Amendment approved

at a meeting of the Academic Board of University Geomedi LLC
Minutes №11, 29.10.2026

Rector, Professor Marina Pirtskhalava

Instructions for the Preparation, Submission, and Assessment of Bachelor's Theses

1. A bachelor's thesis is a final academic project completed by a student at the end of their educational program and defended before the Bachelor's Thesis Defense Committee in a public session.
2. The thesis must demonstrate that the student's knowledge, creative abilities, and research skills meet the requirements of the educational program.
3. Eligibility for the bachelor's thesis defense is determined by the requirements of the relevant educational program.
4. Students select their thesis supervisors from a list of academic staff provided by the faculty.
5. The thesis supervisor assists the student in selecting the topic, preparing the work plan, and reviewing the relevant literature. The supervisor regularly monitors the student's progress, provides feedback, and helps the student adjust the direction of the research when necessary. Upon completion of the thesis, the supervisor prepares a written evaluation containing the following information:
    a) Title of the thesis;
    b) Identity of the author;
    c) Brief overview of the thesis;
    d) Strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, including comments and recommendations;
    e) Evaluation of the student's commitment, work ethic, and academic abilities;
    f) Overall evaluation of the thesis;
    g) The supervisor's assessment of the student's eligibility for the bachelor's degree.
6. The faculty publishes the list of bachelor's thesis topics at the beginning of the eighth semester and approves each student's selected topic and supervisor at the beginning of Week 13. The student submits the completed thesis to the Dean's Office by the end of Week 17. The Program Director ensures that the submitted thesis is checked using the plagiarism detection system in accordance with the Rules for the Detection and Response to Plagiarism. Upon receiving a positive evaluation from the supervisor, the thesis is presented to the Committee for preliminary review at the end of Week 18. The preliminary defense assesses the student's readiness to present the thesis. The public defense takes place in Week 20.
7. In Week 16 of the eighth semester, a Bachelor's Thesis Defense Committee is established for the public defense. Its members include representatives of the faculty's academic and invited staff in the relevant specialty. The Committee is approved by the University Rector upon nomination by the Faculty Dean. The Committee must consist of at least three members. The proceedings and outcomes of the Committee meeting are documented in the official minutes.
8. One copy of the bachelor's thesis must be submitted to the Committee three days before the preliminary defense.
9. The public defense of the bachelor's thesis is limited to 10 minutes.
10. The student may use visual materials during the defense.

11. The bachelor's thesis is included as a separate item in the Diploma Supplement and assessed as a research component completed by the student as part of the educational program.
12. A defense may be postponed for a valid reason on the basis of the student's written application specifying and substantiating the reason for the request.

Formatting Requirements for Bachelor's Theses

1. The bachelor's thesis must be prepared on A4 paper and contain at least 30 pages. The text must use a standard font (AcadNusx, Litnusx, or Sylfaen). Font size: 12 pt for the main text and 14 pt for headings and subheadings. Line spacing: 1.5; page margins: 2 cm on all sides.
2. The bachelor's thesis must include the following components:
– Title page — the first page of the bachelor's thesis (see Annex 1);
– Abstract — no more than one page, outlining the thesis structure, objectives, and a brief conclusion;
– Introduction — the general section of the thesis, describing the relevance of the selected topic, the aim and specific objectives, the subject of the research, and the methods used (where experimental research is conducted);
– Main body — may be divided into chapters and sections; diagrams, tables, and figures may be included;
– Conclusion — must present the findings of the bachelor's thesis;
– References — must be presented in alphabetical order in accordance with the American Psychological Association Publication Manual, 7th edition (APA 7). Georgian-language publications must be listed first, followed by foreign-language publications. Each reference must comply with APA 7 requirements, including the author's surname and initials, title of the work, journal or publication title, year of publication, volume, issue, page numbers, and, where applicable, the DOI or electronic link. For books or monographs, the reference must include the author's surname and initials, year of publication, title of the work, and publisher. Punctuation, order of information, use of italics, and other formatting elements must follow APA 7 rules;
– When internet sources are used, indicate the author of the material, author or owner of the website, title of the material with a link, website address, and date accessed;
– Table of contents — the bachelor's thesis must include a table of contents listing all chapters, subsections, and paragraphs, with their corresponding page numbers aligned to the right margin;
– Page numbering — all pages must be numbered consecutively, with no omitted or repeated page numbers or blank pages. All pages except the title page must be numbered;
– In-text citations — references to literature must be indicated in the main text (generally at the end of a paragraph), using Arabic numerals in square brackets. The list of cited works must appear at the end of the thesis;
– Footnotes — may appear at the bottom of the page in 10 pt font and may be numbered using symbols or Arabic numerals;
– Annexes (where applicable) — may contain tables, figures, programs, calculations, diagrams, and similar supplementary materials;
– Government documents — when citing such documents, indicate the country, the issuing authority, the type of document (order or law), the year of the publication in which it was located, and the document title, together with its identification number and year.

