Georgian Institute of Public Affairs

Rule of planning, implementation and evaluation of the Master Programs Research Component

Article 1. Masters programs research component

1. The research component of Masters Programs in Georgian Institute of Public Affairs is designed to develop student research skills.
2. Compulsory research component of master programs is master's thesis.
3. Execution of compulsory research component of master programs is confirmed by presenting and observing master's thesis (presentation, discussion).
4. The goal of the Master's thesis and its public defense is to develop a student's ability to carry out the research independently, present the results achieved, and publicly present it reasonably.
5. Master's thesis is the student's original research / thesis; The student undertakes responsibility on the quality of its performance.
6. In the research project of the Master's Thesis the literature shall be cited according to the Chicago Style or Apa Style.

Article 2. Precondition for admission

Compulsory research component of Master Programs shall be done by students who meet the conditions envisaged by the master's program education component and collect all relevant credits before the Master's thesis defense in all obligatory subjects.[1]

[1] Accumulation of at least 90 credits is the precondition for admission for master's thesis for MA students of public adminitration, local governance, public policy, environmental managment policy, public relations, applied psychology, international relations and international law;
Accumulation of at least 105 credits is the precondition for admission for master's thesis for MA students of business administration;

Article 3. Registration of the topic and head of the Master's Thesis

1. The title and head of the Master topic shall be registered with the Head/coordinator of the Master Program.
2. The head shall be chosen within 14 calendar days from the beginning of the fourth semester within the masters program.
3. Selecting a master topic within the Masters program shall be conducted by the MA student within 7 calendar days from the selection of the head of the thesis.
4. The work and its title may be changed in agreement with the head during the working process.
5. After the title and head of the Master topic are registered, the MA student begins to work independently on the Master's Research Project / Prospectus.

Article 4. Shifting the topic of the Master's Thesis

The student has the right to shift the Master's thesis on the basis of personal application, in accordance with the Regulations of the Educational process of the university and the agreement.[2]

Article 5. Head and Co-head of MA student

1. The head of the MA student might be a Doctor or have equivalent degree, who has research experience related to the master's topic and relevant publications.
2. Duty of the head of Master's thesis is to give the student direction and advice to improve the work. The head controls the performance of the research component by the MA student.
3. If needed, MA student may have a consultant who is a field expert and / or a person with practical experience and has the relevant experience / knowledge related to the topic of master's thesis, which is chosen with the head or coordinator of the program.
4. In this case the consultant will be identified as co-head of a master's thesis.
5. One person might guide up to five master's works. However, in case of co-administration, no more than eight mastership management is allowed.

Article 6. Master Research Project / Prospectus

[1] Accumulation of at least 95 credits is the precondition for admission for master's thesis for MA students of multimedia journalism and media managment, and media engineering.
[2] The student has the right to shift the master's thesis on the basis of personal application for the next academic year. In such case student obliged to pay a master's thesis shift fee of 500 GEL. In case of a valid document, the student is exempt from payment of the fee.

1. Master's Research project / Prospectus is a preliminary draft of the Master's work carried out with the independent work of the student and the implemented research of the head.
2. Within 49 calendar days from the date of registry of the thesis title and head, MA student shall represent the completed research project to the program head / coordinator.
3. The submitted Master Degree Project should be accompanied by a written conclusion of the head of the topic that he /she has acquired the Master's Research Project and the Project / Prospectus is ready for approval.
4. The capacity of the Master Research Project / Prospectus should be at least 8 and not more than 10 pages. All pages must be numbered in a sequence. It is not allowed to leave a free space or page. The Master Research Project / Prospectus text shall be done on A4 format paper with Sylfaen font, size-12. Minimum size for page numbers and footnotes is 10. Heading and subheadings might be in a larger font size. In the main text of the Master Research Project / Prospectus, the interval shall equal 1,5. The left side margin of the Master Research Project / Prospectus shall be 25 mm and other marging shall be 15 mm. The master's research project / prospectus should be printed on a single page.
3. The Master Research Project / Prospectus shall include:[3]
a. Introduction (general characterization, novelty, actuality, project objectives);
b. Basic issues and approximate structure;
c. Bibliography (review of initial sources, scientific and other literature overview).
4. The public presentation of the Master Research Project / Prospectus shall be conducted before the Commission created by the Program Director, within 14 calendar days after the date of the submission of the Master Project / Prospectus. The Head of the Masters Program, the Head of the Masters Research, as well as the representatives of the academic and invited personnel shall participate in the Commission.
5. MA student shall present the research project that is properly prepared, using electronic presentation and answer the questions of commission members.
6. The Commission approves the master's research project by the majority of votes after which the MA student starts working on Master's Degree. In case of negative decision, the student is entitled to prepare additional work on the master's research project within 7 calendar days.
7. In case of negative assessment of the revised version, absense of the students or non-use of additional term, the MA student shall be permitted for the project for the next semester.

