

## Education Science

<b>Name of the Educational Programme:</b>	<b>Education Science</b>
<b>Awarded Qualification:</b>	Doctor of Education Science
<b>Credit Value of the Programme:</b>	55 ECTS
<b>Language of Education:</b>	English
<b>Programme Admission Preconditions:</b>	<p>According to Georgian legislation the candidate for studying at this program should have a Master’s degree or a degree equivalent to it, except for the person who was awarded the Master's academic degree on the basis of completion of the Master's educational program, which includes at least 60 credits, provided for in Article 46, Paragraph 23 of the Law of Georgia on Higher Education.</p> <p><b>Educational Background</b>  The program requires either a Bachelor’s or a Master’s degree in the Education, Psychology, Humanities, Social Sciences, Law, and Business fields, or a one-year 60-credit teacher-training certificate.</p> <p><b>Work Experience</b>  A candidate (with an education or psychology background) must have a minimum of 2 years of experience working in the field of education and/or teaching.  A candidate (with humanities and social sciences, law, and business education) must have a minimum of 3 years of experience working in the field of education and/or teaching.</p> <p><b>Scientific/Research Background</b>  The candidates should submit at least one published article in peer-reviewed scientific journals/ conference proceedings in the area of education. The article should be written in English.</p> <p><b>Language Requirement</b>  The candidate should have the C1 level in the English language according to the Common European Framework of Reference, which should be documented by either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An International Certificate (FCE (A grade), CAE, IELTS-7.0, TOEFL iBT-95, CERTUS, etc.) obtained within the last 3 years (refers to the exams with set lifespan) or</li> </ol>

2. A Master's Diploma delivered in English obtained within the last 5 years

#### Dissertation Proposal

The candidate is requested to submit a dissertation proposal, which aims to check the candidate's research potential. The written dissertation proposal is evaluated by the minimum 3 members of Dissertation Field Board (including the head of the program).

Assessment criteria for the dissertation proposal (64 points):

Title and Introduction (8 points total)

1.1. Title Clarity (4 points)- (Poor (1): Title is vague or inappropriate; Fair (2): Title partially reflects research focus; Good (3): Title clearly reflects research focus; Excellent (4): Title is precise, compelling, and perfectly aligned with research).

1.2. Problem Statement (4 points)- Poor (1): Problem is unclear or trivial; Fair (2): Problem is stated but lacks clarity; Good (3): Problem is clear and significant; Excellent (4): Problem is extremely well-defined and highly significant;

2. Research Goals and Objectives (12 points total).

2.1. Main Goal Clarity (4 points)- Poor (1): Goals are unclear or unrealistic; Fair (2): Goals are somewhat clear but need refinement; Good (3): Goals are clear and achievable; Excellent (4): Goals are exceptionally clear, relevant, and achievable.

2.2. Specific Objectives (4 points)- Poor (1): Objectives are vague or misaligned; Fair (2): Objectives partially align with goals; Good (3): Objectives align well with goals; Excellent (4): Objectives are perfectly aligned and SMART

2.3. Research Questions (4 points)- Poor (1): Questions are poorly formulated; Fair (2): Questions need some refinement; Good (3): Questions are well-formulated; Excellent (4): Questions are excellent and perfectly aligned

3. Significance of Research (12 points total)

3.1. Theoretical Contribution (4 points)- Poor (1): No clear contribution; Fair (2): Limited contribution; Good (3): Clear contribution; Excellent (4): Exceptional contribution

3.2. Practical Impact (4 points)- Poor (1): No practical relevance; Fair (2): Limited practical relevance; Good (3): Clear practical relevance; Excellent (4): High practical impact

3.3. Innovation (4 points)- Poor (1): No original elements; Fair (2): Some original elements; Good (3): Clear originality; Excellent (4): Highly innovative

4. Literature Review (12 points total)

4.1. Coverage (4 points)- Poor (1): Inadequate coverage; Fair (2): Partial coverage; Good (3): Good coverage; Excellent (4): Comprehensive coverage

4.2. Currency (4 points)- Poor (1): Outdated sources; Fair (2): Mix of current and outdated; Good (3): Mostly current sources; Excellent (4): Excellent source currency

4.3. Critical Analysis (4 points)- Poor (1): No critical analysis; Fair (2): Limited analysis; Good (3): Good analysis; Excellent (4): Excellent critical analysis

5. Research Methodology (12 points total)

5.1. Research Design (4 points)- Poor (1): Inappropriate design; Fair (2): Design needs refinement; Good (3): Appropriate design; Excellent (4): Excellent design choice

5.2. Data Collection (4 points)- Poor (1): Methods unclear; Fair (2): Methods partially clear; Good (3): Clear methods; Excellent (4): Excellent methodology

5.3. Data Analysis (4 points)- Poor (1): