

The changes has been approved by  
LLC Teaching University Geomedi  
Academic Council session: protocol № 04  
"10" 04 2020

Rector, Professor: Marina Firtskhalava

## **Completion, presentation, and evaluation of the master's thesis**

### **Instruction**

#### **I. General Part**

- 1.1. The master's thesis is a scientific research part of the master's educational program, which the master's student prepares for the public defence at the open session of the commission for the defence of the master's thesis.
- 1.2. The thesis reflects the compliance of the master's student's knowledge level and scientific research skills with the requirements defined by the master's program.
- 1.3. The master's student will be allowed to defend the thesis after obtaining the credits provided by the mandatory training courses of the speciality within the framework of the master's program.
- 1.4. The evaluation of the master's thesis is based on the rules for evaluating the knowledge and skills of students operating in the university and the components provided by the master's program.
- 1.5. A supervisor of the thesis is assigned by the academic staff who is chosen by the faculty (invited staff with appropriate qualifications are also allowed). The Head of the theme can supervise only three active master's student.

#### **II. Master thesis topic**

- 2.1. The topic of the master's thesis is selected from the list of possible topics proposed by the supervisor or supervisors of the master's thesis based on the reconciliation of the opinions of the master's student and the topic supervisor.

2.2. The topic of the master's thesis shall be relevant, research-oriented, and correspond to the current scientific directions for the specialty of the master's educational program.

2.3. The list of topics for the master's thesis is approved by the faculty council upon submission by the supervisor of the relevant program.

2.4. Based on the decision of the faculty council, the specified topic and scientific supervisor of the master's thesis are approved by the rector in an appropriate order.

### **III. Master's supervisor**

3.1. The supervisor of the master's thesis can be an academic or invited lecturer of the university with appropriate qualifications in the field. Taking into account the specificity of the research topic, priority can be given to the scientific and/or practical experience of the supervisor, as well as the relevance and fluency of topics previously performed under his guidance.

3.2. The supervisor of the master's thesis is approved by the rector of the university based on the decision of the faculty council.

3.3. The supervisor is obliged to:

1. to help the master's student choose a topic, draw up a plan and process a bibliography;
2. periodically check the progress of work on the topic, express remarks, and provide appropriate consultations;
3. to explain to the master's student how to draw up his rights and duties and to demand their protection;

d. To advise the master's student to draw up an individual plan and to monitor its implementation.

1. After completing the work, prepare a written conclusion, which should include:
  - title of the thesis;
  - Master student's identity;
  - A brief overview of the work and its strengths and weaknesses;
  - Master's student's work capacity and other skills;
  - general assessment of labor (without marks);
  - Correspondence of the content of the thesis with the master's specialty;
  - Conclusion on admission-non-admission to the public defense of the work.

3.4. The supervisor has the right to refuse to guide the research process. In this case, within a reasonable period of time, he should apply to the faculty council with appropriate arguments in writing, which will consider the grounds for refusal as well as the reasonableness of the deadline for the refusal application, and in the case of a positive decision, approve the new supervisor.

3.5. If the faculty council does not agree with the grounds for the supervisor's refusal and/or the term of the refusal application makes it impossible to appoint a new supervisor and perform his duties, the supervisor is obliged to continue and faithfully fulfill the duties assigned to him.

#### **IV. Submission of the master's thesis to the public defence**

4.1. The completed thesis shall be submitted to the supervisor of the master's program on the basis of the written conclusion, which shall be certified by the signature and seal of the faculty;

4.2. The supervisor of the master's program ensures that the work performed by the graduate is checked in the anti-plagiarism system in accordance with the plagiarism detection and response rule.

4.3. In the event of a positive request from the supervisor of the master's program, the graduate student will be admitted to the preliminary review of the thesis before the commission, which is approved by the faculty council.

4.4. The preliminary review of the master's thesis is a necessary condition for the public defense of the thesis;

#### **V. Reviewer**

5.1. The supervisor of the master's program, together with the supervisor of the topic of the thesis, appoints a reviewer, who is formed by the resolution of the faculty council.

5.2. The reviewer can be both an employee of the university and an outside person;

5.3. The reviewer should only be a person with a relevant scientific (or academic) degree;

5.4. The reviewer presents a written review of the paper with the appropriate conclusion.

5.5. The review should reflect:

- The title of the thesis
- Master student's identity;
- Review of the work (volume, architecture, language, decoration, etc.);
- Strengths and weaknesses of the paper, with notes and recommendations;
- compliance of the content of the thesis with the requirements of the master's program;
- general assessment of the work (without marks);
- The reviewer's personal opinion on awarding a master's degree to the author—not awarding it.

5.6. The reviewer is obliged to inform the master's student of his notes and conclusion about the paper no later than 3 days before the public defense;

5.7. The reviewer's attendance at the public defense is not mandatory, although the commission or the graduate student can invite him and attend the session.

#### **VI. Thesis protection procedure**

6.1. The master's student presents the finished paper to the thesis supervisor, who, after reading it, returns it to the author with his notes (if any).

5.2. Taking into account the comments of the supervisor, the master's student completes the paper in a final form and again submits it to the supervisor of the topic for a written conclusion;

6.3. The thesis, together with the conclusion of the supervisor, will be submitted to the head of the master's program, upon whose positive request the master's student will be admitted to the preliminary review of the thesis. It is not necessary to submit the paper in bound form for preliminary consideration.

6.4. One copy of the peer-reviewed thesis (along with the electronic version) fully formatted, bound, and in a cover will be submitted to the relevant faculty at the Master's Thesis Defense Commission for public defense;

6.5. The head of the master's program checks the finished master's thesis (along with the electronic version) for plagiarism no later than one week before the public defence.

6.6. The public defense of the master's thesis is carried out at the commission, which is formed from the relevant university of the master's specialty and invited specialists with scientific (or academic) degrees.

6.7. Leading specialists (employers) of the relevant organization may be invited to the public defence of the master's thesis.

6.8. The commission should consist of at least three members; the final protocol is drawn up based on the proceedings and results of the commission session.

#### **6. 8. Public defence of the work:**

6.8.1. The secretary of the master's thesis defence commission informs the public attending the public defence of the biography of the master's student, academic results, name of the master's thesis, supervisor, and reviewer;

6.8.2. Master's thesis presentation regulations: 15 minutes. The master's student makes a 15-minute presentation before the Defence Commission;

6.8.3. The master's report should briefly describe the purpose, tasks, current opinions about the problems, and its analysis. conclusions and their theoretical and practical values;

6.8.4. During the reporting process, the master's student must present properly designed illustrative materials with the help of technical means;

6.8.5. After the master's report, with the permission of the chairman of the commission, the members of the commission and then the attending public can ask questions of the master's student. The graduate student is obliged to consistently answer each question.

6.8.6. Then the word is given to the reviewer (if he is present at the meeting), or the review is read by the secretary of the commission. The graduate student responds to the comments made by the reviewer.

6.8.7. Then the word is given to the master's supervisor, who characterizes the master's student.

6.8.8. After the speech of the supervisor of the master's degree, the members of the public protection commission, together with the invited specialists, discuss the presented work.

6.8.9. The final word is given to the graduate student. This concludes the defence of the master's thesis.

## VII. Evaluation of a master's thesis

7.1. The master's thesis is evaluated using a 100-point system:

1. a) **Excellence** (summa cum laude): excellent paper (91–100 points);
2. b) **Very good** (magna cum laude)—a result that exceeds the requirements in every way (81–90 points);
3. c) **Good** (cum laude): a result that exceeds the requirements (71–80 points);
4. d) **Average** (bene): a result that meets the requirements in every respect (61–70 points);
5. e) **Satisfactory** (rite): the result that, despite the shortcomings, still meets the requirements (51–60 points);
6. f) **Unsatisfactory** (insufficient): a result that does not meet the requirements due to significant deficiencies (41–50 points);
7. g) **Completely unsatisfactory** (sub omni canone)—a result that does not fully meet the requirements (0–40 points).

The evaluation score of the master's thesis is calculated using the arithmetic mean of the scores written by the commission.

**The public defence of the master's thesis** (held on the 21st week) is evaluated according to the following criteria:

<b>Evaluation of the master's thesis defence commission</b>
<p>Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:</p> <p><b>5 points:</b> the structure of the work corresponds to the standard, the academic style is perfectly preserved, the titles of paragraphs, chapters, and sub-chapters fully correspond to the content, and references to the used literature are correct.</p> <p><b>4 points:</b> the structure of the paper complies with the standard, the academic style is preserved, the title of the paragraphs fully corresponds to the content, and the reference to the used literature is mostly correct.</p> <p><b>3 points:</b> the language and style of the design are mostly correct, the consistency of the headings of the paragraphs with the content is satisfactory, and the reference to the used literature is mostly correct.</p> <p><b>2 points:</b> the language and style of the design are partially correct, the correspondence of the titles of the paragraphs with the content is unsatisfactory, and the reference to the used literature is only partially correct.</p> <p><b>1 point:</b> the language and style of formatting contain many errors; the headings of the paragraphs are illogical; and the reference to the used literature is incorrect.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> the design of the paper does not meet the existing requirements.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Master's Thesis The structure of the thesis is evaluated with a maximum of 5 points.</b></p>

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**The compatibility of the set goals and research methods is evaluated with a maximum score of 15 points.**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**15–13 points:** the relevance of the research topic is clearly and logically established, the goals are presented, the conclusions are clearly related to the research issues, the latest research methods and approaches relevant to the problem are selected, and the feasibility of their use is fully justified.

**12–10 points:** presented objectives and conclusions are clearly related to the research questions; the latest research methods and approaches relevant to the problem are selected; the feasibility of their use is not fully justified.

**9–7 points:** most of the presented goals are well related to the research issues, and the selected research methods and approaches provide specific results. Although they are not modern, the feasibility of their use is well justified.

**6–3 points:** the presented goals are related to the research issues, and the selected research methods and approaches provide specific results. Although they are not modern, the feasibility of their use is weakly substantiated.

**2–1 points:** the presented objectives partially answer the questions posed in the paper; the selected research methods and approaches are outdated or only partially adequate to the problem; they cannot ensure specific results; and the feasibility of their use is not justified.

**0 points:** the goals are not clear, the selected research methods and approaches are not adequate to the problem, and they cannot provide specific results.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**The variety and validity of the sources used are evaluated with a maximum of 10 points**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**10–9 points:** the sources are relevant to the research topic, are the latest, and represent high-level scientific original (including foreign language) publications and specialized monographs. The ability to critically analyze and synthesize sources is demonstrated.

**8–7 points:** the sources are relevant to the research topic, are new, and, with rare exceptions, are referable scientific publications and specialized monographs. A critical approach to the sources and the ability to synthesize them are revealed.

**6–5 points:** the sources are relevant to the topic; most of them are publications of low scientific quality and training manuals; a critical approach to the sources and the ability to synthesize them are sufficiently demonstrated.

**4–3 points:** the sources are selected according to the topic, a small amount includes scientific publications; a critical approach to the sources and the ability to synthesize them are partially revealed.

**2–1 points:** the list of used sources is scarce, only partially corresponds to the topic of the research, almost does not include scientific publications, and the ability to synthesize the used sources cannot be demonstrated.

**0 points:** the used sources are not presented or the sources do not correspond to the topic of the research.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**The citation technique is evaluated with a maximum of 5 points.**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**5 points:** the used material (including foreign languages) is relevant and is represented only by refereed publications and specialized monographs (study manuals are not used); the citation index is high.

**4 points:** the material used is relevant, its main part is represented by referable publications and specialized monographs (in some cases, study guides are used), and the citation index is good.

**3 points:** the material used is relevant, its main part is represented by referable publications and specialized monographs (in some cases, study guides are used), and the citation index is good.

**2 points:** only a small part of the used material is represented by refereed publications and specialized monographs; a significant part is represented by low-quality publications and training manuals. In many cases, the degree of relevance is low, and the citation index is low.

**1 point:** the used material is represented by low-quality publications and study guides; in many cases, the degree of relevance is low, and the citation index is very low.

**0 points:** the used material is not relevant.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**Presentation techniques and technology are evaluated with a maximum of 5 points.**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**5 points:** the presentation is made at a high level, the technologies used meet the standards, and the history of the research on the issue is clearly established, deeply analyzed, and evaluated.

**4 points:** the presentation is well done, the technologies used meet the standards, the research history of the issue is well established, and the analysis and evaluation lack depth.

**3 points:** The presentation is satisfactorily performed, the technologies used partially meet the standards, the history of the research on the issue is satisfactorily established, and it is not analyzed and evaluated.

**2 points:** the presentation is performed unqualifiedly, the research history of the issue is formed superficially, and it is not analyzed and evaluated.

**1 point:** the presentation is poorly executed, mistakes are made, the research history of the issue is unqualifiedly formulated, and it is not analyzed and evaluated.

**0 points:** the presentation is not performed, and the research history of the issue is not presented.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**Relevance and presentation of the topic: a maximum of 15 points are assessed;**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**15–13 points:** the topic is modern and innovative, the relevance of the research topic is clearly and logically established, it is consistent with the goals of the educational program, and the research results have special theoretical and practical significance.

**12–10 points:** the topic is modern, the relevance of the research topic is logically established, but there is a lack of clarity, it is consistent with the goals of the educational program, and the research results have some practical significance.

**9–7 points:** the topic is less relevant, the relevance of the research topic is formulated, but the contextual factors are not fully taken into account, and it is in accordance with the goals of the educational program.

**6 to 3 points:** The relevance of the research topic is formulated superficially and without arguments; it is in accordance with the goals of the educational program.

**2-1 points:** the relevance of the research topic is formulated unqualifiedly and contextually.

Regardless of the factors, it is indirectly related to the goals of the educational program.

**0 points:** the relevance of the research topic is not formulated and does not correspond to the goals of the educational program.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

**The ability to reason and perform critical analysis is evaluated with a maximum of 15 points.**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**15–13 points:** mastery of terminology is perfect, participation in discussion is effective, and reasoning is coherent. The information about the topic is presented exhaustively.

**12–10 points:** the mastery of the terminology is complete, the participation in the discussion and reasoning are consistent, and the information about the topic is conveyed fully but not exhaustively.

**9–7 points** have enough professional terminology, participation in the discussion and reasoning is less consistent, and the content of the topic is satisfactorily conveyed.

**6–3 points:** reasoning is incomplete and unconvincing. The content of the topic is not satisfactorily conveyed.

**2–1 points:** the reasoning is incomplete and fragmented; it cannot reflect the content of the presented topic.

**0 points**—the student could not defend the topic. Reasoning is not relevant to the issue.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

The sum of all the components

--	--	--	--	--	--

**Conclusions and recommendations are evaluated with a maximum of 10 points.**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**10–9 points:** original and interesting results are obtained, research objectives are fully achieved, innovative synthesis of knowledge and research results is implemented, and conclusions are professional and formed on the basis of critical research analysis.

**8–7 points:** new results are obtained, research goals are achieved, a good synthesis of knowledge and research results is carried out, conclusions are formulated clearly and justified by logical argumentation, and the weaknesses and strengths of the work are not evaluated critically.

**6–5 points:** with the obtained results, the goals of the research are mostly achieved, the synthesis of knowledge and research results is carried out satisfactorily, the conclusions are convincingly formulated but need refinement, and the weak and strong points of the work are evaluated superficially.

**4–3 points:** the obtained results achieved only a small part of the research goals; the synthesis of knowledge and research results is carried out in a fragmented way and includes unfinished parts; The conclusions are superficial.

**2–1-point:** the objectives of the research are not achieved, the reasoning misses the results, the conclusions are weak and superficial, and the critical assessment of the work is not presented or is superficial.

**0 points:** research objectives are not achieved; conclusions are inadequate.

Commission member #1	Commission member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total

The sum of all the components

--	--	--	--	--	--

**Research planning and implementation are assessed with a maximum of 15 points.**

Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:

**15–13 points:** independently planned and carried out research in accordance with the plan, showed high responsibility, and fulfilled all agreements with the supervisor in full and on time.

**12–10 points:** independently planned and carried out the research in accordance with the plan; the implementation of the research plan was slightly violated (without a valid reason); showed sufficient responsibility; fully fulfilled all agreements with the supervisor, although in some cases, agreements were violated.

**9–7 points:** planned and carried out research with a little help. Compliance with the plan was slightly violated (without good reason), demonstrated satisfactory responsibility, and fulfilled the main part of the issues agreed upon with the supervisor in full.