Article 7. Master's Thesis

1. Master's thesis shall be the result of independent research work of the MA student. Master's thesis should reflect the grounded results of scientific research.

[3] Please, see specific requirements for master programs in the relevant attachments (see Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4)

2. Requirements of master's thesis (detailed structure, volume, format, style, assessment criteria and other technical data) shall be determined by the appropriate attachments of the present Rule (see Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4).

Article 8. Master's thesis submission

1. The MA student shall represent to the School Administration two print copies of the Master's paper and its electronic version (in Microsoft Word and PDF formats), until the end of the Fourth Training Semester (no later than 22nd week of the education course).
2. In addition to a Master's Degree, MA student shall present to the Program manager the written conclusion of the Head on Master's thesis, as well as the acquaintance that the head has read the Master's thesis and the work is ready to be submitted for the final assessment.

Article 9. Approval of the Masters Thesis Date and the composition of the Commission

1. The decision of the Master's thesis defense date and the Composition of the Commission (including the Chairperson of the Commission) shall be made by the school Dean with representation of the head of the program.
2. The Master's thesis may be prescribed no later than 24th week after the decision on the date of the Master's examination is made.
3. After 3 working days from the approval of the composition of the Master's Thesis Competition, the School provides copies of the Master's thesis to the Commission members.
4. The Master's Defense Commission shall consist of 5 members of the respective science field related to the Master's Thesis.
5. A member of the Master's Defense Commission may be either professor of university or associate professor, as well as a doctor or other person with scientific degree. The Head of the MA students also participates (without the right to vote).
6. The Master's Defense Commission shall be headed by the Chairperson approved by the School Dean, chosen from its members.

Article 10. Master's thesis defense

1. The Master's thesis defense shall be conducted publicly so that the student represents the results of the work performed.
2. The Master's Thesis Commission meeting is authorized if it is attended by at least three members of the Commission.

3. Master's thesis process is desirable to be attended by the head of the MA student. If such person does not attend the Commission meeting due to a reason, he / she shall notify the Program Head in advance.
4. If the MA student could not attend the defense due to a documented reason or the or the Commission's Quorum was not held, or the Master's thesis defense was not held due to other reasons independent from the student, the school administration will appoint additional date for the defense of Master's thesis in the same semester.
5. Each MA student will be examined individually at the defense. In addition, the duration of defense should not exceed 30 minutes.
6. The defense process includes the presentation and question-answer / discussion of the results about the master's work at the defense.
7. During the presentation of the master's thesis, the student shall use the visible material, for example, slides, posters, video-movie equipment, etc.
8. After the presentation of the thesis the discussion is held, the duration shall not exceed 15 minutes. MA students responds to the questions asked by the commission members.
9. After the discussion, the Commission shall make a decision at the closed session for thesis evaluation.

Article 11. Evaluation of Master's Thesis

1. The commission set up to assess the master's thesis shall evaluate it with a single, final assessment.
2. Student's achievements are evaluated by a 100-point system.
3. The criteria used for the final assessment of the master's thesis shall be determined in accordance with the Programs given in the attachments (see Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4).
3. The final points of oral defense are determined by the arithmetic average of the the scores obtained from the Commission members individually (the amount of points divided in the number of commission members).
4. Credit is given with one of the positive evaluation in accordance with the legislation.
7. The assessment system gives five types of positive assessment:

a) (A) Excellent - a rating of 91-100 points;
b) (B) Very good - 81-90 points of maximum evaluation;
c) (C) Good - 71-80 points of maximum evaluation;
d) (D) satisfactory - 61-70 points of maximum evaluation;
e) (E) enough - 51-60 points of maximum evaluation;
8. The assessment system gives two types of negative assessment:

a) (FX) can not pass - 41-50 points of maximum evaluation which means that the student needs more work to pass and is given the right to pass the exam once more with independent work; MA student is entitled to submit an edited research component for the next semester.
b) (F) - fail - 40 points and less of maximum evaluation which means that the work carried out by the student is not sufficient and the MA student loses the right to present the same scientific-research component.
9. In case of negative assessment of master's thesis, the student shall be granted the right to present a new Master's Degree in accordance with the terms of the agreement
10. The grounds for the negative assessment of the Master's thesis are:
a) Absence from the public defense for no reason;
b) Refusal of defence at the public defense;
c) Violation of academic faithfullness (plagiarism);
d) Attempt to get an assessment with a threat to the examiner, by physical or mental pressure, deception, fraud or other ways.

