



## **NNLE GIPA-Georgian Institute of Public Affairs**

The rule of planning, implementation and evaluation of the research component of master's educational programs

### **Article 1. Research component of master's education programs**

1.1. The purpose of the research component of the Master's educational programs operating at NNLE GIPA- Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the University) is to develop the ability of the student to conduct research independently, by using the latest methods and approaches, adhering to the principles of academic integrity.

1.2. Mandatory research component of master's educational programs is master's project/thesis (hereinafter master's thesis).

1.3. Completion of the mandatory research component of the master's educational programs is confirmed by the presentation and defense of the master's thesis (presentation and discussion).

1.4. The goal of completing and defending the master's thesis is to develop the student's ability to independently conduct research in the selected field, to present the results of his studies and to present his reasoning based on the research results in an argumentative manner.

1.5. A master's thesis is a student's individual, independent, original research/thesis, and responsibility for maintaining standards of academic and research integrity of it rests with the student.

1.6. The literature citation in the research project/prospectus and the master's thesis should be done according to APA 7 or Chicago Style. The decision as to which style should be used in relation to a particular Master's program is made by the academic council of the respective school.

### **Article 2. Prerequisite for admission to the research component**

2.1 Only those students who meet the requirements established by the curriculum of the relevant educational program can complete the mandatory research component of the master's educational programs.

### **Article 3. Registration of the title and supervisor of the master's thesis**

3.1. The title and supervisor of the master's thesis are registered with the supervisor/coordinator of the respective program.

3.2. The selection of the subject and supervisor of the master's thesis must be made no later than 14 calendar days after the beginning of the fourth/relevant semester in agreement with the head/coordinator of the master's program.

3.3. The registration of the title of the master's thesis must be carried out by the student no later than 7 calendar days after the selection of the topic and supervisor of the master's thesis.

3.4. The title of the master's thesis may be changed during the subsequent work period in agreement with the supervisor of the master's thesis, which should be reported to the head/coordinator of the relevant program.

3.5. After registration of the master's thesis title and supervisor, the student starts working on the project/prospectus of the master's thesis in consultation with the master's thesis supervisor.

#### **Article 4. Postponement of master's thesis defense**

4.1 The student has the right, based on a personal statement, to postpone the defense of the master's thesis to the next semester/semesters in accordance with the rules governing the educational process of the university.

#### **Article 5. Master thesis supervisor and co-supervisor**

5.1 The supervisor of the master's thesis can be a doctor or a person with an academic degree equivalent to it, who is confirmed to have the experience of conducting research in the scientific field related to the topic of the master's thesis selected by the student and relevant publications.

5.2 The supervisor of the master's thesis is obliged to give direction and advise the student regarding the research design of the master's thesis, research methodology and the planning and implementation of the research project, as well as monitor the implementation of the student's research project and give feedback in order to improve the master's thesis. (Additional rights and duties of the supervisor of the master's thesis are determined by the agreement to be signed with him).

5.3 If necessary, the student may have a consultant who is an expert in the field and/or a person with practical experience and the confirmed relevant knowledge/experience related to the topic of the master's thesis selected by the student.

5.4 In the case provided by paragraph 5.3 of this article, the consultant is identified as the co-supervisor of the master's thesis.

5.5 The co-supervisor of the master's thesis is chosen by the student in agreement with the head and coordinator of the relevant program.

5.6 The master's thesis supervisor and co-supervisor should work in a coordinated manner to improve the quality of the master's thesis.

5.7 Taking into account the requirements of this article, the same person has the right to simultaneously supervise no more than 5 (five) master's theses, and in the case of co-supervision, no more than 8 (eight) master's theses.

5.8 For the purpose of periodic formative assessment of the student's progress on the master's thesis, the supervisor of the master's thesis evaluates the student's work in accordance with Appendix No. 20 of the regulations governing the educational process of the university.

5.9 The supervisor of the master's thesis, according to the appendix provided for in paragraph 5.7 of this article, must conduct a formative assessment of the student after the student submits the project/prospectus of the master's thesis in accordance with this rule.

## **Article 6. Master thesis project/prospectus and its design**

6.1 Master's thesis project/prospectus is a pre-developed plan of research to be carried out by the student, which the student submits to the sectoral commission for evaluation.

6.2 Defense of the project/prospectus of the master's thesis is a periodic formative assessment of the student's progress, which is a prerequisite for the admission of the student to the defense of the master's thesis.

6.3 The student is obliged to submit the master's research project/prospectus to the head/coordinator of the relevant program no later than 45 calendar days after the registration of the title of the master's thesis.

6.4 The completed master's research project/prospectus must be accompanied by a written statement from the supervisor of the master's thesis that he/she has familiarized himself/herself with the master's research project/prospectus and the thesis is ready for submission to the sectoral committee.

6.5 The project/prospectus of the master's thesis must be made on A4 format paper. The main text should be printed on one page only.

6.6 When formatting the project/prospectus of the master's thesis, the font - Sylfaen, font size -12 should be used and in the titles of chapters and sub-chapters, a larger font can be used, but not more than -14. 1.5 spacing should be maintained between lines of main text. The main text should be aligned both on the right and on the left side (layout – paragraph – Alignment – left/right).

6.7 The fields in the project/prospectus of the master's thesis should be kept as follows: 3 cm on the left side, 2 cm on the top side, 1.5 cm on the right side. and 2 cm on the lower side.

6.8 Master's thesis project/prospectus is numbered with Arabic numerals, on the lower side in the middle. Pages are numbered with the same font size - 12. Introduction pages are not numbered.

6.9 The names of all chapters and sub-chapters in the project/prospectus of the master's thesis must be presented in the table of contents. All chapters should start on a new page and sub-chapters should continue from the same page. In case of numbering of chapters and sub-chapters, it is possible to use Roman numerals.

6.10 The first page of the project/prospectus of the master's thesis must indicate the name and logo of the university, the title of the master's thesis, the name and surname of the student, the name(s) and surname(s) of the supervisor/co-supervisors of the master's thesis, the academic degree to be awarded, for which the project/prospectus of the master's thesis is made, year and place of performance.

6.11 The project/prospectus of the master's thesis shall consider the components provided for in Annex 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this rule.

6.12 The administration of the relevant program shall set the date of defense of the projects/prospectus of the master's theses after the expiration of the deadline for submission of them.

6.13 The academic councils of the respective schools determine the sectoral commissions according to the educational programs of the master's degree in order to evaluate the projects/prospectus of master's theses. The sectoral commission must consist of at least 3 members and must be mandatorily staffed with the following members: the head of the program and representative(s) of the academic and/or guest staff of the relevant direction/sector, it is also possible for the commission to include other experts in the relevant field.

6.14 The session of the sectoral commission is valid if more than half of the list of the sectoral commission is present. The sectoral commission makes a decision by the majority of votes, each member of the sectoral commission has one vote. In case of an equal number of votes, the head of the program, who at the same time is the chairman of the sectoral commission, has the decisive vote. In the event that the head of the program cannot participate in the activities of the sectoral commission, the sectoral commission is headed by a person designated by him.

6.15 In the event that a member of the sectoral commission is at the same time the supervisor of the student's master's thesis, he/she does not participate in the evaluation process of the project/prospectus of the student's master's thesis.

6.16 The supervisor of the master's thesis, who does not participate in the evaluation process, should be present at the process of evaluation of projects/prospectuses of students' master's theses by the sectoral commission.

6.17 On the day set by the administration of the relevant school for the defense of master theses projects/prospectus, the student is obliged to present the master thesis project/prospectus in the form of a presentation to the sectoral commission, demonstrate the work performed by him/her and give argued answers to the questions posed by the members of the sectoral commission.

6.18 The sectoral committee, taking into account the introduction, presentation and question-and-answer of the submitted master's thesis project/prospectus, makes a decision to approve or disapprove the master's thesis project/prospectus.

6.19 In case of approval of the project/prospectus of the master's thesis, the student continues to work on the master's thesis. In the event that the project/prospectus of the master's thesis is not approved by the sectoral committee, the student is given no more than 10 working days, during which time he is obliged to submit the revised project/prospectus of the master's thesis to the head/coordinator of the relevant program.

6.20 In case of submission of revised master's thesis project/prospectus by the student, the head of the relevant program in agreement with the members of the sectoral commission determines the date of re-defense of the master's thesis project/prospectus.

6.21 The sectoral commission, taking into account clauses 6.14 and 6.18 of this article, re-evaluates the student's reworked master's thesis project/prospectus and makes a decision on its approval or disapproval.

6.22 In the event that the student does not submit a revised draft/prospectus of the master's thesis within the period specified in paragraph 6.19 of this article, does not appear for the defense of the project/prospectus of the master's thesis, or the sectoral commission repeatedly disapproves the project/prospectus of the revised master's thesis, he loses the right to protection of the master's thesis in the current semester.

## **Article 7. Requirements for the master's thesis**

7.1 Master's thesis requirements (detailed structure, volume, format, style, evaluation criteria and other technical data) are defined in the relevant appendices of this rule according to educational programs (see Appendix 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6).

7.2 The completion of the master's thesis must be carried according to the requirements established by clauses 6.5-6.10 of Article 6 of the present rule.

## **Article 8. Submission of master's thesis**

8.1 According to the decision of the academic council of the relevant school, the term in which the student must submit the completed master's thesis to the coordinator of the relevant program is determined for each master's educational program.

8.2 The master's thesis must be submitted in two copies, in printed (bound) form. Master's thesis should also be submitted in electronic (PDF) form.

8.3 Along with the master's thesis, the student must submit to the relevant program coordinator a written statement from the supervisor of the master's thesis, which should confirm that he/she has read the

finished version of the master's thesis and believes that the master's thesis is ready or not ready for submission to the final assessment.

8.4 In the event that the supervisor of the master's thesis determines that the master's thesis is not ready for submission to the final assessment, the student loses the right to defend the master's thesis in the current semester.

8.5 In order to avoid plagiarism and comply with citation standards, the student must be guided by the instructions for students of the Georgian Institute of Public Affairs-GIPA on the prevention of plagiarism at each stage of work on the master's thesis.

8.6 The finished master's thesis is checked for plagiarism using appropriate software. If plagiarism is not confirmed in the master's thesis, it will be sent to a reviewer for evaluation.

8.7 In case of confirmation of plagiarism in the master's thesis, the student loses the right to defend the presented master's thesis in the current semester and is subject to disciplinary liability stipulated by the university's internal regulatory documents.

### **Article 9. Master thesis review**

9.1 The head of the relevant program shall determine the reviewer to whom the master's thesis will be submitted for evaluation within 5 working days after the expiration of the deadline set by the academic council of the respective school for the submission of completed master's theses.

9.2 The purpose of reviewing a master's thesis is to objectively assess its research value in accordance with pre-established criteria.

9.3 The reviewer of the master's thesis can be an academic/guest staff member of the university or an expert in the relevant field who has research or practical experience in the scientific field related to/adjacent to the master's thesis.

9.4 In order to ensure an impartial, fair and objective evaluation of the master's thesis, the university ensures that the reviewers are given the master's thesis in such a way that the identity of the student and the supervisor of the master's thesis are unknown to him. Also, the identity of the reviewers should be unknown to the student.

9.5 An appropriate agreement is signed between the reviewer and the university, which defines the rights and obligations of the parties and sets a deadline, in which the reviewer must submit a written conclusion regarding the master's thesis.

9.6 After signing the agreement with the reviewer, the relevant program head/coordinator provides him with the electronic version of the master's thesis and the evaluation criteria of the master's thesis.

9.7 The reviewer is obliged to evaluate the master's thesis in accordance with the predetermined form and criteria and provide the evaluation to the head/coordinator of the relevant program no later than 5 working days after receiving the master's thesis, if no other deadline is established by the agreement signed with him/her.

9.8 The relevant program coordinator must provide the evaluation received from the reviewer to the student within a reasonable time before the defense of the master's thesis.

### **Article 10. Determination of the date of defense of the master's thesis and the composition of the commission**

10.1 Based on the submission of the head of the program, the academic council of the respective school makes a decision about the date of the defense of the master's thesis and the composition of the commission for the defense of the master's thesis.

10.2 The master's thesis defense commission must consist of at least 5 members, it must include: the head of the program and representatives of the academic/guest staff of the master's program or an adjacent field, and it can also include experts from the relevant/adjacent field, who have proven research and/or practical experience in the field

10.3 The master's thesis defense commission is headed by the head of the relevant program or another person determined by the academic council of the school.

10.4 The relevant program coordinator provides information to the students about the date of defense of the master's thesis and the composition of the commission.

10.5 The student has the right to request the expulsion of the member/members of the master's thesis defense commission based on a written statement addressed to the dean within 2 working days after receiving information about the composition of the master's thesis defense commission.

10.6 If the student's written application lacks justification, the dean of the relevant school has the right to request the student and specify a deadline (no more than 2 working days) to justify in writing why the student requests the expulsion of the member/members of the master's thesis defense commission. In the event that the student does not submit a substantiated application within the specified period, the dean has the right to refuse to accept the submitted written application, in such a case the master's thesis defense commission remains unchanged.

10.7 The dean of the relevant school, together with the head of the program, reviews the submitted application within a period of no more than 5 calendar days and makes a decision to accept or refuse to accept the submitted application.

10.8 In cases where the application provided for in clause 10.5 of this article is satisfied, the dean of the school will determine the new member/members of the master's thesis defense commission in agreement with the head of the relevant program within 5 working days from the decision on expulsion.

10.9 If the dean of the relevant school meets the request to exclude a member of the commission for the protection of the master's thesis, and if at the same time the number of members of the commission remains not less than 5, it is possible for the dean of the school not to determine a new member of the commission and the existing composition of the commission may evaluate the student's master's thesis without the excluded person.

10.11 Within no more than 5 calendar days from the determination of the composition of the Master's Thesis Defense Commission, the coordinator of the relevant program ensures that the electronic versions of the Master's theses are sent to the members of the commission.

10.12 The academic council is authorized to determine in relation to the master's degree educational programs of the relevant school in a specific academic year set different dates of the deadlines in accordance with Article 3.2 stipulated by clauses 3.3, clauses 6.3 and 6.19 of Article 6, clause 9.1 of Article 9, clause 10.11 of article 10 of the present rule .

#### **Article 11. Master thesis defense**

11.1 The meeting of the master's thesis defense commission is valid if more than half of the commission's list members are present.

11.2 The supervisor of the master's thesis should preferably be present at the master's thesis defense process. If he is unable to attend the Master's Thesis Defense Commission session for an honorable reason, he must inform the program head in advance.

11.3 In the event that a student who has submitted a completed master's thesis in accordance with this rule to the coordinator of the relevant program and failed to pass the defense of the master's thesis for a documented and honorable reason, or the quorum of the commission was not met, or the defense of the

master's thesis did not take place due to other objective reasons independent of the student, the revised date of defense of the master's thesis is appointed by the decision of the commission.

11.4 During the defense of the master's thesis, each student must individually present the results of the research carried out by him/her in the form of a presentation and answer the questions of the members of the commission for the defense of the master's thesis. The defense of each master's thesis should not exceed, as a rule, 30 minutes.

11.5 During the presentation of the master's thesis, the student must use visible material (which may include slides, posters, video-film etc.). The duration of the presentation, as a rule, should not exceed 15 minutes.

11.6 The duration of the question-and-answer session after the master's thesis presentation should not exceed 15 minutes.

11.7 Photo-video recording and audio recording of the master's thesis defense process is not permitted without the prior consent of the head of the master's thesis defense committee. In case of violation of this clause, the committee has the right not to allow the student to defend the master's thesis.

11.8 The members of the master's thesis defense commission, based on the presented master's thesis, the presentation and the answers given by the student to the questions, in accordance with the individually predetermined form and criteria, evaluate the master's thesis.

11.9 The assessment of the commission for the defense of the master's thesis is determined based on the calculation of the arithmetic average of the evaluations carried out individually by the members of the commission (the sum of the received points divided by the number of members of the commission).

## **Article 12. Evaluation of master's thesis**

12.1. The master's thesis, in accordance with the pre-established criteria for the relevant master's educational program, must be evaluated entirely, as a whole - by the final evaluation.

12.2. The master's thesis must be evaluated in the same or the next semester in which the student completes work on it.

12.3. The evaluation of the master's thesis includes the reviewer's evaluation in accordance with the present rule and the evaluation carried out by the commission for the defense of the master's thesis.

12.4. According to the master's educational programs, the criteria used for the evaluation of the master's thesis, as well as the specific share of the evaluation of the master's thesis defense commission and the reviewer are determined in the relevant appendices of this rule (see appendix 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6).

12.5. Master's thesis evaluation system of the master's educational program:

12.5.1 The rating system allows five types of positive ratings:

- a) (A) Excellent - 91-100 points;
- b) (B) Very good – 81-90 points;
- c) (C) Good – 71-80 points;
- d) (D) Satisfactory – 61-70 points;
- e) (E) Sufficient – 51-60 points.

12.5.2. Two types of negative evaluation:

- a) (FX) Failed( with the right of re-submission) - 41-50 points.
- b) (F) Failed - 40 points and less.

12.6 If the master's thesis receives the evaluation provided for in subsection „a“ of clause 12.5.2 of this article, the student is allowed to submit the revised master's thesis during the next semester, and in case of

receiving the evaluation provided for in subsection “b” of clause 12.5.2 of this article, the student loses the right to submit the same master's thesis.

### **Article 13. Appealing the assessment received in the master's thesis**

13.1 The student has the right to appeal the assessment received in the master's thesis, in accordance with the rules governing the educational process of the university.

## **Appendix N1**

### ***Public administration, local self-government, environmental protection management, public relations,<sup>1</sup> applied psychology and international relations master's education program requirements***

---

<sup>1</sup>The structure of the public relations master's program - "Strategic plan of the organization's public relations" is presented in a different form, see Appendix 3

#### **Master Thesis Project/Prospectus Structure**

**The mandatory constituent parts of the project/prospectus of the master's thesis are:**

- Title page;
- Table of contents;
- Number of abbreviations (if necessary);
- Definition of terms (if necessary);
- Relevance, novelty and significance of the research;
- Research purpose and research subject;
- Literature review;
- Research methodology - methods, technical description of the research and limitations of the research;
- Research implementation plan;
- Preliminary bibliography.

#### **Master thesis structure**

**The mandatory necessary constituent parts of the master's thesis are:**

- Title page;
- Student's application - according to which the student confirms that the master's thesis is the result of the author's individual research and that the standards of research ethics and integrity are respected in it;
- Resume/abstract in Georgian and English;
- Number of abbreviations (if necessary);
- Definition of terms (if necessary);
- Introduction (relevance, novelty and need of the research; purpose of the research);
- Literature review/theoretical framework;
- Research methodology (research question, methods, technical description of the research and limitations of the research);
- Description of research results;
- Interpretation of research results;
- Conclusion;



- Bibliography;
- Appendices.

**Evaluation of master's thesis:**

The finished master's thesis is evaluated by the reviewer and the master's thesis protection commission, the specific weights of the evaluation are distributed as follows: the reviewer's evaluation - 50%, the reviewer writes the evaluation out of 100 points. Evaluation of the members of the master's thesis defense commission - 50%, each member of the master's thesis defense commission writes an evaluation out of 100 points, the commission's evaluation is calculated on the basis of the arithmetic average (sum of received points divided by the number of commission members)

If the student fails to pass the minimum competence level in the review of the master's thesis, the master's thesis will no longer be accepted for defense.

### Evaluation criteria for a master's thesis (for reviewer)

1	20 points	20-18	17-15	14-12	11-9	8-6	5-3	2-0
	<b>The relevance, focus and clarity of the research problem, the originality of the topic</b>	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is clearly and argumentatively formulated, the focus of the paper is clearly defined, the selected master's topic is distinguished by a high degree of originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is mainly clearly and argumentatively formulated, , the focus of the paper is mainly clearly defined, the selected master's topic is distinguished by originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is largely clearly and argumentatively formulated, the focus of the paper is largely clearly defined, the selected master's topic is mainly characterized by originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is formulated more or less argumentatively, the focus of the paper is partially determined, the selected master's topic is less characterized by originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is not clearly and argumentatively formulated, the focus of the paper is poorly defined, the selected master's topic is not characterized by originality.	The relevant research problem for the field is vague, the focus of the paper is poorly defined, the selected master's topic is not characterized by originality.	poorly, The research problem is poorly or not generally defined, the focus of the paper is not present.
2	20 points	20-18	17-15	14-12	11-9	8-6	5-3	2-0
	<b>Review of the literature/relevance of the theoretical framework</b>	The literature review/theoretical framework is in full compliance with the research issue and is related to the relevant literature, including the latest literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is largely relevant to the research issue and is related to the relevant literature, including the latest literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is partially relevant to the research issue and is related to relevant literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is less relevant to the research issue and is related to a limited number of relevant literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is in weak compliance with the research issue and is hardly backed up by relevant literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is vague and not backed up by relevant literature.	The theoretical framework/lit erature review is poorly or not presented at all.
3	20 points	20-18	17-15	14-12	11-9	8-6	5-3	2-0
	<b>The paper is methodologic al and the excellence of</b>	The main reading/sub-questions of the study are effectively formulated, the relevant variables and their level of	The main questions/sub-questions of the study are largely formulated, the relevant variables and their level of interoperability are	The main questions/sub-questions of the study are formulated more or less properly, the relevant variables and	The main reading/subsets of the study are less properly formulated, the relevant variables and their level of	The main reading/subsets of the study are poorly formulated, the corresponding variables and their	The formulation of the main questions/sub-questions of the study, the relevant variables and their	The methodologic al side of the paper is flawed or not

<b>the research carried out</b>	interoperability are high, the selected method/s are highly relevant, the technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are presented perfectly. The selection used in the research process is substantiated, complete and transparent. The study is carried out through the relevant method(s) and the ethical standards for conducting research are observed.	high, the selected method/s are relevant, the technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are presented in a large way. The selection used in the research process is substantiated and transparent. The study is largely implemented through the relevant method(s), and the ethical standards for conducting research are observed.	their level of interoperability are more or less relevant. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are outlined. The selection used in the research process is substantiated, although imperfect and less transparent. The study is implemented through a more or less relevant method(s) and ethical standards are observed.	interoperability are less relevant. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are incomplete. The selection used in the research process is less substantiated. The study is less relevant through the relevant method(s). However, ethical standards are met.	level of interoperability are weak. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are incomplete. The selection used in the research process is not substantiated. The relevant method(s) used in the study It's vague. The ethical standards of research implementation are almost non-compliant.	level of interoperability are vague. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are incomplete. The methodological and ethical standards of conducting research are almost non-compliant.	presented at all.
4 <b>20 points</b>	<b>20-18</b>	<b>17-15</b>	<b>14-12</b>	<b>11-9</b>	<b>8-6</b>	<b>5-3</b>	<b>2-0</b>
<b>Interpretation of survey results and level of justification of presented findings</b>	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation respond to the objectives of the study, are clearly and consistently described/analyzed and confirmed with relevant validated data, the reasoning is	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation largely respond to the goals of the study, are consistently described/analyzed and confirmed with relevant valid data. Reasoning is distinguished by	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation more or less respond to the goals of the study, are consistently described/analyzed and confirmed with relevant validated data. The reasoning is	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation more or less respond to the goals of the study, less confirmed by relevant valid data. The reasoning is less objective and critical.	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation are less consistent with the goals of the study, not consistently described/analyzed. Reasoning is devoid of objectivity, the	The results obtained and their interpretation are almost inconsistent with the objectives of the study, not consistently described/analyzed. The objectivity and criticality of	The results obtained in the study are almost non-responsive or not presented in compliance with the goals of the study.

		distinguished by high objectivity and the level of critical analysis.	objectivity and the level of critical analysis.	more or less objective and critical.		level of critical analysis is low.	the reasoning is not confirmed.	
<b>5</b>	<b>20 points</b>	<b>20-18</b>	<b>17-15</b>	<b>14-12</b>	<b>11-9</b>	<b>8-6</b>	<b>5-3</b>	<b>2-0</b>
	<b>Structural Alignment, Consistency and Academic Style of the Thesis</b>	The paper is logically structured and each part of it is related to each other, the reasoning is perfectly proper and tampering, the writing style corresponds to a high academic level, and each relevant source is indicated in compliance with the relevant standards of citation.	The paper is largely logically structured and each part of it is connected to each other, the reasoning is proper and consistent, the writing style is largely academic, and each source is indicated in compliance with the relevant standards of citation.	The paper is more or less logically structured and each part of it is connected to each other, the reasoning is proper and consistent. The writing style is more or less academic, and the sources are referenced in compliance with the relevant standards of citations.	The paper is poorly structured. The constituent parts of the work are poorly connected to each other. The reasoning is weak and less thorough and consistent. The writing style is less academic. However, the relevant citation standards are mostly protected.	The structure of the work and its The relevance of the constituent parts to each other is vague. The reasoning is weak and not consistent. The writing style is less academic. However, the relevant citation standards are partially followed.	The structure of the paper is not maintained, the connection of the constituent parts of the work is weak. The reasoning is vague. The writing style is less academic and the relevant standards of citations are less protected.	The paper is almost or completely not structured. The writing style is non-academic and the relevant standards of citations are mostly violated.

## Criteria for Evaluating Master's Thesis (Master's Thesis Defense Commission)

1	20 points	20-18	17-15	14-12	11-9	8-6	5-3	2-0
	<b>The relevance, focus and clarity of the research problem, the originality of the topic</b>	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is clearly and argumentatively formulated, the focus of the paper is clearly defined, the selected master's topic is distinguished by a high degree of originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is formulated in a basic clear and argumentative manner, the focus of the paper is mainly clearly defined, the selected master's topic is distinguished by originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is largely clearly and argumentatively formulated, the focus of the paper is largely clearly defined, the selected master's topic is mainly characterized by originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is formulated more or less argumentatively, the focus of the paper is partially determined, the selected master's topic is less characterized by originality.	The relevance of the relevant research problem for the field is not clearly and argumentatively formulated, the focus of the paper is poorly defined, the selected master topic is not characterized by originality.	The relevant research problem for the field is vague, the focus of the paper is poorly defined, the selected master's topic is not characterized by originality.	The research problem is not poorly or overall defined, the focus of the paper is not present.
2	15 points	15-14	13-11	10-9	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-0
	<b>Review of the literature/relevance of the theoretical framework</b>	The literature review/theoretical framework is in full compliance with the research issue and is related to the relevant literature, including the latest literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is largely relevant to the research issue and is related to the relevant literature, including the latest literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is partially relevant to the research issue and is related to relevant literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is less relevant to the research issue and is related to a limited number of relevant literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is in weak compliance with the research issue and is hardly backed up by relevant literature.	The literature review/theoretical framework is vague and not backed up by relevant literature.	The theoretical framework/literature review is poorly or not presented at all.
3	20 points	20-18	17-15	14-12	11-9	8-6	5-3	2-0
	<b>The paper is methodological and the excellence of</b>	The main reading/sub-questions of the study are effectively formulated, the relevant variables and their level of	The main questions/sub-questions of the study are largely formulated, the relevant variables and their level of interoperability are	The main questions/sub-questions of the study are formulated more or less properly, the relevant variables and	The main reading/subsets of the study are less properly formulated, the relevant variables and their level of	The main reading/subsets of the study are poorly formulated, the corresponding variables and their	The formulation of the main questions/sub-questions of the study, the relevant variables and their	The methodological side of the paper is faulty or not

	<b>the research carried out</b>	interoperability are high, the selected method/s are highly relevant, the technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are presented perfectly. The selection used in the research process is substantiated, complete and transparent. The study is carried out through the relevant method(s) and the ethical standards for conducting research are observed.	high, the selected method/s are relevant, the technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are presented in a large way. The selection used in the research process is substantiated and transparent. The study is largely implemented through the relevant method(s), and the ethical standards for conducting research are observed.	their level of interoperability are more or less relevant. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are outlined. The selection used in the research process is substantiated, although imperfect and less transparent. The study is implemented through a more or less relevant method(s) and ethical standards are observed.	interoperability are less relevant. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are incomplete. The selection used in the research process is less substantiated. The study is less relevant through the relevant method(s). However, ethical standards are met.	level of interoperability are weak. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are incomplete. The selection used in the research process is not substantiated. The relevant method(s) used in the study It's vague. The ethical standards of research implementation are almost non-compliant.	level of interoperability are vague. The technical description of the study and the limitations of the study are incomplete. The methodological and ethical standards of conducting research are almost non-compliant.	presented at all.
<b>4</b>	<b>20 points</b>	<b>20-18</b>	<b>17-15</b>	<b>14-12</b>	<b>11-9</b>	<b>8-6</b>	<b>5-3</b>	<b>2-0</b>
	<b>Interpretation of survey results and level of justification of presented findings</b>	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation respond to the objectives of the study, are clearly and consistently described/analyzed and confirmed with relevant validated data, the reasoning is	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation largely respond to the goals of the study, are consistently described/analyzed and confirmed with relevant valid data. Reasoning is distinguished by	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation more or less respond to the goals of the study, are consistently described/analyzed and confirmed with relevant validated data. The reasoning is	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation more or less respond to the goals of the study, less confirmed by relevant valid data. The reasoning is less objective and critical.	The results obtained on the basis of the study and their interpretation are less consistent with the goals of the study, not consistently described/analyzed. Reasoning is devoid of objectivity, the	The results obtained and their interpretation are almost inconsistent with the objectives of the study, not consistently described/analyzed. The objectivity and criticality of	The results obtained in the study are almost non-responsive or not presented in line with the goals of the study.

		distinguished by high objectivity and the level of critical analysis.	objectivity and the level of critical analysis.	more or less objective and critical.		level of critical analysis is low.	the reasoning is not confirmed.	
<b>5</b>	<b>15 points</b>	<b>15-14</b>	<b>13-11</b>	<b>10-9</b>	<b>8-7</b>	<b>6-5</b>	<b>4-2</b>	<b>1-0</b>
	<b>Structural Alignment, Consistency and Academic Style of the Thesis</b>	The paper is logically structured and each part of it is related to each other, the reasoning is perfectly proper and consistent, the writing style corresponds to a high academic level, and each relevant source is indicated in compliance with the relevant standards of citation.	The paper is largely logically structured and each part of it is connected to each other, the reasoning is proper and consistent, the writing style is largely academic, and each source is indicated in compliance with the relevant standards of citation.	The paper is more or less logically structured and each part of it is connected to each other, the reasoning is proper and consistent. The writing style is more or less academic, and the sources are referenced in compliance with the relevant standards of citations.	The paper is poorly structured. The constituent parts of the work are poorly connected to each other. The reasoning is weak and less thorough and consistent. The writing style is less academic. However, the relevant citation standards are mostly protected.	The structure of the work and its relevance of the constituent parts to each other is vague. The reasoning is weak and not consistent. The writing style is less academic. However, the relevant citation standards are partially followed.	The structure of the paper is not maintained, the connection of the constituent parts of the work is weak. The reasoning is vague. The writing style is less academic and the relevant standards of citations are less protected.	The paper is almost or completely not structured. The writing style is non-academic and the relevant standards of citations are mostly violated.
<b>6</b>	<b>10 points</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9-8</b>	<b>7-6</b>	<b>5-4</b>	<b>3-2</b>	<b>2-1</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Oral presentation</b>	The visual and structure of the presentation are understandable and easily perceived. The ability to convey the issue and communicate with the audience is highly effective. The work done within the	The visual and structure of the presentation are largely understandable and easy to perceive. The ability to convey an issue and communicate with an audience is largely effective. The work done within the framework of the study	The visual and structure of the presentation are more or less understandable and easily perceivable. The ability to convey an issue and communicate with the audience is more or less effective. The work done within the	The visual and structure of the presentation are less understandable and perceivable. The ability to convey the issue and communicate with the audience is partly effective. The work done within the	The visual and structure of the presentation are perceived poorly. The ability to convey the issue and communicate with the audience is weak. The work done within the framework of the	The visual and structure of the presentation are not perceptible. The ability to convey an issue and communicate with an audience is ineffective. The work done within the framework of	The presentation is not presented at all or fully complies with the requirements for the input.

		framework of the study is presented perfectly. The reasoning is proper and understandable. The answer to the audience's questions is argumentative and complete.	is mainly present. The reasoning is proper and understandable. The answers to questions are largely argumentative.	framework of the study is more or less present. Discussion and answers to questions are more or less argumentative.	framework of the study is underestimated. Discussion and answers to questions are more or less argumentative.	study is underestimated. The reasoning is not valid, and the answer to questions is less argumentative.	the study is imperfect. The reasoning is vague and the answers to questions are not confirmed.	
--	--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--



## Requirements for the Master's Program in Business Administration

### Project/Prospectus/Structure of the Master's thesis:

The essential constituents of the master's thesis project/prospectus are:

- Title page;
- Brief information about the business selected within the framework of the study (100-250 words);
- The relevance of the topic - the justification of why this business is interesting to research;
- Structure of the paper – Table of contents of Business document
- Justification and summary of the significance of each paragraph/element of the paper (80-150 words);
- Time horizon - the period by which the business plan is covered with appropriate justification;
- Plan and description of the work to be carried out - review of the tools planned and used by the master's student in the research process (150-250 words);
- Schedule of the paper;
- Preliminary Bibliography.

### The structure of the master's thesis:

The essential constituents of the master's thesis are:

- Title page;
- Student application - according to which the student confirms that the master's thesis is the result of the author's individual research and the standards of research ethics and integrity are observed in it;
- Resume/abstract in Georgian and English (80-150 words);
- Table of Contents ;
- Definition of terms and/or list of abbreviations (if necessary);
- Review of the paper - the so-called "Executive Summary" (400-450 words - maximum 2 pages);
- The purpose of the plan and the relevance of the research topic;
- "Company Today" and its present value;
- Analysis and development prospects of the field of the chosen company;
- Company development strategy;
- Business value growth initiatives;
- Financial plan - increase in value;
- Plan for withdrawal from business;
- Conclusion;
- Bibliography;
- Appendices.

**Master's thesis assessment:** The master's thesis is evaluated for once , based on a 100-point assessment by the reviewer and the Master's Thesis Defense Commission. The appraisal is distributed as follows: assessment of reviewer - 60%,

assessment of the Master's Thesis defence Commission - 40% (the assessment of the commission will be calculated on the basis of the average arithmetic).