**6–3 points:** Planned and implemented research with significant assistance. Compliance with the plan has been substantially breached (without good reason). He showed low responsibility; he fulfilled only a small part of the issues agreed upon with the supervisor in full.

**2-1-point:**planned and implemented research with significant help. Compliance with the plan has been substantially breached (without good reason). He showed little responsibility; he could not fully fulfill the issues agreed upon with the head.

**0 points:** failed to plan the research and its implementation; showed irresponsibility.

Commission member #1	Commission member#2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total
The sum of all the components					
<b>Compliance with the regulations is evaluated with a maximum of 5 points.</b>					
Each member of the commission evaluates the paper according to the following criteria:					
5 <b>points:</b> strictly adheres to the time limit set for the presentation and does not violate the regulations.					
4 <b>points:</b> adheres to the time limit set for the presentation, slightly violates the rules set for the presentation					
3 <b>points:</b> adheres to the time limit for the presentation; partially violates the time regulation for the presentation.					
2 <b>points:</b> fits in the time limit for the presentation, breaks the rules					
1 <b>point:</b> cannot fit in the time allotted for the presentation; violates the regulations					
0 <b>points:</b> cannot follow the rules defined for the presentation.					
Commission member #1	Commssion member #2	Commission member #3	Commission member #4	Commission member #5	Total
The sum of all the components					

7.2. The master's thesis will be considered completed if it scores 51 or more points during the evaluation.

7.3. If the master's thesis is evaluated at 41–50 points, the master's student is allowed to submit a revised master's thesis during the next semester.

7.4. If the master's thesis is evaluated with 0–40 points, the master's student loses the right to submit the same thesis. He is given the right to choose a new topic and supervisor and to defend his master's thesis before the commission in the next academic year.

7.5. The members of the master's thesis defense commission are obliged to attend the defense of the master's theses until the end, actively participate in the debate, summarize at the closed session of the commission after the defenses are over, and evaluate each master's thesis by open vote.

7.6. The commission establishes the master's thesis evaluation protocol and makes the final decision on awarding the master's academic degree to the graduate. The minutes must be accompanied by reviews and a source of final evaluation written by the commission and signed by the commission members.

- 7.7. The positive decision of the commission is the basis for issuing a master's degree to the graduate;
- 7.8. The master's degree of the university is a document issued in accordance with the current standards that confirms the completion of the second level of higher education in Georgia—the master's degree.
- 7.9. Along with the master's diploma, a diploma supplement is issued to the graduate, which is filled out in compliance with the applicable rules.
- 7.10. A graduate student with a complaint about the results of the thesis defense has the right to make a written application immediately after the announcement of the results and to meet with the commission to clarify the unacceptable result.
- 7.11. If the master's student fails to appear before the commission to defend the master's thesis within the set period, the head of the master's program is obliged to consider each such case in time and submit the appropriate recommendation to the faculty council for an adequate decision.

## VIII. Designing a master's thesis

8.1. The master's thesis has a structure that is compiled with the help of a scientific supervisor and includes the following parts:

8.1.1. **The title page** is formed according to certain rules (the name of the higher education institution is indicated at the top of the page: Ltd. University of Geomed). The postgraduate's name and last name are inscribed two to three centimeters below. The topic of the master's thesis is written in the middle of the page in 16 font sizes. Then the master's speciality name and the research degree of which a thesis for defense is submitted. The supervisor's name, last name, and academic status are then shown near the bottom of the page, on the right side. The work's performance, location (i.e., city), and year of submission are outlined below (see Annexes 1a and 1b).

8.1.2. **Annotation** of not more than half a page and not less than 150 words, which briefly describes the relevance, purpose, and main news of the topic. Annotation is required. be written in the Georgian language. Annotations will be placed on one page and bound on the next title page.

8.1.3. **Table of contents:** in which the exact names of all chapters and paragraphs of the text of the work are listed.

8.1.4. The **introduction** is the general part of the paper, where the relevance of the topic, the purpose, and the tasks of the research are substantiated in no more than 2–3 pages. The subject and object of the research, the methods used for the research and the material-technical base are defined.