Article 12. Results of positive assessment of master thesis

1. In case of positive evaluation of the master's thesis, the student is awarded with the Master's degree, which will be confirmed by the Master's Diploma.
2. The diploma of Master's Academic degree is issued by the University. The diploma and diploma attachment will be done in accordance with the procedure established by the university. The diploma is signed by the school's Dean and the Rector of the university.

Annex N1.

Requirements of Public Administration, Local Government, Public Policy, Environmental Management and Policy and Management, Public Relations, Applied Psychology, International Relations, International Law Master Programs

Structure of the Master's Thesis Prospectus:

The essential component parts of the master's thesis prospectus are:

a. Title page;

b. Copyright page;

c. Content:

c.a. The importance of research;

c.b. Literature review;

c.c. Research question / goal / hypothesis;

c.d. Research plan;

c.e. Technical description of the research (optional component);

c.f. Thesis schedule;

c.g. Preliminary bibliography.

Structure of Masters Thesis:

The essential component parts of the master's thesis are:

a. Title page;

b. Resume/Abstract in Georgian and English languages;

c. Content;

d. Definition of Terms; Abbreviation list (if necessary)

e. Main Text:

e.a. Introduction;

e.b. Literature review;

e.c. Research question / goal / hypothesis;

e.d. Technical description of the research (optional component);

e.e. Research results and analysis;

e.f. Research restrictions;

e.g. Conclusion;

f. Bibliography or list of used literature;

g. Annexes.

Master's thesis evaluation: Master's thesis is evaluated by a reviewer and commission members. Special points are divided as follows: 50% reviewer's evaluation, 50% of the average arithmethic of the number of commission members. The reviewer delivers a review of the diploma thesis to the program coordinator a week before the Master's thesis presentation. The program coordinator sends the document to the student and other commission members for discussion.

Master's thesis evaluation criteria and form:

Evaluation Criteria	Reviewer's comment	Points
Focus (20%) • All parts of the work is related to the research question		
Research (20%) • Methodology • Quality of performance		
Literature (15%) • Relevance of the used literature • Critical analysis		
Argumentation (15%) • Argumentation Ability • Critical thinking ability • Argumentation • Conclusions		
Information and data presentation (20%) • Academic writing skills • Structure and consistency • Ability to convey thoughts and information		
Oral Presentation (10%)		

• Ability to deliver information orally • Improvisation and argumentation skills		

Distribution of Evaluation Points

91-100% - Focus and structure of the work is done precisely, format is reserved; The meaning is given well both in writing and in oral form; The literature presented in the work is academic and corresponds to the subjective topic; The student uses theoretical knowledge obtained within the program; Research, critical analysis and evaluation is shown; The recommendations received as a result of the research comply with conclusions and research findings; After the presentation, the student draws argumentative conclusions and demonstrates improvisation skills;

81-90% - Focus and structure of the work is almost done precisely, format is reserved; The meaning is given both in writing and in oral form mostly in a good manner; The literature presented in the work is academic and mostly corresponds to the subjective topic; The student mostly uses theoretical knowledge obtained within the program; Research, critical analysis and evaluation is shown; The recommendations received as a result of the research mostly comply with conclusions and research findings; After the presentation, the student draws argumentative conclusions and mostly demonstrates improvisation skills;

71-80% - Part of the focus and structure of the work is done clearly and accurately, but several components are missing; Format is reserved; In a satisfactory part t, the opinion is given in writing and in oral form mostly in a good manner; The literature presented in the work is academic and satisfactory to its compliance with the subject; The student partly reveals the theoretical knowledge received within the program; Critical analysis and evaluation of research is shown; Recommendations as a result of the research partially comply with conclusion and research findings; After the presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion, lack credibility; In most cases the student is able to demonstrate the improvisation skills;

61-70% - Focus and structure of the work are more or less distinct, but lacks important components; The format is partly violated; Opinion is fragmented in both written and oral forms; The literature presented in the study is academic and more or less relevant to the subject; The student reveals the average level of theoretical knowledge obtained from the program; The ability to analyze and evaluate the research is

partially shown; The recommendations received as a result of the research are more or less in compliance with the conclusion and research findings, but it is obvious that a deeper understanding of important components is lacking; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack convincing / relying on relevant data on relevant data; The student can more or less demonstrate the ability of improvisation;

