness and argumentation. Not all answers to the reviewer's comments and recommendations are well-understood.
2 Points	The student's answers to the committee's questions are unconvincing and lack argumentation. The student has not understood the reviewer's comments and recommendations and fails to respond to them persuasively.
1 Points	The student is unable to provide well-reasoned answers to the questions posed by the committee. The responses to the reviewer's comments and recommendations are incorrect.
0 Points	The student is unable to answer the questions posed by the committee and has no responses to the reviewer's comments and recommendations.

Regulation

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

Chapter

I

General

Provisions

Article 1. Scope of Regulation

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

Article 2. Thematic Seminar

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

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

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

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

Chapter

II

Formatting

the Thematic Seminar

Article

Article 3. Volume and Structure of the Thematic Seminar

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

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

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

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

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

3.6. The main text of the thematic seminar must be written in Sylfaen font, size 12. A larger font size must be used for chapter and subchapter titles. Chapter titles must be in 14 pt bold;

subchapter titles – 12 pt bold. Chapter titles must be separated from the text by a 3-line space; subchapter titles must be separated from both the chapter title and the text by a 2-line space. Condensed font types are not accepted. Text must be printed using a laser printer or a comparable quality device.

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

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

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

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

3.11. Footnotes in the dissertation must be placed at the bottom of the page, in 10 pt font size, and numbered with Arabic numerals. Bibliographic footnotes in the main text must follow the “footnote” principle.

Article 4. Rules for Formatting Footnotes

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

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

- a. For books – the author’s surname, first name initial, book title (without quotation marks), part or volume number (if needed), place of publication, year, and page number (without “p.”).
- b.
 - b. For articles in collections – the article author’s surname, first name initial, article title (without quotation marks), name of the collection (without quotation marks), editor (if applicable), part or volume number (if needed), place of publication, year, and page number (without “p.”).
 - c. For journal articles – the article author’s surname, first name initial, article title (without quotation marks), abbreviated periodical name (e.g., *journ.*, *newsp.*), title (in quotation

marks), number, year (month, day), and page number (without “p.”); all bibliographic elements of foreign sources must be indicated in the original language or in the language known to the author (with the reference to the official translation).
d. A uniform citation system must be maintained in the footnotes: the author’s name and the title of the work must be distinguished by different font styles (e.g., author’s name in italics, the remaining information in regular font; all referenced surnames, such as editors’, also in italics). All components (except for surname and initial) must be separated by commas, and a period must follow at the end of the footnote.

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

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

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

f. For decisions of international and foreign courts:

Court of Justice

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

European Court of Human Rights

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

International Court of Justice

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

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

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

for U.S. courts: საქმე ბრაუნის განათლების საბჭოს წინააღმდეგ (*Brown v Board of Education*, 347 US 483 (1954)).

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

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

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

- j. Foreign terms and expressions must be explained in footnotes unless the objective of the paper is to trace the origin of the term.
- k. For Georgian text, use Georgian-style opening and closing quotation marks („...“); for foreign texts, use international-style quotation marks (“...”).
- l. Punctuation marks at the end of cited text—period, colon, semicolon, question mark, and exclamation mark—must appear *before* the closing quotation mark if they complete the sentence; or *after* the quotation mark, depending on context, if the quotation is part of a phrase or word. When quotation mark, punctuation, and footnote reference come together, the order should be: 1. quotation mark, 2. punctuation mark, 3. footnote indicator. At the end of a quoted sentence: 1. punctuation mark, 2. quotation mark, 3. footnote indicator. Double quotation marks should not be written consecutively. Different forms of brackets may be used as needed.

When Referring to the Same Source in Footnotes
 In cases where the same source is cited in the footnotes:

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

Article 5. Components of the Thematic Seminar

- 5.1. The mandatory components of the thematic seminar are:
- a. Formal section:
 - a.a. Title page;
 - a.b. Signature page;
 - a.c. Copyright page;
 - a.d. Abstract in Georgian and English;
 - a.e. Table of contents.
 - b. Substantive section:
 - b.a. Introduction;
 - b.b. Main text;
 - b.c. Conclusion.
 - c. Bibliography.

- 5.2. Additional components of the thematic seminar are:
- a. List of tables;
 - b. Appendices.

Article 6. Title Page of the Thematic Seminar

The title page (outer cover) must follow a standard format. It must include the title of the thematic seminar, the author’s and the scientific supervisor’s first and last names. It must also contain the text “Caucasus University,” “Tbilisi, 0102, Georgia.” The page must also indicate the

month and year when the seminar presentation is scheduled. The page number is (I), although it is not displayed.

Article 7. Copyright Page of the Thematic Seminar

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

Article 8. Abstract of the Thematic Seminar

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

Article 9. Content of the Thematic Seminar

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

Article 10. Main Text of the Thematic Seminar

9.1. The main text of the paper must be divided into chapters and various levels of subchapters. It must include the introduction, main body, and conclusion.
9.2. The introduction is the general part of the thematic seminar in which the research problem is presented, the relevance of the study is justified, the aim and objectives are defined, and the hypothesis is formulated (a scientific assumption by the author, expected to be proven through the research). It must also include the methodology (justifying the relevance of the research methods used and indicating the specific purpose of each method in relation to the study). The introduction must not exceed 5% of the total length of the main text.
9.3. The main body is divided into chapters and subchapters. It must cover the theoretical framework and literature review relevant to the topic, conflicting ideas and controversial issues in the sources, a detailed description of the conducted research, its findings, the author's original scientific contributions, and new perspectives and approaches.
9.4. The structure for the analysis of the results of the thematic seminar depends on the topic and may be presented in a format preferred by the author. There is no restriction on the number of

subchapters.

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

Article 10. Rules for Compiling the Bibliography

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

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

Article 11. Additional Components of the Thematic Seminar

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

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

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

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

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

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

11.7. At the author’s discretion, the paper may include an alphabetical index. The index must be

placed in the introductory section of the paper, after the table of contents, list of tables, or list of abbreviations used.

Article 12. Electronic Version of the Thematic Seminar

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

Chapter

III

Presentation of the Thematic Seminar

Article 13. Submission and Review of the Thematic Seminar

1. If registration takes place during the fall semester, the deadline for submission of the thematic seminar is December 20; for the spring semester – May 20.
2. The thematic seminar must be submitted to the school administration in 4 (four) printed and bound copies and 1 electronic version.
3. The thematic seminar must be accompanied by the advisor's evaluation form, a written review, and a statement confirming that no plagiarism was detected during the Turnitin review.
4. A thematic seminar will not be admitted for defense without the documents specified in paragraph 13.3.
5. The School of Law sends the submitted paper for review to a qualified expert holding a doctorate in law or an equivalent academic degree in the relevant field. The reviewer must submit the evaluation form and written review within 10 days.
6. A prerequisite for admission to the defense is achieving the minimum threshold of 59% in the interim evaluation, which is calculated as the arithmetic average of the advisor's and reviewer's evaluations.
7. If the thematic seminar fails to meet the minimum interim evaluation threshold (59%), the student must re-register for this component.

Article 14. Thematic Seminar Committee

14.1. The Dean of the School of Law appoints the seminar defense committee at least 15 days prior to the scheduled defense.

14.2. The committee must consist of individuals holding a doctorate in law or an equivalent academic degree in the relevant field of the thematic seminar. The committee shall consist of 5 members, including the advisor and the reviewer.

14.3. The committee is chaired by the head of the doctoral program.

14.4. A quorum for the committee session is three members present.

Article 15. Thematic Seminar Defense Procedure

15.1. The defense of the thematic seminar takes place during a formal committee session. The date and time of the presentation are published in advance on the university website and/or posted in a visible place within the university building at least one week prior to the seminar.

15.2. The electronic version of the presentation (slides) must be submitted to the doctoral

academic manager two days before the defense. Two bound copies of the paper are submitted to the university library after successful defense.

15.3. The defense takes place in an orderly environment. Nameplates indicating the surname, first name, and academic title of each committee member must be prepared.

15.4. The session is opened and chaired by the committee chair. The advisor and the reviewer present their written reviews; in their absence, the chair presents them. The reviews are attached to the session minutes and must include a recommendation on whether to admit the work for defense.

15.5. The floor is then given to the doctoral student, who presents the research results both verbally and via slides. The length of the presentation is determined by the committee.