8.1.5. **The main text** is broken up into paragraphs inside chapters. Paragraphs and chapters are titled, with the topic supervisor considering the material.

8.1.6. **The conclusion** represents a part of the main research results of the paper, which briefly and concretely answers all the tasks.

8.1.7. **Used literature:** a list of literature that is formed in compliance with the specified rules.

8.1.8. All parts of the finished master's thesis must be bound in the cover in the following order: title page annotation, table of contents, introduction, chapters (main content), conclusion, references, and appendices.

8.2. The master's thesis submitted for defence before the attestation commission must meet the following formal requirements:

8.2.1. The volume of the master's thesis should be no less than 50 pages, which means all linked pages;

8.2.2. The work is printed on A4 size paper in Silfaen with a 12-point font; the size of headings and sub-headings is 16–14; Spacing between lines: 1.5 spaces; text alignment: full width; indentation of the first line of the paragraph: 1.27 (5 spaces). Page margins: 3.0 cm; from left, 1.60 cm. - From above, below, and from the right.

8.3. The master's thesis is completed in Georgian, following orthographic and stylistic norms.

8.4. All pages of the paper must be numbered sequentially. It is not allowed to leave a free space or page; repeat pages. Each page is numbered in the lower right margin with Arabic numerals, size 10. The page number should be spaced 1.3 cm from the bottom edge of the page and 2.0 cm from the right edge. The title page is not numbered but will count towards the total number of papers.

8.5. The titles of all chapters and sub-chapters of the paper should be included in the table of contents. All chapters should start on a new page and sub-chapters should continue on the same page.

8.6. The structural elements of the paper ("Table of Contents," "Introduction," "Conclusion," "References," "Appendices," and others) and the titles of individual chapters are written (size 14) in the middle part of the line without a period or underline. The distance between the title and the text, between the main title and the sub-heading, is determined by 1.5 spaces.

8.7. Chapters, paragraphs, and subsections of the work are numbered with Arabic numerals. In the main part of the work, the chapters are numbered sequentially, with Arabic numerals and a period. Paragraphs and subsections are numbered with a combination of Arabic numerals (e.g., 1.2 means the first paragraph of the second paragraph, etc.); if necessary, the next digit with a dot determines the number of the subsection.

8.8. If abbreviations of words or sentences are used in the text of the work, then the accepted list of abbreviations should be used, or they should be deciphered directly after the first use in the text and written in parentheses.

8.9. It is necessary to indicate the literary sources used in the master's thesis. The used literature should be cited in the main text (at the end of the citation) in square brackets with Arabic numerals (e.g., [7.13–14] means the source of name 7 in the list of used literature, pages 13–14).

8.10. An alphabetical list of the used books will be included at the bottom of the paper. The sources are written in Georgian initially, and afterwards, they are published in other languages. Their listing should be done according to the rules:

8.10.1. When referring to a book or monograph, it is necessary to name:

- Surname and initials of the author(s);

- Name of the book;
  - City of publication;
  - year of publication;
  - Total number of pages;
- 8.10.2. When referring to a scientific article, the author(s).
- Surname and initials;
  - title of the article;
  - Journal abbreviation;
  - year of publication;
  - volume;
  - number;
  - The first and last pages of the article.
- 8.10.3. In the case of using Internet materials:
- author of the material;
  - Website author;
  - name of the material with a link marking
  - Website address;
  - a retrieval date for an online source
- 8.10.4. In the case of the use of governmental and statutory documents:
- Name of the country;
  - Name of the agency to which the document belongs;
  - year when the requested material was looked for.
  - Type of document (order, instruction, law)
  - Name of the document concerning the appropriate identification number and year;
  - Location of the publication where the requested material was looked for.
  - The title of the publication where the requested material was looked for.

## **IX. Deadlines for the selection, execution, preliminary review, and defence of the master's thesis**

9.1. The faculty council approves the master's thesis list before the start of the fourth academic semester.

9.2. Completing work on the master's thesis and checking the thesis in the anti-plagiarism system—17th week of the IV semester;

9.3. Preliminary examination of the master's thesis, 18th week of the IV semester;

9.4. Presentation of the review, 20th week of the IV semester;

9.5. Public defence of master's thesis, 21st week of IV semester.