51-60% - Focus and structure of the work lack important components, the format is partly violated; Opinion is fragmented in both written and oral forms; The literature presented in the work is less academic and partly corresponds to the subject; The student reveals low level of theoretical knowledge obtained within the program; The critical analysis and evaluation is partly shown, but the work contains mostly dry facts; The conclusions obtained from the research repeat the different components of the work and lack understanding and analysis; Research findings are not fully developed; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion are weak, lacking convincing / relying on relevant data on relevant data; The student can more or less demonstrate the ability of improvisation;

41-50% - Focus and structure of the work lack important components, the format is partly violated; The idea is fragmentary and vague, it is not adequate to the demand; The literature presented in the work is not academic and mostly does not correspond to the subject; The student does not show the theoretical knowledge obtained within the program; Critical analysis and evaluation of research is not shown; Research findings and recommendations are inadequate in relation to the given information; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion are weak and not convincing / relying on relevant data; The student does not have the ability to improvise;

0-40% - The work is not presented or completely incompatible with the requirements.

Annex N2.

Requirements for the Master's Program in Business Administration

Master's Thesis Prospectus / Project Structure:

The essential component parts of the master's thesis are:

a. Title page;

b. Copyright page;

c. Content:

c.a. Short information about the selected business (100-250 words)

c.b. Topic Actuality - justified why the business is interesting;

c.c. Structure of the Thesis - Business Document Table of Contents;

c.d. Substantiation and brief overview of each item / element of the work (80-150 words);

c.e. Time horizons - what period is covered by the business plan and why;

c.f. Schedule and description of the works to be carried out - review of the tools to be envisaged by MA student (150-250 words);

d. Schedule of the work;

e. Preliminary bibliography.

Structure of Master's Thesis

The essential parts of the master's thesis are:

a. Title page;

b. Abstract /Resume in Georgian and English languages (80-150 words);

c. Table of contents

d. Definition of Terms; Abbreviation list (if necessary);

e. Review of the work - "Executive Summary" (400-450 words - maximum 2 pages);

e.a The purpose of the plan and Topic Actuality - the reason why the business is interesting;

e.b. "Company Today" and its current value;

e.c. Analyzing the company's chosen field and development prospects;

e.d. Company Development Strategy;

e.e. Initiatives of Business Value Increase (including plan-schedule, responsible individuals and results);

e.f. Financial plan - increase in value;

e.g. Business plan;

e.h. Conclusion;
f. Bibliography or list of used literature;
g. Annexes.

Master's thesis assessment: Master's thesis is evaluated by a reviewer and commission members. Points are distributed as follows - 40% reviewer's evaluation, 60% the average arithemtic of the number of commission members.

Master's thesis evaluation criteria and form:

Evaluation Criteria	Reviewer's comment	Points
Layout (10%) • All part of the work is related to the idea • Format is reserved • The work is original • The work is innovative		
Content (30%) • The work is assembled methodologically • The work content is presented academically		
Structure (30%) • Project structure • Strategy strength • Risk assessment • Evaluation of returns • Use of management tools • Consistency • Result overview		
Reality (10%)		

• Critical thinking ability • Business and industry research and analysis • Business shrewdness • Argumentation • Conclusions		
Presentation (20%) • Ability to deliver information orally • Improvisation and argumentation skills • Confidence • Presentation visualization		
Final points		

Distribution of Evaluation Points:

91-100%- Focus and structure of the work is done precisely, format is reserved; The meaning is given well both in writing and in oral form; The literature presented in the work is academic and corresponds to the subjective topic; The student uses theoretical knowledge obtained within the program; Research, critical analysis and evaluation is shown; The recommendations received as a result of the research comply with conclusions and research findings; After the presentation, the student draws argumentative conclusions and demonstrates improvisation skills;

81-90% - Structure of the work is almost done precisely , format is reserved; The meaning is given both in writing and in oral form mostly in a good manner; The student mostly shows the theoretical knowledge obtained within the module; Critical analysis and evaluation of business processes are shown; The recommendations received as a result of the research mostly comply with conclusions and research findings; After the presentation, the student draws argumentative conclusions and mostly demonstrates improvisation skills;

71-80% - Part of the structure of the work is done clearly and accurately, but specific components are lacking; Format is reserved; In a satisfactory part, the opinion is mostly written both in writing and in oral form;

The student partially reveals the theoretical knowledge obtained within the module; Critical analysis and evaluation of business processes; Decisions and recommendations made as a result of the research are partially concluded with conclusions and research findings; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack credibility; In most cases the student shows improvisation skills;