## Criteria and Form of Master's Thesis Evaluation

25 points	4-0 points	9-5 points	15-10 points	20-16 points	25 -21 points
<b>Current situation overview</b>	The author poorly or does not describe the current situation, market situation, strategy, plans for the future, financial forecasts and their interconnectedness. Poorly answer or can't answer questions at all. There is a poor overview of one's own and competitors' strengths and weaknesses; ; Limited information is provided about efficiency.	The author partially reasonably reviews the current situation, market situation, strategy, plans for the future, financial forecasts and their interconnectedness. The author discusses less complex issues, mainly gives an argumentative representation of his/her views and expresses his/her opinion on broad issues with an in-depth summary of competition, strengths and weaknesses. The author's strategy and tactics are less likely to cover more of them; The results are mostly well reviewed, although the author focuses only on the good and covers the bad.	The author mainly reasonably reviews the current situation, market situation, strategy, plans for the future, financial forecasts and their interconnectedness. The author mostly discusses complex issues well, mainly gives an argumentative representation of his views and expresses his opinion on broad issues with an in-depth summary of competition, strengths and weaknesses. The author's strategy and tactics cover more of them, but not everyone; The results are mostly well reviewed, although the author focuses only on the good and covers the bad.	The author well describes the current situation with the state of the market, strategy, plans for the future, financial forecasts and their interconnectedness. The author discusses complex issues well, mainly gives an argumentative representation of his views and expresses his opinion on broad issues with an in-depth summary of competition, strengths and weaknesses. The author's strategy and tactics cover some of them, but not everyone. There is a good overview of the results, although the author focuses only on the good and covers the bad.	The author perfectly describes the current situation, market situation, strategy, plans for the future, financial forecasts and their interconnectedness. The author confidently discusses complex issues, makes an argumentative representation of his views and expresses his opinion on broad issues with an in-depth summary of competition, strengths and weaknesses. The author's strategy and tactics cover all of them; There is a good overview of the results, with a balanced submission of good and bad.
<b>30 points</b>	<b>4-0 points</b>	<b>10-5 points</b>	<b>17-11 points</b>	<b>23-18 points</b>	<b>30-24 points</b>
<b>Strategy Strength</b>	Limited strategic thinking is confirmed. The author identified goals, strategies and tactics, although the connections between them are not clearly developed, tactics are	The "less clear" strategy of the business is confirmed. unclear goals. Some of the tactics are related to the goals, although they do not fully cover the strategies. Key tactics are not presented or poorly conveyed.	The "largely bright" strategy of the business is confirmed. Specific goals. Tactics are derived from strategies and goals.	The "clear" strategy of the business is confirmed. specific goals. Tactics are derived from strategies and goals.	The "clear" strategy of the business is confirmed. specific goals. Tactics are derived from strategies and goals. The author presented an innovative approach.

	unintegrated and unsynergized.				
<b>20 points</b>	<b>4-0 points</b>	<b>9-5 points</b>	<b>13-10 points</b>	<b>17-14 points</b>	<b>20-18 points</b>
<b>Using Business insight and management tools</b>	The author uses a small number of business concepts and principles, business thinking is limited to the author to enhance the analysis The data is not presented.	The author used various business concepts and principles. However, business thinking and vision are limited, the author has insufficient data to enhance the analysis.	The author is largely well versed in business concepts, principles, and business thinking when arguing about his own analysis and plan. The author presents data to enhance the analysis, but uses them less for argument.	The author makes good use of business concepts, principles and business thinking when arguing on his own analysis and plan. The author presents data to enhance the analysis, but does not use them perfectly for argument.	The author is free to apply business concepts, principles and business thinking when arguing about issues related to his own analysis and plan. The author presents data to enhance the analysis and makes a complete argument based on them.
<b>15 points</b>	<b>2-0 points</b>	<b>6-3 points</b>	<b>10-7 points</b>	<b>13-11 points</b>	<b>15-14 points</b>
<b>Structural Performance, Consistency and Academic/Professional Style of the Work</b>	The structure of the work and the relevance of its constituent parts together are ambiguous. The reasoning is weak and not consistent. The writing style is less academic and professional, and the relevant standards of citations are mostly not followed.	The paper is more or less logically structured and each part of it is connected to each other, the reasoning is proper and consistent. The writing style is more or less academic and professional, and the sources are referenced in compliance with the relevant citation standards.	The paper is largely logically structured and each part of it is connected to each other, the reasoning is proper and consistent, the writing style is largely academic and professional. Each source is referenced in compliance with the relevant citation standards.	The paper is mainly logically structured and each part of it is related to each other, the reasoning is well-maintained and consistent, the writing style is mainly relevant to the academic and professional level, and each relevant source is indicated in compliance with the relevant standards of citation.	The paper is logically structured and each part of it is connected to each other, the reasoning is perfectly proper and consistent, the writing style corresponds to a high academic and professional level, and each relevant source is indicated in compliance with the relevant standards of citation.
<b>10 points<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>3-0 points</b>	<b>5-4 points</b>	<b>7-6 points</b>	<b>8-7 points</b>	<b>10-9 points</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of evaluation by the reviewer of the master's thesis, the share of the oral supervision (10 points) will be equally distributed to the remaining evaluation criteria and will be added to the relevant scores of the last column/higher grade.

<p><b>Oral presentation</b></p>	<p>The visual and structure of the presentation are perceived poorly. The ability to convey the issue and communicate with the audience is weak. The work done within the framework of the study is underestimated. The reasoning is not true, and the answer to the questions is unargumentative.</p>	<p>The visual and structure of the presentation are more or less understandable and easily perceivable. The ability to convey an issue and communicate with the audience is more or less effective. The work performed within the framework of the study is more or less satisfactorily presented. Discussion and answers to questions are more or less argumentative.</p>	<p>The visual and structure of the presentation are largely understandable and easy to perceive. The ability to convey an issue and communicate with an audience is largely effective. The work done within the framework of the study is presented in a proper way. The reasoning is proper and understandable. The answer to questions is largely argumentative.</p>	<p>The visual and structure of the presentation are basic to understand and easily perceivable. The ability to convey the issue and communicate with the audience is largely effective. The work done within the framework of the study is largely presented in perfection. The reasoning is proper and understandable. The answer to questions is mainly argumentative.</p>	<p>The visual and structure of the presentation are understandable and easily perceived. The ability to convey the issue and communicate with the audience is highly effective. The work done within the framework of the study is presented perfectly. The reasoning is proper and understandable. The answer to the audience's questions is argumentative and complete.</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	---

## Requirements for the Master's Program in Multimedia Journalism and Media Management

### **Master's thesis/project description:**

Master's thesis/project combines the student's practical skills and theoretical knowledge and is a synthesis of practical and theoretical works. Master's thesis/project paper consists of two components:

1) **Conceptual application of the master's thesis/project:** The conceptual application of the master's thesis/project is based on the general principles of academic writing. It covers 4000-5000 words. The topic of conceptual application of the master's thesis should be related to the new practical component selected by the student. In the conceptual application of the master's thesis, the student must demonstrate existing and/or new opinions on the topical issue Based on academic sources; Conceptually use independently sourced and original data. The conceptual application of the master's thesis/project also includes information on the methodology of the works prepared within the practical component of the master's thesis/project.

2) **Practical component of the master's thesis/project - Portfolio and original (new) practical project:** Within the framework of the practical component of the student master's thesis/project, it is obliged not only to combine the practical works created by him/her, but also to select the appropriate platform and also the concept of how he will unite and represent these works in the web space.

**Portfolio** - The student under the creative concept combines at least six practical works created during the master's program and the original (new) practical Project; The works are presented by the student using digital narrative methods in the web space . The concept of portfolio should be thought out in depth and should also include the creative/professional biography of the student.

### **The mandatory formats of six practical works created in the learning process are:**

- In-depth article;
- Photo History - Multimedia Story;
- Multimedia story;
- Video reporting or short documentary;
- Radio reporting;
- Non-financial business plan of a journalistic startup.

The assessment of the portfolio is carried out taking into account its conceptual side and not with the above six practical works, the assessment of which has already been carried out during the studying period.

### **The optional formats of the original (new) practical project are:**

- In-depth article - including 2000-3000 words/10-12 source documents on the current/topical topic selected within the framework of the Master's thesis/project;

- Photo history - (20-35 photos) with small texts (annotations) on the topical topic selected within the framework of the master's thesis/project;
- Multimedia story - a combination of photos (not less than 10), text (1000 words) and video (2-3 short video stories) on the current/topical topic selected within the framework of the master's thesis/project;
- In-depth video report - 7-10 minute report on the current/topical, acute topic selected within the framework of the master's thesis/project;
- Short documentary - 15-30 min. With a distinctive creative approach
- Narrated visual history on the topical topic selected within the framework of the master's thesis/project;
- In-depth radio report - 7-10 minute report on the current/topical, acute topic selected within the framework of the master's thesis/project;
- Journalistic Star-Up Business Plan (Financial) on the current business idea selected within the framework of the Master's thesis/project.

### **Structure of the conceptual application/prospectus of the master's thesis:**

The essential constituents of the prospectus of the master's thesis/project conceptual application are:

- Title page;
- Copyright page;
- Justification of the importance of research;
- Literature Review;
- Research question/purpose;
- Research plan;
- Technical description of the study;
- Schedule of the paper;
- Preliminary Bibliography.

### **Structure of the conceptual application of the master's thesis/project:**

The necessary constituents of the conceptual application of the master's thesis/project are:

- Title page;
- Student application - according to which the student confirms that the master's thesis is the result of the author's individual research and the standards of research ethics and integrity are observed in it;
- Resume/abstract in Georgian and English;
- List of abbreviations (if necessary);
- definition of terms (if necessary);
- Introduction (relevance of research, novelty and need);
- Literature Review;
- Research question/purpose;
- technical description of the study and research limitations;
- Description of the results of the study;
- Interpretation of research results;
- Conclusion;
- Bibliography;
- Appendices.