15.6. After the presentation, the committee chair initiates a scientific discussion (question-answer format). Following the discussion, the advisor is given the floor. Other committee members and the chair may speak at their discretion.

15.7. The doctoral student is given the opportunity to deliver final remarks. Thereafter, at the request of the chair, the audience leaves the room, and the committee members begin evaluation in the prescribed format (by completing score sheets).

15.8. The final points of the seminar evaluation are announced in the presence of the doctoral student.

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

Article 16. Evaluation of the Thematic Seminar

16.1. A thematic seminar is considered successfully defended if the student meets the required competency threshold at both evaluation stages. The final evaluation consists of an interim score (sum of advisor and reviewer evaluations) and the final score (committee evaluation).

16.2. The seminar is evaluated on a 100-point scale. The advisor evaluates the content of the seminar based on established criteria (0–30 points) (Appendix #5.1), and the reviewer evaluates according to the same criteria (0–30 points) (Appendix #5.2). The sum of these two constitutes the interim score. The committee evaluates the public defense (0–40 points) (Appendix #5.3). The committee consists of academic staff or invited professors holding a doctoral degree in the relevant field. Each thematic seminar accounts for 20 credits – 500 hours, broken down as follows: 25 hours – homework/presentation, 30 hours – consultations with the advisor, and 445 hours – independent work.

16.3. Cases of negative evaluation of the thematic seminar:
a) If the doctoral student receives a final defense score between 41% and 59%, they are granted the opportunity to revise the paper and resubmit it for defense within 5 (five) working days of result notification, subject to applicable financial obligations.
b) If the doctoral student receives a failing score (0%–40%), they are assigned a grade of F and lose the right to continue working on the same paper. One copy of the negatively evaluated seminar and the written assessments from the committee members are submitted to the university archive for retention.



Annex #7

Instruction

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

Chapter

I

General Provisions

Article 1. Scope of the Instruction

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

Article 2. The Doctoral Dissertation

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

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

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

Chapter

II

Formatting the Doctoral Dissertation

Article 3. Volume and Structure of the Doctoral Dissertation

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

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

3.3. The dissertation must be printed on A4-sized (297×210 mm), 80 g/m² paper, in vertical orientation, single-sided. Photographs and special-purpose tables may also be printed on A4-sized paper. For larger format pages (e.g., diagrams), any size may be used, but such pages must not be bound with the main text.

- 3.4. Page margins: 2 cm on the top and bottom, 3 cm on the left, and 1.5 cm on the right.
- 3.5. The main text must be written in Sylfaen font, size 12. Chapter titles should be in 14 pt bold; subchapter titles in 12 pt bold. Chapter titles must be separated from the text by three line spaces; subchapter titles must be separated from both the chapter title and the main text by two line spaces each. Condensed fonts are not accepted. Printing must be done with a laser printer or equivalent quality.
- 3.6. All pages must be numbered sequentially. Blank spaces or unnumbered pages are not allowed. Duplicate page numbers are also not permitted. Minimum font size for page numbers is 10 pt. Introductory pages, except for the title page, must be numbered in lowercase Roman numerals (I, II, III, etc.) at the bottom right corner. The rest of the document is numbered with Arabic numerals. Page numbers must be placed 1.3 cm from the bottom and 2.5 cm from the right edge of the page.
- 3.7. Line spacing for the main text is 1.5. For smaller sections (table of contents, list of tables, abstract, footnotes, notes, etc.), line spacing is 1. Paragraphs are separated by a single line space. Tables and figures are separated from the text by two line spaces.
- 3.8. All chapter and subchapter titles must appear in the table of contents. Each chapter begins on a new page; subchapters may continue on the same page.
- 3.9. When abbreviations are used, they must be spelled out in full the first time they appear, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses, which will then be used throughout the text (e.g., Civil Code of Georgia (hereinafter – CCG)). This principle applies to recurring titles as well, except when the abbreviation results in an unusual or unclear symbol combination.
- 3.10. Footnotes must be placed at the bottom of the page. Font size for footnotes is 10 pt. Footnotes must be numbered with Arabic numerals. In-text bibliographic citations must follow the "footnote" principle.