61-70% - The structure of the work is more or less distinct, but lacks significant components; The format is partly violated; Opinion is fragmented in both written and oral form; The student reveals the level of theoretical knowledge obtained within the module; The ability to analyze and evaluate business processes is partly shown; The decisions and recommendations made as a result of the research are more or less in compliance with the conclusion and research findings, but it is obvious that it lacks of understanding of important components; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack conviction / relying on relevant data; The student can partly demonstrate the ability of improvisation;

51-60% - The structure lacks significant components, the format is partly violated; Opinion is fragmented in both written and oral form; The student reveals the low level of theoretical knowledge obtained within the module; The ability to analyze and evaluate the business processes are partly shown, though dry facts are mostly given in the work. The conclusions obtained from the survey replicate the processes and lack of understanding and analysis; Research findings are not fully developed; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion are weak, lack conviction / relying on relevant data; The student can partly demonstrate the ability of improvisation;

41-50% - The structure lacks significant components, the format is partly violated; The idea is fragmentary and vague, it is not adequate to the demand; The student does not show the theoretical knowledge received within the module; Critical analysis and assessment of business processes is not shown; Research findings and recommendations are inadequate in relation to the given information; After the presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion are weak and not convincing / relying on relevant data; The student does not have the ability to improvise;

0-40% - The work is not presented or completely incompatible with the requirements.

Annex N3.

Multimedia Journalism and Media Management Masters Program Requirements

Master's Thesis Prospectus / Project Structure:

The essential component parts of the master's thesis prospectus are:
a. Title page;
b. Copyright page;
c. Contents:
c.a Detailed discussion of the concept of the portfolio and works nin it (as old and additional new components) in the framework of the master project;
c.b Topic Actuality - the reason why these works are interesting;
c.c. Argumentation and brief overview of each item of the work (80-150 words);
c.d.Detailed description of all the technologies used in the process of creation of portfolios and works;
c.e.Plann and description of works
d.Schedule of the work;
e. Preliminary bibliography.

Structure of Masters Thesis:

The essential parts of the master's thesis are:
a. Title page;
b. Abstract / Resume in Georgian and English languages (80-150 words);
c. Table of contents
d. Definition of Terms; Abbreviation list (if necessary);
e. Portfolio concept and at least four practical works including:
e.a. Reportage - in-depth article / research;
e.b. Photo - story (with annotations)
e.c. Video reportage or short documentary
e.d Audio history
f. The new (or improved) fifth portfolio which might show:
f.a. In-depth article / research

f.b. Photo history (with annotations)
f.c. In-depth video reportage or short documentary
f.d. In-depth radio reportage
f.e. Media Startup Business Plan
f.f. Conclusion;
f.g. Bibliography or list of used literature;
f.h Annexes.

All components of the portfolio: practical journalistic works and media startup business plan should comply with criteria for the master's project.

Additional (fifth) Practical component criteria:

1. In-depth article - including 2000-3000 words / including 10-12 source documents;
2. In-depth of video reportage - 7-10-minute reportage on current active, acute themes or short documentary film - 15-30 min, visual history narrated by a distinctive creative approach.
3. In-depth Radio Reportage - 7-10-minute report on current acute issues.
4. Photo History (20-35 photos) with small texts (with annotations);
5. Media Management Project - Startup Business Plan - 3000 - 4000 words.

Criteria for portfolio component:
Portfolio made in web should have the following:

- Creative concept that unites / unifies all works. The concept should be understood with the help of the Project Head of the Project Portfolio.
- It should also contain student's creative / professional biography.
- Digital narrative should be used to interconnect journalistic works logically and conceptually.

Examples of platforms that can be used to build portfolio:

- *https://www.clippings.me/*
- *https://www.journoportfolio.com/*
- *https://www.squarespace.com/*
- *https://pressfolios.com/*
- *https://wordpress.com/*

Master's thesis evaluation: Each work is evaluated by 3 reviewers: one of them is the head of the MA diploma work. The first assessment of the work is done by the head of the head of the MA work. In case of a positive assessment (51 points and more), the paper is given to two reviewers. If all of them give positive assessment, the student is allowed to attend the oral presentation, which will be attended by the same reviewers. Points received in the oral presentation will be added to the points received in the written paper. The final point is calculated with the average point of three different assessments. To calculate the final mark, all three assessments of the work should be positive.

MA project evaluation criteria and Distribution of evaluation points

1. Portfolio web dimension - 30%
2. New (or improved) work (component) - 50%
3. Presentation - 10%
4. Activity / Deadlines - 10%

1) Portfolio Web Dimension (Content, Visual, Software Solution) - 30 points

The purpose of the evaluation component:

This component checks the student's works for two years; Ability to unite on a single (web platform) of individual works with interconnecting and logical chain. Also, ensuring the smooth and functional work of the platform.

Special conditions: Protection of the deadlines prescribed for project submission. The precondition of this component is timely and in-depth work on the previous stages of the project, finding materials, structuring, and organizing the work.

Component structure: upload and process materials in web space.

Distribution of evaluation points:

30-26 points: Web platform represented by a student has an original concept. It is unique with its findings and visions and ideal design. As for the content, it is well-arranged in the program visually. It consists of at least 5 components (works). The author is also effectively presented.

25-21 points: Web platform represented by the student has an interesting concept, though it does not stand out with special originality. As for the content, it is well-arranged in the program visually. It consists of at least 5 components (works). The author is also effectively presented.

20-16 points: The web platform represented by the student has a certain concept, though it does not stand out with special originality. Content is well-arranged, but there are software flaws. The visual concept is not well-understood. It consists of at least 5 components (works). The page contains the author representation, but is limited to the standard biography and does not attract special attention, though gives detailed information.

15-11 points: Web platform represented by the student includes all the necessary work that has some content logic with the accompanying visual material, although the page is not intended to be visually and conceptually well-understood. Connections between individual components are not well-arranged. Lists of materials are incomplete, as well as the author's representation (requires additional information). Despite these flaws, all five components are presented on the web and are easily available.

10-6 points: Web platform represented by the student includes all the necessary works, but there is no content and visual logic (there are no connections between individual components). Lists of materials are incomplete, as well as the author's representation (requires additional information). Despite all these shortcomings, all five components are presented on the web, although there are some software flaws.

5-2 points: The works on the web platform presented by the student are incomplete (lacking 1 or 2 works). There is no content and visual logic (there are no connections between individual components). Lists of materials are incomplete, as well as the author's representation (requires additional information). There are software gaps in the process of access to material.

1-0 points: Student has presented several works on different platforms in the incomplete form and does not have any web space / platform created.
Minimum competence level: 6 points

2) New component (reportage-text; audio; video / documentary, photo-project, business plan)- 50 points

Aim of the assessment component: The aim of this component is to create a new (or improved) work in one of the formats (text, video, photo, audio, startup business plan).

Special Conditions: Master Practical Courses (Audio, Photo, Video, Reporting, in case of choosing Media Management, the student should have the following courses passed: Media Management, Media Marketing and Sales, Media Entrepreneurship).

Component Structure:

- Text - 2000-3000 words / in-depth reportage (10-12 sources - including documents);
- Video - 7-10 minutes/ in-depth reportiage on acute current problem (or 15-30 min documentary film with special visual and creative approach);
- Audio reportage - 7-10 minutes in-depth reporting on the acute current problem;
- Photo project - 20-35 photos showing interesting story / character / problem with small texts;
- Media Management Project - Startup Business Plan - 3000-4000 words.

Distribution of Evaluation Points (Practical journalistic work):

50-43

In-depth actual reportage on acute issues, with a clearly defined focus to present unique history based on verifiable facts and diverse sources, syntactically and morphologically well-made text in accordance with journalistic ethics and balances. Technically perfect video and audio.

2000-3000 words (in case of an article); 7-10 minutes- in case of video / audio; 20-30 photo with annotations (in case of photo project). The project is presented within deadline.

42-35

In-depth actual reportage on acute issues, with a clearly defined focus, verified facts, based on several sources. The text contains a small number of grammatical errors. The norms and balance of journalistic ethics are not violated. In case of video and audio, there are some technical flaws. The material meets professional standards but does not stand out unique and original coverage.

2000-3000 words (in case of an article); 7-10 minutes- in case of video / audio; 20-30 photo with annotations (in case of photo project). The project is presented within deadline.

35-27

In-depth reportage on acute issues, with more or less focused focus, verified facts, based on several sources. The text includes grammatical errors. The norms of journalistic ethics are not violated. There is a problem of balancing the material, lacking the prospect of the other side. In case of video and audio,

there are technical flaws. The material does not stand out with unique history and original view of coverage.

2000-3000 words (in case of an article); 7-10 minutes- in case of video / audio; 20-30 photo with annotations (in case of photo project). The project is presented within deadline.4

26-19

The reportage lacks depth and actuality, requires narrowing of focus. It is based on several sources, but sources and evidence presented in the report are not enough. The text includes grammatical errors. The norms of journalistic ethics are not violated. There is a problem of balancing the material, lacking the prospect of the other side. In case of video and audio, there are serious technical flaws. The material does not stand out with unique history and original view of coverage.

2000-3000 words (in case of an article); 7-10 minutes- in case of video / audio; 20-30 photo with annotations (in case of photo project). The project is presented within deadline.