**Master's thesis assessment:** The master's thesis is evaluated for once , based on a 100-point assessment by the reviewer and the Commission for the defense of the Master's Thesis. The appraisal is distributed as follows: assessment of reviewer - 70%, assessment of the Master's Thesis defense Commission - 30% (the assessment of the commission will be calculated on the basis of the average arithmetic).



## Criteria and Form of Master's thesis/project evaluation (100 points)

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation Scheme	Points
<b>Conceptual application (40 points)</b>		
<b>Focus (5 points)</b> All parts of the paper are related to the research question	<p>5 points- the focus and structure of the paper are precisely disrupted, the format is preserved; The thought is conveyed correctly;</p> <p>4 points - the focus and structure of the paper is largely clearly and accurately disrupted, the format is protected; The opinion is mostly conveyed correctly;</p> <p>3 points - part of the focus and structure of the paper is clearly and accurately disrupted, although specific components are missing; Format protected; In the satisfactorily executed part, the opinion is mostly conveyed correctly;</p> <p>2 points - the focus and structure of the paper are more or less clearly and accurately disrupted, although significant is missing components; The format is partially violated; The opinion is conveyed in fragment;</p> <p>1 point - the focus and structure of the paper lack important components, the format is partially violated; The opinion is fragmented and vague, not adequate for the request.</p>	5
<b>Research (5 points)</b> methodology; Quality of performance	<p>5 points – the methodology used corresponds to the research task; The study is structured according to the requirements; The analysis of the results is complete; Document formatting, bibliography and citation style do not contain errors</p> <p>4 points – the methodology used is consistent with the research style contains minor errors</p> <p>3 points - the methodology used is largely consistent with the research task; The study is structured mainly according to the requirements; The analysis of the results is more or less adequate for small errors; Document formatting, bibliography and citation style contain errors;</p> <p>2 points - the methodology used does not correspond to the task of the study; The study is mostly not structured according to requirements; The analysis of the results is not adequate; Document formatting, bibliography and citation style contain a number of errors;</p> <p>1 point - the methodology used does not correspond to the task of the study; The study is not structured according to the requirements; The analysis of the results is not adequate; Document formatting, bibliography and citation style contain multiple errors.</p>	5

<p>Literature (10 points) relevance of the literature used; Critical analysis</p>	<p>10 - 9 points - the literature presented in the paper is academic and corresponds to the topic of study; The student uses the theoretical knowledge gained within the program; Research, critical analysis and evaluation are visible;        8 - 7 points - the literature presented in the paper is academic and mostly corresponds to the subject of research; The student mostly reveals the theoretical knowledge gained within the program; Critical analysis and evaluation of the study is largely seen;        6 – 5 points - the literature presented in the paper is academic and its compliance with the subject of research is satisfactory; The student partially reveals the theoretical knowledge gained within the program; Critical analysis and evaluation of the study is partially visible;        4 – 3 points – the literature presented in the paper is academic and less correlates with the subject of research; The student reveals the average level of theoretical knowledge gained by the program; The ability to critically analyze and evaluate research is less visible;        2-1 point - the literature presented in the paper is not academic and mostly does not correspond to the research topic; The student does not reveal the theoretical knowledge gained within the program; No critical analysis and evaluation of the study is visible.</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>Argumentation (10 points) argumentation skills;</p>	<p>10-9 points - the recommendations obtained from the study are in full compliance with the conclusion and the findings of the study;        8-7 points - the recommendations obtained from the study are mostly in line with the conclusion and the findings of the study;        6-5 points - the recommendations obtained as a result of the study are partially in line with the findings of the study and the findings;        4-3 points - the recommendations received as a result of the study are not fully formulated and are less in line with the conclusion and research findings;        2-1 points - the recommendations obtained from the study are not in line with the conclusion and the findings of the study.</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>information , Data Presentation (5 points) Structure, consistency and ability to convey opinion, information</p>	<p>5 points – the language of the paper is balanced and academic;        Maintained. The structure is maintained and complies with the standards of the academic paper;        4 points – the language of the paper is mostly balanced and academically;        Maintained. The structure is maintained and complies with the standards of the academic paper;        3 points – The language of the paper lacks balancing and is academically faulty. The structure is not preserved;        2-1 points – the paper lacks components; The language is non-academic and faulty; The structure is faulty.</p>	<p>5</p>

<p><b>Oral Presentation (5 points) <sup>2</sup>Ability to convey information in an oral form</b></p>	<p>5 points - the information is fully sought and the presentation covers the entire material; During the discussion, the student cites argumentative conclusions and reveals the ability to improvise;</p> <p>4 points- The information is well researched and the presentation covers the main part of the material; During the discussion, the student cites argumentative conclusions and in most cases reveals the ability to improvise;</p> <p>3 points - part of the information is retrieved and the presentation covers a certain part of the material; The arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack persuasion; In most cases, the student exhibits the ability to improvise;</p> <p>2 points - information is incomplete and the presentation lacks content components, which is why it is difficult to understand the essence of the findings; The arguments presented by the student during the discussion lack persuasion/do not rely on relevant data; The student more or less demonstrates his ability to improvise;</p> <p>1 point - the information is incomplete and the presentation is not able to convey the components of the paper; The arguments presented by the student during the discussion are weak and inconclusive/do not rely on relevant data; The student does not have the ability to improvise.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><b>Practical Component (60 points)</b></p>		
<p><b>Portfolio (15 points)</b></p>	<p>15 - 12 points: The web platform presented by the student has an original concept. It is distinguished by its findings and vision. Proper design. Contently, visually; And programmatically absolutely manageable. Consists of 6 non-specific components (artwork). Information about the author is effectively submitted;</p> <p>11 - 8 points: The web platform presented by the student has a certain concept, although it is not distinguished by special originality. The content is maintained, but there are software flaws. The visual concept is not well understood. Consists of no less than 6 components (artwork). The page contains the author's submission, but is limited to a standard biography and does not attract special attention, although it provides detailed information;</p> <p>7 - 4 points: The web platform presented by the student includes all the necessary works, although there is no content and visual logic between them (there are no connections between individual components). The lead of materials is imperfect, as is the submission of the author (requires additional information). Despite this drawback, all five essential components are presented on the web, although there are also software flaws;</p> <p>3 - 1 point: The student has only presented individual works on different platforms, it is also incomplete and has not created any web space/platform.</p>	<p>15</p>

<sup>2</sup> In case of evaluation by the reviewer of the practical component of the master's thesis, the share (5%) of the oral presentation will be equally distributed to the remaining evaluation criteria.

New practical project (40 points)

40 – 32 points – In-depth topical reporting on a heated issue, with a clearly defined focus, presents a unique history, based on verifiable facts and diverse sources, syntactically and morphologically sound text, in keeping with journalistic ethics and balance. Technically perfect, and video and audio are presented. 2000-3000 words (in the case of the article); 7-10 minutes in case of video/audio; 20-30 photos with annotations (in the case of a photo project). The student presented a well-organized business plan for the startup. All components of the business plan are thoroughly reviewed, analyzed and substantiated. The idea is innovative. The student presents proper sources to substantiate his own decisions. The structure of the paper is maintained;

31 - 24 points - in-depth topical reporting on an acute issue, with a clearly defined focus, verifiable facts, based on several sources. There are a small number of grammatical errors in the text. The norms and balances of journalistic ethics are respected. In the case of video and audio there are slight technical shortcomings. The material meets professional standards, but does not stand out in its uniqueness and original terms. 2000-3000 words (in the case of the article); 7-10 minutes in case of video/audio; 20-30 photos with annotations (in case of photo project). The student presented a well-organized business plan of the startup. Almost all components of the business plan are well reviewed, analyzed and substantiated. The idea is interesting, though not innovative. The student presents proper sources to substantiate most of his own decisions. The structure of the paper is maintained;

23 – 16 points – in-depth topical reporting on the acute issue, although the focus is not clearly defined. Use of insufficient reliable sources. There are grammatical errors in the text. The norms of journalistic ethics are observed. There is a problem with balancing the material, the perspective of the other side is missing. In the case of video and audio, there are technical flaws. The article is not notable for its unique history and original coverage. 2000-3000 words (in the case of the article); 7-10 minutes in case of video/audio; The business plan presented by the student is acceptable, but lacks certain components, analysis and logical links. The student presents sources to substantiate only a small part of his own decisions. The structure of the paper is weak;

15 - 8 points - the report lacks depth and relevance, requires narrowing the focus. Relies on several sources, although the sources and evidence presented in the report are not sufficient. There are grammatical errors in the text. Journalistic ethics norms are more or less followed. There is a problem with balancing the material, the perspective of the other side is missing. In the case of video and audio, there are serious technical flaws. The material does not feature a unique history and original coverage angle. 2000-3000 words (in the case of the article); 7-10 minutes in case of video/audio; 20-30 photos with annotations (in the case of a photo project). The business plan presented by the student lacks the main components and data. Sources are insufficient or inadequate. The structure of the paper is either not intersected or very weak;