Article	4.	Footnote	Formatting	Rules
4.1.	When citing legal acts,	the full title, the source of publication, date, and page number must be indicated in the footnote.		
4.2.	When citing literary sources,	the following format must be used:		
a.	For books –	author's surname, initial of first name, title of the book (without quotation marks), volume or part number (if applicable), place of publication, year, and page number (without "p.").		
b.	For articles in collections –	author's surname, initial of first name, title of the article (without quotation marks), title of the collection (without quotation marks), editor's name (if applicable), volume or part number (if applicable), place of publication, year, and page number (without "p.").		
c.	For journal articles –	author's surname, initial of first name, title of the article (without quotation marks), abbreviated name of the periodical (e.g., <i>journ.</i> , <i>newsp.</i>), title (in quotation marks), issue number, year (month, day), and page number (without "p."). All bibliographic elements of foreign sources must be presented in the original language or in a language understood by the author (with reference to the official translation).		
d.	A consistent citation system must be maintained in footnotes:	the author's name should be in italics; other information in regular font. All surnames, including editors', should be italicized. All components (except the surname and initial) must be separated by commas, and the footnote must end with a period.		
✓	Ivanidze M.,	<i>Alternative Sentences, Trends of Liberalization in Criminal Legislation in</i>		

Georgia. Tbilisi, 2016, 342.

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

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

f. For decisions of international and foreign courts:

Court of Justice

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

European Court of Human Rights

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

International Court of Justice

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

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

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

for US courts: საქმე ბრაუნი განათლების საბჭოს წინააღმდეგ (*Brown v Board of Education*, 347 US 483 (1954)).

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

1. Published decisions,
2. Officially available electronic sources,
3. Archive-only access, and develop a consistent approach.
- h. Documents of international organizations must be cited according to the citation format officially used by the organization (see official websites).
- i. Conventions and international treaties must be cited as follows: e.g., *1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer*.

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

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

m. At the end of a cited text, punctuation marks (period, colon, semicolon, question mark, exclamation point) must be placed *before* the closing quotation mark when completing a sentence, or *after* the quotation mark if the quotation is a single word or phrase within a sentence.

When a word is followed by a quotation mark, punctuation, and a footnote mark simultaneously, the correct sequence is: 1. quotation mark, 2. punctuation mark, 3. footnote symbol. At the end of a cited sentence, the sequence should be: 1. punctuation mark, 2. quotation mark, 3. footnote symbol. Double quotation marks must not appear consecutively. For brackets, different types may be used.

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

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

Article	5.	Components	of	the	Doctoral	Dissertation
5.1.	Mandatory	components	of	the	doctoral	dissertation:
a.				Formal		section:
a.a.				Title		page;
a.b.				Signature		page;
a.c.				Copyright		page;
a.d.	Abstract	in		Georgian	and	English;
a.e.		Table		of		contents.
b.				Main		body:
b.a.						Introduction;
b.b.				Main		text;
b.c.						Conclusion.
c.	Bibliography.					
5.2.	Additional	components	of	the	doctoral	dissertation:
a.		List		of		tables;
b.	Appendices.					

Article 6. Formal Section of the Doctoral Dissertation

- 6.1. The title page (outer cover) must follow a standard format and include the title of the dissertation, the full names of the author and the scientific advisor, and the text “Dissertation submitted for the award of the academic degree of Doctor of Law,” “Caucasus University,” “Tbilisi, Georgia.” The page is numbered (I), but the number is not shown (Appendix 5).
- 6.2. The signature page (page II) must follow a standard format. All copies of the submitted version must include original signatures. This page must contain the following text: “Caucasus University,” “School of Law,” “We, the undersigned, confirm that we have reviewed the doctoral dissertation submitted by [full name] titled: [title], and recommend its submission to the Dissertation Board of the School of Law at Caucasus University for consideration toward the academic degree of Doctor of Law,” and the date. It must be signed by the scientific advisor and all reviewers.
- 6.3. The copyright page (page III) must follow a standard format. The original of the standard version must bear the author’s handwritten signature. This page grants Caucasus University Library non-commercial, educational rights to distribute and reference the dissertation. It must include: “Caucasus University,” the year of submission, author’s full name, title of the

dissertation, name of the school, and the academic degree sought. It must also include the standard texts: “Caucasus University is granted permission to copy and distribute the above-mentioned dissertation for non-commercial purposes upon request by individuals or institutions,” and “The author retains all other copyright-related rights. The author affirms that permission has been obtained for all copyrighted materials used in the dissertation (except for minor quotations that require only proper bibliographic referencing, as accepted in academic works), and assumes full responsibility for them.”