Assessment of Bachelor's Theses

1. 1. The assessment system provides for:

a) Five positive grades:

a.a) (A) Excellent — 91–100%;

a.b) (B) Very Good — 81–90%;
a.c) (C) Good — 71–80%;
a.d) (D) Satisfactory — 61–70%;
a.e) (E) Sufficient — 51–60%.

b) Two negative grades:
b.a) (FX) Fail — 41–50% of the maximum grade. This means that the student needs to undertake additional work and is entitled to one additional public defense of the bachelor's thesis after independent preparation.
b.b) (F) Fail — 40% or less of the maximum grade. This means that the student's work is insufficient and the bachelor's thesis must be prepared once again.
If the thesis receives 0–40 points, the student may select a new topic and supervisor and defend the thesis before the Committee during the following academic year.

2. The bachelor's thesis is assessed on a 100-point scale:

– The public defense of the bachelor's thesis takes place in Week 20 and is assessed according to the components listed below. Each component has an individual minimum competency threshold.
3. The bachelor's thesis assessment score is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the scores awarded by the Committee members.

5. Assessment criteria:

1. Significance of the research topic - **15 points** (minimum threshold: 8 points).
2. Appropriate selection and systematic organization of relevant literature - **10** points (minimum threshold: 5 points).
3. Ability to review and present material relating to the research topic — **10** points (minimum threshold: 5 points).
4. Ability to understand, investigate, and analyze the problem and present a coherent argument — **10** points (minimum competency threshold: 5 points).
5. Technical, stylistic, and grammatical quality of the thesis - **10** points (minimum threshold: 5 points).
6. Structure of the submitted thesis - **10** points (minimum threshold: 5 points).
7. Technical quality of the presentation -**10** points (minimum threshold: 5 points).
8. Quality of Discussion and Responses to Questions and Comments -**15** points (minimum threshold: 8 points).
9. Relevance of scientific sources and presentation materials to the research topic - **10** points (minimum threshold: 5 points).

A bachelor's thesis is considered successfully completed if the student earns at least 51 points.
If the thesis receives 41–50 points, the student is entitled to one additional public defense during the same semester. The interval between the initial public defense and the additional defense must be at least five days.
If the thesis receives 0–40 points, the student may select a new topic and supervisor and defend the thesis before the Committee during the following academic year.
6. The student is entitled to an additional public defense of the bachelor's thesis during the same semester. The additional public defense must take place at least five days after the initial defense.

7. The Committee prepares summary minutes of the bachelor's thesis assessment and makes the final decision on awarding the graduate a bachelor's degree. The minutes must be accompanied by the supervisor's written evaluation, recommendation, individual assessments, and the final assessment record prepared by the Committee and signed by its members.
8. A bachelor's diploma is issued to the graduate following a positive decision by the Committee.
9. The University's bachelor's diploma is issued in accordance with applicable standards and certifies the completion of the first cycle of higher education in Georgia.
10. The graduate receives a Diploma Supplement, completed in accordance with the applicable regulations, together with the bachelor's diploma.

Timelines for the Selection, Preparation, Preliminary Review, and Defense of Bachelor's Theses

1. The list of bachelor's thesis topics is published at the beginning of the eighth semester; the topic selected by the student and the supervisor are approved at the beginning of Week 13.
2. Completion of the thesis and plagiarism screening - Week 17 of Semester VIII;
3. Preliminary review of the thesis - Week 18 of Semester VIII;
4. Public defense of the bachelor's thesis - Week 20 of Semester VIII.

Annex 1

University Geomedi LLC

---------- Faculty

Surname, Given Name

Bachelor's Thesis

Thesis Title

Supervisor: Surname, Given Name
Academic degree,
Academic position.

Tbilisi _____ (year)

Annex 2

Bachelor's Thesis Defense Committee Assessment

1. **Significance of the Research Topic - maximum 15 points;**

(Minimum threshold: 8 points)
Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria.

Significance of the Research Topic - maximum 15 points

15 points - The research topic is current, innovative, and highly relevant. Its relevance is justified clearly, logically, and with well-supported arguments, taking into account the theoretical and practical context. The topic fully corresponds to the aims and field of the educational program. The research findings have significant theoretical and practical value.

14 points - The research topic is current, innovative, and highly relevant. Its relevance is justified clearly and logically, and the principal contextual factors are considered. The topic fully corresponds to the aims of the educational program. The findings have substantial theoretical and practical significance, although minor aspects of the justification or context could be improved.

13 points - The research topic is current and relevant. Its relevance is adequately stated and largely supported by arguments. The principal contextual factors are considered, and the topic corresponds to the aims of the educational program. The findings have significant practical and/or theoretical value, although the justification is not fully developed.

12 points - The research topic is current and relevant. Its relevance is logically explained and largely substantiated, although the arguments are not sufficiently comprehensive. The topic corresponds to the aims of the educational program. The findings have practical and theoretical significance.

11 points - The research topic is current and relevant. Its relevance is presented logically but lacks some clarity or depth of argument. The principal contextual factors are considered. The topic corresponds to the program aims, and the findings have some practical significance.

10 points - The research topic is relevant and corresponds to the aims of the educational program. Its relevance is stated, but the arguments are partial and do not fully demonstrate the significance of the research problem. Most contextual factors are considered.

9 points - The research topic is relevant and consistent with the program aims. Its relevance is stated, but the justification is general and requires greater specificity. Some contextual factors are considered.

8 points - The research topic is generally relevant and corresponds to the aims of the educational program. Its relevance is stated, but the supporting arguments are not sufficiently convincing. The significance of the research problem is only partly demonstrated.

7 points - The research topic is relevant, but the justification is general and insufficiently supported. Alignment with the program aims is largely established, but the theoretical and practical significance of the topic is not clearly demonstrated.

6 points - The research topic has some relevance. Its relevance is stated, but the relevant contextual factors are not fully considered. Alignment with the program aims is only partly substantiated.

5 points - The research topic has limited relevance. The justification is superficial and omits important contextual aspects. Alignment with the program aims is only partly apparent.

4 points - The research topic has limited relevance. Its relevance is stated formally, but the supporting arguments are weak. Contextual factors are inadequately considered.

3 points - The relevance of the research topic is minimally demonstrated. The justification is weak and fragmented. The significance and context of the research problem are not adequately presented.

2 points - The relevance of the research topic is inadequately formulated. Important contextual factors are not considered, and the significance of the topic is not sufficiently established.

1 point - The relevance of the research topic is virtually unsubstantiated. The explanation does not demonstrate the significance of the research problem or its alignment with the aims of the educational program.

0 points - The research topic is not relevant; the need for the research and the significance of the problem are not justified; relevant contextual factors are not considered; and the topic does not correspond to the direction and requirements of the educational program.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	

Total for All Components

2. Appropriate selection and systematic organization of relevant literature - maximum 10 points

(Minimum competency threshold: 5 points)

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:

9–10 points - The sources used, including foreign-language sources, are relevant and consist exclusively of significant publications in the field, specialized monographs, and textbooks.

7–8 points - The sources are relevant and consist mainly of publications and specialized monographs; textbooks are used in some cases.

5–6 points - A substantial proportion of the sources consists of publications and specialized monographs; lower-quality publications and textbooks are also used, and relevance is sometimes limited.

3–4 points - Only a small proportion of the sources consists of peer-reviewed publications and specialized monographs; much of the material consists of low-quality publications and textbooks, and relevance is often limited.

1–2 points - The sources consist of low-quality publications and textbooks and are often of limited relevance.

0 points - The sources used are not relevant**.**

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					

3. **Ability to review and present material relating to the research topic - maximum 10 points (minimum competency threshold: 5 points).**

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:
9–10 points - The sources are highly relevant and up to date, consisting of high-quality original scientific publications, including foreign-language works, and specialized monographs. The student demonstrates the ability to critically analyze and synthesize the sources.
7–8 points - The sources are relevant and recent and, with rare exceptions, consist of peer-reviewed scientific publications and specialized monographs. The student demonstrates a critical approach and an ability to synthesize the sources.
5–6 points - The sources are relevant, although many are of lower scientific quality or are textbooks. The student demonstrates an adequate critical approach and an ability to synthesize the sources.
3–4 points - The sources are selected according to the topic but include few scientific publications. The student demonstrates a partial ability to assess and synthesize the sources critically.
1–2 points - The list of sources is limited and only partly relevant; it contains almost no scientific publications. The student does not demonstrate an ability to synthesize the sources used.
0 points - No sources are presented, or the sources do not correspond to the research topic.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					

4. **Ability to understand, investigate, and analyze the problem and present a coherent argument - maximum 10 points (minimum competency threshold: 5 points).**

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:
9–10 points - The research aim is innovative and precisely defined. The research problem is clearly identified and fully consistent with the research aim. The relevance of the research is justified by an in-depth review and critical analysis.
7–8 points - The research aim is clearly defined, and the research problems are well formulated and consistent with that aim. The relevance of the research has been examined in depth, although the critical analysis is incomplete.
5–6 points - The research aim is adequately defined, and the research problems are clearly stated and generally consistent with the aim. The relevance of the research is satisfactorily justified.
3–4 points - The research aim is clearly defined, but the research problems are not appropriate to it and are explained ambiguously. The justification of relevance is superficial or partly illogical.

1–2 points - The research aim is unclear, or the research problem is insufficiently precise. The justification of relevance is inadequate or absent.
0 points - The research aim and problem are not presented or are inappropriate.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					

5. **Technical, stylistic, and grammatical quality of the thesis - maximum 10 points (minimum competency threshold: 5 points).**

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:
9–10 points - The thesis fully complies with academic writing conventions; the thesis includes a comprehensive abstract; section headings accurately reflect their content; and references are cited correctly.
7–8 points - The thesis complies with academic writing conventions; the abstract is well prepared; section headings accurately reflect their content; and references are generally cited correctly.
5–6 points - The language and style are generally appropriate; the abstract is satisfactory; section headings adequately reflect their content; and references are generally cited correctly.
3–4 points - The language and style are only partly appropriate; the abstract is unsatisfactory; section headings do not adequately reflect their content; and references are cited correctly only in part.
1–2 points - The language, style, and abstract contain numerous errors; section headings are illogical; and references are cited incorrectly.
0 points - The thesis does not meet the applicable formatting requirements.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					

6. **Structure of the submitted thesis — maximum 10 points. (Minimum competency threshold: 5 points)**

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:
9–10 points - The thesis structure meets the required standard, academic writing conventions are fully observed, chapter and subsection headings accurately reflect their content, and references are cited correctly.
7–8 points - The thesis structure meets the required standard, academic writing conventions are observed, section headings accurately reflect their content, and references are generally cited correctly.
5–6 points - The language and style are generally appropriate, section headings adequately reflect their content, and references are generally cited correctly.
3–4 points - The language and style are only partly appropriate, section headings do not adequately reflect their content, and references are cited correctly only in part.
1–2 points - The language and style contain numerous errors, section headings are illogical, and references are cited incorrectly.
0 points - The thesis does not meet the applicable formatting requirements.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					

7. Technical quality of the presentation — maximum 10 points.
(Minimum competency threshold: 5 points)

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:
10 points - The presentation is of high quality, the technology used meets the required standards, and the history of research on the topic is clearly presented, analyzed, and evaluated in depth.
8–9 points - The presentation is well prepared, the technology used meets the required standards, and the history of research on the topic is clearly presented, although the analysis and evaluation lack depth.
6–7 points - The presentation is satisfactory, the technology used partly meets the required standards, and the history of research on the topic is adequately presented but not analyzed or evaluated.
4–5 points - The presentation is of low quality and has significant technical deficiencies. The materials do not fully meet academic and technical standards. The design is weak, and the quality of visual materials makes the information difficult to understand. The technical presentation does not adequately support a clear and effective explanation of the research findings.
2–3 points - The presentation is of very low quality. The materials fall significantly below the required technical standards. The structure is inconsistent, the information is poorly organized, and the visual materials are inappropriate or insufficient. Major technical deficiencies make it difficult to understand the presentation and interpret the research findings. The formatting falls short of the requirements for an academic presentation.
1 point - The presentation is unsatisfactory. The materials do not meet basic technical requirements. The slides are disorganized, the information is presented chaotically, and numerous technical errors substantially hinder comprehension and the proper presentation of the research findings.
0 points - No presentation is provided, or the submitted materials are so inconsistent with technical requirements that assessment is impossible.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					

8. Quality of Discussion and Responses to Questions and Comments — maximum 15 points.
(Minimum competency threshold: 8 points)

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:

15 points - The student demonstrates excellent command of professional terminology and uses it accurately and appropriately; participates actively and effectively in discussion; and presents a coherent, logical, and well-supported argument. The content of the topic is explained completely, comprehensively, and clearly.

14 points - The student demonstrates very good command of professional terminology and generally uses it correctly; participates effectively in discussion; and presents a logical and coherent argument. The content is explained fully and comprehensively, with only minor shortcomings.

13 points - The student demonstrates good command of professional terminology and participates effectively in discussion. The argument is generally coherent and well supported, and the topic is presented fully, covering the principal issues.

12 points - The student demonstrates full command of professional terminology and participates in discussion with a coherent argument. The topic is presented in full but not comprehensively; some issues require further explanation.

11 points - The student demonstrates good command of professional terminology, although minor inaccuracies occur. Participation in discussion is appropriate, and the argument is generally coherent. The content is presented in full, but some important aspects are insufficiently developed.

10 points - The student demonstrates command of professional terminology and generally uses it correctly, participates in discussion, and answers questions. The argument is generally coherent, and the topic is presented fully but without sufficient depth or detail.

9 points - The student demonstrates adequate command of professional terminology and satisfactory participation in discussion. The argument is generally coherent, but some statements lack support. The main content of the topic is presented, although incompletely.

8 points - The student demonstrates adequate knowledge of basic professional terminology, though its use is not always accurate. Participation in discussion is partly effective. The argument is generally understandable but lacks coherence. The topic is presented satisfactorily, although significant issues are omitted.

7 points - The student knows most basic professional terms and participates in discussion, but some answers are superficial. The argument is insufficiently coherent and requires further justification. The main content of the topic is presented satisfactorily.

6 points - The student has partial command of professional terminology and participates only to a limited extent in discussion. The argument is incomplete and unconvincing. The content is presented only in part, and important issues are not adequately addressed.

5 points - The student has limited command of professional terminology and makes significant errors in its use. Participation in discussion is ineffective. The argument is fragmented and insufficiently supported, and the topic is presented incompletely and superficially.

4 points - The student has inadequate command of professional terminology and participates minimally in discussion. The argument is incomplete, fragmented, and unconvincing. The topic is not adequately presented and does not cover its principal components.

3 points - The student has very limited knowledge of professional terminology and participates in discussion with little effectiveness. The argument is fragmented and inconsistent. The content consists only of isolated, disconnected issues.

2 points - The student has virtually no command of professional terminology. Participation in discussion is negligible, and the argument is defective, fragmented, and does not convey the essence of the topic. Only minor fragments of the content are presented.

1 point - The student demonstrates almost no knowledge of professional terminology and cannot participate effectively in discussion. The argument is incoherent and fragmented and does not reflect the topic's content or principal issues.

0 points - The student is unable to defend the thesis, does not demonstrate knowledge of professional terminology, cannot participate in discussion, and cannot present relevant arguments about the topic. The response does not correspond to the content of the topic.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					

9. **Relevance of scientific sources and presentation materials to the research topic — maximum 10 points.**

(Minimum competency threshold: 5 points)

Each Committee member assesses the thesis according to the following criteria:

9–10 points - The materials used, including foreign-language sources, are relevant and consist exclusively of peer-reviewed publications and specialized monographs (without textbooks), and the citation index is high.
7–8 points - The materials are relevant and consist mainly of peer-reviewed publications and specialized monographs (textbooks are occasionally used), and the citation index is good.
5–6 points - A substantial proportion of the sources consists of peer-reviewed publications and specialized monographs, but low-quality publications and textbooks are also used. Relevance is sometimes limited, and the citation index is low.
3–4 points - Only a small proportion of the sources consists of peer-reviewed publications and specialized monographs. Much of the material comprises low-quality publications and textbooks; relevance is often limited, and the citation index is low.
1–2 points - The materials consist of low-quality publications and textbooks; their relevance is often limited, and the citation index is very low.
0 points - The materials used are not relevant.

Committee Member No. 1	Committee Member No. 2	Committee Member No. 3	Committee Member No. 4	Committee Member No. 5	Total
Total for All Components					