7 – 1 point - there are factual errors in the report, is superficial, its focus is unclear, the credibility of the sources has not been confirmed. The material is biased, unbalanced. Video and audio do not comply with the standard. The text is faulty, with many grammatical errors. number of words - cannot reach 1000 (in the case of an article); The duration of the

	video/audio (number of photos) also does not comply with the requirement (less than 3 minutes). The project is presented in violation of the deadline . The student is unable to present an acceptable business plan. The paper lacks key components, data, analysis, discussion, justification, and logical links. Sources are insufficient or not presented at all.	
<b>Oral presentation (5 points)</b>	<p>5 points - the presentation is held both verbally and visually. The material is well prepared and the presentation covers the essence of both the total portfolio and the main component. Clearly presents the main findings;</p> <p>4 points – the presentation is held visually, although there are minor gaps in the verbal presentation. The material is well prepared and the presentation covers the essence of both the total portfolio and the main component. Clearly presents the main findings;</p> <p>3 points – the presentation has visual flaws, and the student has difficulty to express the main topic without questions. The presentation covers a certain part of the portfolio;</p> <p>2 points - the material is incomplete and the presentation fails to convey the concept of portfolio;</p> <p>1 point - the material is inadequate and the presentation fails to convey the concept of the portfolio.</p>	5
<b>ALL</b>		100

## Requirements for Software Engineering Master's Program

### Master's thesis/project description:

The master's thesis/project is a synthesis of the student's practical skills and theoretical knowledge obtained during the program. The paper consists of three components:

1. **Software product;**
2. **Research/Software Product Analysis;**
3. **Demonstration of a software product.**

### 1. Software product:

The student is obliged to be guided by the following instructions when working on the program part of the master's thesis/project:

1. The master's thesis/project must be a fully functioning software product (application);
2. It can be a web application, web service, mobile app, desktop app or game;
3. The submitted work is preferably uploaded to the server (in the case of a web product) or to the corresponding Store (in case of mobile application);
4. It is advisable that the application be innovative (it can answer the problem already solved many times to this day, but solve this problem with a completely different approach).
5. It is advisable to use design-patters when assembling the application.
6. The functions and technologies used to assemble the application are:
  - ASP.NET CORE MVC
  - JavaScript, HTML, CSS
  - Android, Kotlin
  - iOS, Swift
  - Unity 3D
  - Other

### 2. Research / Software Product Analysis

This part of the paper must meet the following conditions:

- The volume should be limited to 2500-4000 words (without attachments and bibliography);
- Pages must be numbered; To indicate the sources used, studios must be guided by the citation style established in accordance with the procedure for planning, implementing and evaluating the research component of graduate programs;
- The first page of the paper must indicate the name and surname of the master, the title of the paper, the name and surname of the supervisor, the name and surname of the consultant, if any, year and place of execution;
- The study should be accompanied by a selector, a list of abbreviations, a list of graphs and tables, and a definition of terms.

**The main part of the study consists of the following component:**

**Brief summary of the paper (80-150 words) – (in Georgian and English)**

- Description of the scenario and the client's requirements.
- Purpose and Outputs of the Study

**Chapter 1. Introduction**

- Description of the problematic situation and the relevant context.
- Detailed description of the scenario and the client's requirements.
- Justification of the importance of research: purpose, technological innovation, originality and importance of the decision.

**Chapter 2. Research Objectives and Objectives**

- Specific research objectives and research questions/questions

**Chapter 3. Research Technical Description**

- Description of the orientation of the study (quantitative, qualitative, mixed);
- Description of the design of the study (depending on the number of contacts with the population, depending on the time, depending on the nature of the study - experimental or non-experimental and substantiated);
- Description of chronological, geographic, demographic, etc. boundaries of the study;
- description and justification of population and selection techniques;
- Description of the research tool (what kind of data was collected, how was the data collected, what methods of research were used? (Questionnaire, interview, observation, etc.)) and justification;
- Description of the techniques of processing the obtained data.

**Chapter 4. Analysis and interpretation of research results**

- Presenting the collected data in processed form and analyzing them (description and explanation of their meaning);
- Description of the results of the study - answering a research question or confirming or denying the hypothesis presented.

**Chapter 5. Conclusion and research limitations**

- Summary of survey results in line with goals
- Description of the main weaknesses/problems/difficulties of the study.

**Chapter 6. Software Product Analysis**

- An overview of the solutions to the problem and the advantages of selected technologies.
- Development and planning of the stages of software development.
- Analysis of further development and prospects of the software product.
- Visualization of the structure of the product.
- Detailed visualization and description of software design.
- Importance and analysis of the algorithms used.
- Description of developed technologies and analysis of their advantages.
- Description of additional tools used for software development.
- Assessment of the effectiveness of the project according to feedback from the client.
- Overview of ways to further improve the software product.

## Chapter 7. Bibliography

Appendices (samples of the used research tool (questionnaire, interview guides, etc.), tables, etc.

The presented plan is the main framework by which the student should be guided, however, depending on the specifics of the paper, it can be modified in agreement with the supervisor.

### **3. Demonstration of a software product:**

The student is obliged to create a video for the demonstration of the software product and present the relevant presentation. While demonstrating a software product, students should be guided by the following instructions:

#### **Video:**

- The functionality of the software product must be demonstrated in the form of a video
- Demonstration of the functionality of the software product should not exceed 15 minutes
- The functionality of the software product should be reviewed based on the user-friendly design.
- The proper functionality of the product should be presented and its purpose should be described.

#### **Presentation:**

- The presentation should be arranged in PowerPoint or Google Slide.
- The duration of the presentation should not exceed 15 minutes.

**The master's thesis/draft is subject to preliminary evaluation in the form of a draft of master's thesis/prospectusdefense .** Defending the master's thesis project/prospectus is a periodic assessment of the student's progress, which is a prerequisite for the student's admission to the defense of the master's thesis.

### **Structure of Master's thesis/project prospectus:**

The essential constituents of the master's thesis/project prospectus are:

- Title page;
- Detailed description of the scenario and the client's requirements;
- Justification of the importance of research;
- Objective/question of the study;
- Technical description of the study;
- Review of the solutions to the problem and the advantages of selected technologies;
- Development and planning of the development stages of the software;
- Work schedule.

### **Master's thesis assessment**

The master's thesis is evaluated once, after the student finishes working on it and submits it to the administration in compliance with the procedures of the university. In order to access the review of the paper, the student needs the written consent of the head of the paper which confirms that the paper is ready for submission to the defense.



The master's thesis is evaluated for once , based on a 100-point assessment by the reviewer and the Master's Thesis Defense Commission. The appraisal is distributed as follows: reviewer assessment - 40 points, assessment of the master's thesis defense commission - 60 points (the assessment of the commission will be calculated on the basis of the average arithmetic).

## Reviewer Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation Scheme	Points
<p><b>Product Planning (15 points)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scenario description and client requirements (3 points)</li> <li>● Research and Market Analysis (3 Points)</li> <li>● Solutions and technologies to solve the problem (3 points)</li> <li>● Development and planning of product development stages (3 points)</li> <li>● Product perspective (3 points)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Scenario description and client requirements</u></b>            3 points - the script is perfectly described. Client requirements are formulated correctly and comprehensively;            2 points - the script is partially described. Client requirements are partially formulated;            1-0 Points - the script is not valid and understandable. Client requirements are in part/not formulated.</p> <p><b><u>Research &amp; Market Analysis</u></b>            3 points - the market is studied in detail, the pros and cons of various similar products are discussed. Based on their analysis, the important needs of the new product are highlighted;            2 points - the market is partially studied, the pros and cons of several similar products are partially discussed;            1-0 Points - the market is not/partially studied, superficially reviewed by other similar products.</p> <p><b><u>Problem Solving Solutions and Technologies</u></b>            3 points - the solutions to the problem are optimally developed and technologies are selected correctly;            2 points - partly the solutions to the problem are partially correctly developed and the technologies are selected correctly;            1-0 Points - there are no correctly designed solutions to the problem, the technologies are chosen in part.</p> <p><b><u>Development and planning of product development stages</u></b>            3 points - adequately defined product planning and development stages;            2 points - partially correctly defined the stages of product planning and development;            1-0 Points - the stages of planning and development of the product are inappropriately determined.</p> <p><b><u>Product Perspective</u></b>            3 points - correctly evaluated and clearly formulated product prospects;            2 points - partially correctly evaluated and more or less clearly formulated product prospects;            1-0 points - small/not correctly evaluated and formulated product prospects.</p>	15

<p><b>Implementation (15 points)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use and analysis of algorithms (4,5 points)</li> <li>• Development of rational technologies for creating a product and analysis of their advantages (3,5 points),</li> <li>• High technical skills detection (3,5 points)</li> <li>• Additional tools used for software development (libraries, software packages, etc.) (3,5 points)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Application and analysis of algorithms</u></b></p> <p>4.5 points - the student uses algorithms as intended and analyzes them correctly;  4 points - the student uses algorithms for the intended purpose and more or less correctly analyzes them;  3 points - the student uses the algorithms for the intended purpose and partially analyzes them correctly;  2 points - the student partially uses the algorithms correctly and analyzes them;  1-0 points - the student partially/does not use algorithms and does not analyze them.</p> <p><b><u>Development of rational technologies for creating a product and analyzing their advantages</u></b></p> <p>3.5 points - the student correctly selects technologies for the implementation of the program and analyzes its advantages;  3 points - the student most of the time chooses the right technologies for the implementation of the program and analyzes its advantages;  2.5 points - the student more or less correctly selects technologies for the implementation of the program and analyzes its advantages;  2 points - the student chooses only a small part of the technology for the implementation of the program correctly and partially analyzes its advantages;  1-0 points - the student does not choose the technology for the implementation of the program most of the time and does not analyze its advantages.</p> <p><b><u>Detection of high technical skills</u></b></p> <p>3,5 points - the student reveals high technical skills when writing the code;  3 points - the student mostly exhibits high technical skills when writing the code;  2,5 points - the student more or less demonstrates high technical skills when writing a code;  2 points – the student reveals high technical skills in only a small part when writing the code;  1-0 Points - the student does not show high technical skills when writing the code.</p> <p><b><u>Additional tools used for software development (libraries, software packages, etc.)</u></b></p> <p>3.5 points – the student correctly selects and uses additional tools;  3-2 points - the student chooses correctly and more or less uses additional tools;  1-0 Points - the student does not correctly select or use additional tools.</p>	15
<p><b>Product Development Outlook (evaluation)(10 points)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the effectiveness of the</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Assessment of the effectiveness of the completed project according to the feedback of the client</u></b></p> <p>4-5 points - the student assesses the effectiveness of the successfully completed project taking into account the feedback of the client;  3-2 points - the student partially assesses the effectiveness of the successfully completed project taking into account the feedback of the client;</p>	10

<p>completed project according to the feedback of the client (5 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ways to improve the software product (5 points)</li> </ul>	<p>1-0 points - The student is a little successful/does not assess the effectiveness of the completed project taking into account the feedback of the client.</p> <p><b><u>Ways to further improve the software product</u></b></p> <p>4-5 points - the student realistically and correctly discusses ways to improve the future of the software product;  2-3 points - the student partially realistically and correctly discusses ways to improve the future of the software product;  1-0 points - The student unrealistically/does not discuss ways to improve the future of the software product.</p>	
	<p><b>Sum</b> <b>40</b> <b>points</b></p>	

## Criteria for evaluating the master's thesis by commission members

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation Scheme	Points
<b>Product Planning (15 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scenario description and client requirements (3 points)</li> <li>● Research and Market Analysis (3 Points)</li> <li>● Solutions and technologies to solve the problem (3 points)</li> <li>● Development and planning of product development stages (3 points)</li> <li>● Product perspective (3 points)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Scenario description and client requirements</u></b>            3 points - the script is perfectly described. Client requirements are formulated correctly and comprehensively;            2 points - the script is partially described. Client requirements are partially formulated;            1-0 Points script is not valid and understandable. Client requirements are in part/not formulated.</p> <p><b><u>Research &amp; Market Analysis</u></b>            3 points - the market is studied in detail, the pros and cons of various similar products are discussed. Based on their analysis, the important needs of the new product are highlighted;            2 points - the market is partially studied, the pros and cons of several similar products are partially discussed;            1-0 Points - the market is not/partially studied, superficially reviewed by other similar products.</p> <p><b><u>Problem Solving Solutions and Technologies</u></b>            3 points - the solutions to the problem are optimally developed and technologies are selected correctly;            2 points - the solutions to the problem are partially correctly developed and technologies are selected correctly;            1-0 Score - there are no correctly designed solutions to the problem, the technologies are partly chosen correctly.</p> <p><b><u>Development and planning of product development stages</u></b>            3 points - adequately defined product planning and development stages;            2 points - partially correctly defined the stages of product planning and development;            1-0 Points - not/inappropriately defined product planning and development stages.</p> <p><b><u>Product Perspective</u></b>            3 points - correctly evaluated and clearly formulated product prospects;            2 points - partially correctly evaluated and more or less clearly formulated product prospects;            1-0 points - small/not correctly evaluated and formulated product prospects.</p>	15
<b>Decision Analysis (Solution overview) (8 points)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Working timeline discharge (4 points)</li> <li>● Visualization of product structure (4 points)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Writing work deadlines</u></b>            4 points- working deadlines are optimally set for the task;            3-2 points - working deadlines are not determined satisfactorily for the task;            1-0 Points - working deadlines are not adequately defined by the task.</p> <p><b><u>Visualization of the structure of the product</u></b>            4 points – software structure is correctly planned and presented;</p>	8

	<p>3-2 points - the software structure is not sufficiently planned and presented;  1-0 points - the software structure is incorrectly/not planned and presented.</p>	
<p><b>Demonstration (Development) 15 points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Video demonstration of the functionality of the software product (7,5 points) includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Customer-friendly design (3,5 points)</li> <li>- Presentation of the correct functionality of the product (4 points)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Presentation (7,5 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Structure and sequence (4 points)</li> <li>- Ability to convey opinions, information (3,5 points)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Customer-friendly design</u></b>  3 - 3.5 points - the video discusses in detail the proper functionality of the software product;  2 points - the video partially discusses the proper functionality of the software product;  1-0 Points - In the video, only a small part of the functionality of the software product is discussed.</p> <p><b><u>Presenting the proper functionality of the product</u></b>  4 points - the video details the simplicity of the customer-friendly design;  3-2 points - the video partially shows the simplicity of the customer-friendly design;  1-0 Points - the video does not present the simplicity of the user-friendly design.</p> <p><b><u>Presentation</u></b>  <b>Structure and sequence</b>  4 points - the functionality and consistency of the program are structurally correctly discussed in the presentation;  3-2 points - the presentation structurally discusses the functionality and consistency of the program;  1-0 Points - The functionality and consistency of the program are structurally small/not discussed in the presentation.</p> <p><b><u>Ability to convey opinions, information</u></b>  3 – 3.5 points – the student demonstrates a high level of ability to convey information consistently and properly;  2 points - the student more or less demonstrates a high level of ability to convey information consistently and properly;  1-0 Points - The student does not demonstrate a high level of ability to convey information consistently and properly.</p>	<p>15</p>
<p><b>Implementation (15 points)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Use and analysis of algorithms (4,5 points)</li> <li>● Development of rational technologies for creating a</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Application and analysis of algorithms</u></b>  4.5 points - the student uses algorithms as intended and analyzes them correctly;  4 points - the student uses algorithms for the intended purpose and more or less correctly analyzes them;  3 points - the student uses the algorithms for the intended purpose and partially analyzes them correctly;  2 points - the student partially uses the algorithms correctly and analyzes them;  1-0 points - the student partially/does not use algorithms and does not analyze them.</p>	<p>15</p>

<p>product and analysis of their advantages (3,5 points),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High technical skills detection (3,5 points)</li> <li>• Additional tools used for software development (libraries, software packages, etc.) (3,5 points)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Development of rational technologies for creating a product and analyzing their advantages</u></b>  3.5 points - the student correctly selects technologies for the implementation of the program and analyzes its advantages;  3 points - the student most of the time chooses the right technologies for the implementation of the program and analyzes its advantages;  2.5 points - the student more or less correctly selects technologies for the implementation of the program and analyzes its advantages;  2 points - the student chooses only a small part of the technology for the implementation of the program correctly and partially analyzes its advantages;  1-0 points - the student does not choose the technology for the implementation of the program most of the time and does not analyze its advantages.</p> <p><b><u>Detection of high technical skills</u></b>  3,5 points - the student reveals high technical skills when writing the code;  3 points - the student mostly exhibits high technical skills when writing the code;  2,5 points - the student more or less demonstrates high technical skills when writing a code;  2 points – the student reveals high technical skills in only a small part when writing the code;  1-0 Points - the student does not show high technical skills when writing the code.</p> <p><b><u>Additional tools used for software development (libraries, software packages, etc.)</u></b>  3.5 points – the student correctly selects and uses additional tools;  3-2 points - the student chooses correctly and more or less uses additional tools;  1-0 Points - the student does not correctly select or use additional tools.</p>	
<p><b>Product Development Outlook (evaluation) (7 points)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the effectiveness of the completed project according to the feedback of the client (4 points)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Assessment of the effectiveness of the completed project according to the feedback of the client</u></b>  4 points - the student assesses the effectiveness of the successfully completed project taking into account the feedback of the client;  3-2 points - the student partially assesses the effectiveness of the successfully completed project taking into account the feedback of the client;  1-0 Points - The student does not underestimate the effectiveness of the successfully completed project taking into account the feedback of the client.</p> <p><b><u>Ways to further improve the software product</u></b>  3 points - the student realistically and correctly discusses ways to improve the future of the software product;  2 points - the student partially realistically and correctly discusses ways to improve the future of the software product;</p>	7

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ways to improve the software product (3 points)</li></ul>	1-0 points - The student unrealistically/does not discuss ways to improve the future of the software product.	
		<b>Total 60 points</b>