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

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

Article 7. Main Body of the Doctoral Dissertation

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

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

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

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

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

Article 8. Rules for Compiling the Bibliography

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

8.2. First list Georgian normative materials (with dates of adoption), followed by Georgian academic literature in alphabetical order, and then Georgian court decisions (from newest to oldest). Next, list foreign-language sources in the same order: normative materials, academic literature, online sources, and court decisions. At the end of each academic source, specify page

references. If the same source is cited with different page numbers throughout the paper, it must appear once in the bibliography with all referenced page numbers listed.

Article 9. Additional Components of the Doctoral Dissertation

9.1. If the dissertation includes a list of tables, analytical procedures, diagrams, schemes, and illustrations, it must appear after the table of contents in the introductory section. Line spacing must be 1.5. For paragraphs longer than one line, spacing must be 1. Font size must be 12. Page numbers must be aligned to the right margin. It is acceptable to use symbols like “.”, “-”, or “_” between titles and page numbers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Article 10. Published Version of the Doctoral Dissertation

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

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

Article 11. Electronic Version of the Doctoral Dissertation

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



Annex #8

Scientific Advisor’s Review

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

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

Signature **of** **the** **Scientific** **Advisor:**
Date:



Reviewer’s Report

On the Doctoral Dissertation of the PhD Candidate -----

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

The reviewer must evaluate the doctoral dissertation based on the following criteria:

1. Structure of the dissertation;
2. Relevance of the topic, novelty and innovation of the research, and problem formulation;
3. Research goal(s) and objectives;
4. Research methodology;
5. Scientific value of the research findings and/or potential practical applicability;
6. Information regarding plagiarism or data falsification.

The structure of the review may include the following sections:

- 1. Evaluation of the formal aspects of the dissertation**
 - 1.1. Technical specifications of the dissertation
 - 1.2. Composition and organization
 - 1.3. Language and stylistic formulation
 - 1.4. Use of diagrams, tables, and matrices
 - 1.5. Citation format
- 2. Evaluation of the content of the dissertation**
 - 2.1. Problem statement
 - 2.2. Review of literature
 - 2.3. Evaluation of individual sections of the dissertation
 - 2.4. Research methodology and results of the empirical part
 - 2.5. Practical significance of the dissertation

3. Issues requiring further clarification

4. Summary assessment

The reviewer must provide a recommendation either:

- to admit the dissertation for final evaluation (positive assessment),
or

- to **return the dissertation to the doctoral candidate** for revision and correction of deficiencies based on the provided recommendations (negative assessment).

Annex #10

Minutes No. _____ of the Doctoral Dissertation Defense Committee
 Doctoral Program in Law – Caucasus School of Law
 Doctoral Candidate: _____
 (First Name, Last Name)

Date, Tbilisi

1. **List** of **Attendees:**
 Indicate all present members of the Doctoral Dissertation Defense Committee, reviewers, and the scientific advisor(s) (include full name, institution, academic/scientific position).
2. **Agenda** **Formulation:**
 Defense of the dissertation titled “_____” submitted by PhD candidate _____ (First Name, Last Name) of the “” Doctoral Educational Program, Faculty of _____.
3. **Approval** of the **Agenda:**
 Conduct a vote to approve the agenda of the defense session. Indicate the number of supporting votes.
4. **Committee Decision on Agenda Approval:**
 Indicate the number of members who voted in favor of approving the agenda.
5. **Information About the Candidate:**
 Presented by the committee secretary (maximum 10 minutes).
6. **Presentation by the Doctoral Candidate:**
 Presentation of the dissertation by the candidate (maximum 30 minutes). The candidate’s speech must be attached to the minutes.
7. **Presentation of the First Reviewer’s Report:**
 (Maximum 15 minutes. The review is attached to the minutes.)
8. **Response of the Candidate to the First Review:**
 (Maximum 15 minutes. The candidate’s response is attached to the minutes. The discussion must be recorded in the minutes.)
9. **Presentation of the Second Reviewer’s Report:**
 (Maximum 15 minutes. The review is attached to the minutes.)
10. **Response of the Candidate to the Second Review:**
 (Maximum 15 minutes. The candidate’s response is attached to the minutes. The discussion must be recorded in the minutes.)
11. **Presentation of the Third Reviewer’s Report:**
 (Maximum 15 minutes. The review is attached to the minutes.)
12. **Response of the Candidate to the Third Review:**
 (Maximum 15 minutes. The candidate’s response is attached to the minutes. The discussion must be recorded in the minutes.)
13. **Scientific Discussion:**
 Each speaker is allotted up to 5 minutes; the candidate may respond within 5 minutes.