18-11

Reportage includes actual inaccuracies, is superficial and general, without focus, with scarce sources, causticity of the issue is not demonstrated. The reportage is biased and unbalanced. In case of video and audio, there are serious technical flaws. The text is faulty, with many grammatical errors.

The number of words does not meet the requirement (in the case of the article); Video / audio duration (number of photos) does not match the requirement (less than 5 minutes). Deadline of the project is violated.

10-4

Reportage includes factual errors, is superficial, focus is blurred, the credibility of the sources is not confirmed. The material is biased and unbalanced. Video and audio does not correspond to the standard. The text is faulty, with many grammatical errors.

Number of words - cannot reach 1000 words (in case of article); Video / audio duration (number of photos) is also incompatible with the requirement (less than 3 minutes). Deadline of the project is violated.

3-0

Reportage is not presented, only the individual elements are shown. The material does not contain any important information, the essence of history / problem is blurred. All deadlines are violated.

Minimum competence level:

11 points

Distribution of Evaluation Points (Media Startup Business Plan):

50-43 The student presented the startup business plan. All components of the business plan are considered, analyzed, and justified. The idea is innovative. The student shows a good source of reason to justify own decisions. The work of the thesis is well-arranged.
42-35 The student presented the startup business plan. Almost every component of the business plan is well reviewed, analyzed, and justified. The idea is interesting, though non-innovative. The student shows a good source for most of own decisions. The structure of the work well-arranged.
35-27 The student presented a business plan. Basic components of the business plan are discussed and analyzed. The student shows a source of evidence to justify the major part of own decisions. The structure of the work is acceptable.

26-19 The business plan presented by the student is acceptable, but lacks some components, analysis and logical chains. The student shows the sources to argument just a small part of their own decisions. The structure of the work is weak.

18-11 The business plan presented by the student lacks key components and data. The sources are insufficient or inadequate. The structure of the work is not visible or is very weak.

10-4 The student fails to present a business plan. The work lacks basic components, data, analysis, discussion, argumentation and logical chain. Sources are insufficient or not presented at all. The work does not have a structure.
3-0 The student fails to present any component of the business plan. There is no analysis in the work, any data, argumentation or logical chain. No sources are submitted. The work does not have a structure.

3) Presentation - 10 points

Goal of the component assessment: The purpose of the presentation is to effectively conduct the presentation of the work and presentation of the created portfolio in 10-15 minutes. During this time the concept of portfolio should be clear as well as the main components and the essence of the main component, the main findings and the importance. Verbal presentation must be accompanied by a visual part.

Special conditions: The student should already have a portfolio created in the web space for the presentation.

Component structure: Web site and / or presentation in any presentation program.

Distribution of evaluation points:

10-9 - Presentation is arranged in verbal and visual manner. The material is well-researched and the presentation covers both: the overall portfolio and the essence of the main component. It clearly shows the main findings.
8-7 - Presentation is visualized, but there are minor shortcomings in verbal presentation. The material is well-researched and the presentation covers both: the overall portfolio and the essence of the main component. It clearly shows the main findings.
6-5 - Presentation has visual flaws. The student has difficulty expressing the main point of view without questions. The presentation covers a certain part of the portfolio.
4-3 - The material is incomplete and the presentation lacks the project main components, therefore, it is difficult to understand the essence of the project.
2 - The material is incomplete and the presentation cannot represent a portfolio concept.
1 - The material is inadequate and the presentation cannot represent a portfolio concept
0 - The student has not prepared a presentation
Minimum competence level:
3 points

4) Activity and timeframe - 10 points

Goal of the evaluation component: The goal of this component is to ensure that students complete all the stages of the work, taking into consideration the advice of the head to implement the project successfully.

Special conditions: Deadlines are necessary conditions in the process of journalistic activities. Particular attention shall be paid to this aspect.

Distribution of evaluation points:
10-9 points: The student is actively involved in the process, performs all tasks and instructions. The completed work and the final project are represented on time.
8-7 points: The student is actively involved in the process, performs all tasks and instructions. The completed work and the final project are basically represented on time, only one or two delays.

6-5 points: The student is involved in the process, but there are some inaccuracies and delays in performing some tasks.
4-3 points: Student's involvement and initiative is weak during project implementation. There are frequent violations, but in the end the student still manages to implement the project. The advice of the head is only partial, but still satisfies the minimum standards.
2-1 points: Student's involvement and responsibility are very weak. The student does not perform a large number of the assigned tasks. The execution minimum is presented after the deadline. The student does not take any advice from the head. At any stage, the different components of the project cannot meet the minimum professional standards.
0 - The student is not involved in the process at all.

Minimum competence level:
4-3 points

Annex N4.

Media Engineering Master's Program Requirements

Master's Thesis Prospectus / Project Structure:

The essential component parts of the master's thesis/prospectus are:
a. Title page;
b. Copyright page;
c. Contents:
d.a. Detailed discussion of the application created within the master project;
d.b. Topic Actuality - giving argument why the application is interesting;
d.e. Show all the challenges accompanied by the project;
d.f. Solving a problem with the application;
d.g. Display the ways of solving a problem;
d.h. Display the principles of application functionality;
d.i Review user interface;
d.j Detailed description of all the technologies used in the process of app creation;
d.k. Schedule of the work;
d.l. Preliminary Bibliography.

Structure of Masters Thesis:

The essential parts of the master's thesis are:
a. Title page;
b. Abstract / Resume in Georgian and English languages (80-150 words);
c. Contents;
d. Definition of Terms; Abbreviation list (if necessary);
e. Review of the work - "Executive Summary" - "(400-450 words - maximum 2 pages);
e.a. Application functionality;
e.b. Perfection of the task set;
e.c. Product functionality;
e.d.Simplicity of product (perception of consumer);
e.e.Product needs and market demand;

e.f. Use of high quality code;
e.g. Compliance with software language;
e.h Usage od design patterns in application;
e.i Functions and technologies used for application building.

- ASP.NET MVC;
- JavaScript, HTML, CSS;
- Android, Kotlin;
- Unity 3D;
- Technologies different from the curriculum selected by the student (measured by higher assessment);

e.j. Conclusion;
e.k. Bibliography or list of used literature;
e.l Annexes.

Master's thesis evaluation: Master's thesis is evaluated by a reviewer and commission members. Special points are divided as follows: 50% reviewer's evaluation, 50% of the average arithmethic of the number of commission members.

Master's thesis evaluation criteria and form:

Evaluation Criteria	Reviewer's comment	points
Focus (10%) ● Thesis necessity		
Project Description (15%)		
Quality of application performance (55%) ● Quality of code ● Quality of the use of technologies used in app creation ● Code design ● Functional diversity		

Information and data presentation (10%) ● Structure and consistency ● ●Ability to convey information and mind		
Oral presentation - corrector's assessment (10%) ● Ability to deliver information orally ● Improvisation and argumentation skills		

Distribution of Evaluation Points:

91-100% - The work fully responds to the task defined by the project. The project is thoroughly described and the opinion is correctly expressed. The need for the work is also convincing; The student uses the knowledge received during the course; The student has a very high quality code and has the ability to use the technologies. The project is functionally diverse. After the presentation, the student draws argumentative conclusions and demonstrates the ability to improvise

81-90% - The work mostly responds to the task set out in the project; The project is described very well and the opinion is correctly expressed; The need for the work is also quite convincing; The student mostly uses the knowledge received during the course; The student has mostly high quality code and has the ability to use the technologies; The project is functionally diverse; After the presentation, the student draws argumentative conclusions and in most cases demonstrates the ability of improvisation;

71-80% - The work partially responds to the task set out in the project. The project is partially well described, the idea is more or less legitimate; The necessity of the work is partly convincing; The student uses partial knowledge during the course; The student writes in partially qualitative code and is more or less capable of using technologies; The project is partially functionally diverse. After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack credibility; In most cases the student is able to demonstrate the improvisation skills;

61-70% - The work more or less responds to the task set out in the project, but lacks important components; The description of the project is violated and the opinion is fragmented; The necessity of the work is partly convincing; The student weakly uses the knowledge received during the course; The student has a secondary quality code and has a weal ability to use the technologies; The project is not

functionally arranged; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack credibility; The student can partly show the ability of improvisation;

51-60% - The work does not actually respond to the task set out in the project and lacks significant components; The description of the project is violated and the opinion is fragmented; The necessity of the work is not convincing; The student weakly uses the knowledge received during the course; The student has a low quality code and has a weak ability to use the technologies; The project is not functionally arranged; After presentation, the arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack credibility; The student can partly show the ability of improvisation;

41-50% - The work does not respond to the task defined by the project; The description of the project is violated and the opinion is vague. The necessity of the work is not convincing; The student cannot use the knowledge received during the course; The student has a low quality code and does not have the capability to use the technologies used. The project has no functionality; The arguments presented by the student during the discussion after the presentation are weak and not convincing / relying on relevant data; The student does not have the ability to improvise;

0-40% - The work is not presented or completely incompatible with the requirements.