Questions and answers between the committee members, attending audience, and the candidate must be documented in the minutes.

14. **Scientific** **Advisor's** **Speech:**
(Maximum 10 minutes. The advisor's written evaluation is attached to the minutes.)

15. **Doctoral** **Candidate's** **Final** **Remarks:**
(Maximum 5 minutes.)

16. **Evaluation** **Procedure:**
The dissertation is evaluated in a closed session by the Defense Committee. The final decision is announced publicly.

Signatures:

Chair of the Doctoral Dissertation Defense Committee: _____

Secretary of the Doctoral Dissertation Defense Committee: _____



Annex #11

Summary **Report**
On the Work Completed by the PhD Candidate -----
Doctoral Program **in** **Law**
Caucasus School of Law, Caucasus University

Summary Report On the Work Completed by the PhD Candidate of the Doctoral Program in Law Caucasus School of Law, Caucasus University	
General Information	
Full Name of the Doctoral Candidate: _____	
Date of Admission to the Doctoral Program and Order Number: _____	
Title of the Doctoral Dissertation: _____ <i>(Indicate if the dissertation topic was changed during the course of study; include updated title and date of approval if applicable)</i>	

Learning Component

N	Title of the learning component	Academic year/semester	Credits	Evaluation
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

Scientific Component

1. Information about the scientific component (if applicable)

N	Title of the scientific component	Academic year/semester
1		
2		
3		

2. Local and international scientific collaboration and the relevance of the doctoral candidate's visit abroad to the research topic (if applicable).

(Describe local and international collaborations within the scientific component. For any scientific research visits or internships undertaken for the purposes of the research (if applicable), specify the name of the host institution/research center and country, the name, surname, academic degree, and role of the scientific consultant during the visit/internship in achieving the dissertation objectives. Recommended word count: 400 words.)

3. Participation in local and international scientific events (forums, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.) (if applicable).

N	Title of the scientific forum, Date, and Location	Title of the presentation	Electronic address

2. Published publications related to the dissertation topic

N	Author(s) (All co-authors must be listed; the doctoral candidate's surname should be highlighted in bold)	Type of publication (monograph, article in a peer-reviewed international or foreign journal, local journal, conference proceedings, etc.)	Title of the publication (Name of the journal/publisher, type/volume, pages, electronic address of the publication (if available))
1			
2			

Name and Surname (in full)

Signature

Date



Annex #12

Assistant Professor Evaluation Form

(to be evaluated by the Scientific Advisor)

----- Scientific Advisor Professor
----- Doctoral Candidate's Last Name,
First Name

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Scope	Earned Points	Notes
Content mastery and depth of understanding of the subject matter, demonstrated during lectures and seminars	Maximum 15		
Conducting seminars and effective use of teaching-learning activities	Maximum 15		
Preparation of seminar materials, exam assignments, simulation tasks, and homework projects	Maximum 20		
Assessment and evaluation of students' work	Maximum 20		
Overall cumulative evaluation	70		

Evaluator's signature:

Date:



Annex #13

Assistant Professor Evaluation Form

(Evaluated by the Administration)

Doctoral Candidate's Last Name, First Name

Administration Member's Last Name, First Name

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Scope %	Earned Points	Notes
Structure and Logical Sequence/Coherence of the Presentation (Report)	Maximum 10		
Academic and Substantive Elaboration of Topics Covered During the Assistant Professorship Period	Maximum 10		
Technical Aspects of the Presentation, Presentation Method, and Delivery Skills	Maximum 10		
Overall Evaluation Score	30		

Overall Evaluation

Evaluator's Signature:

Date: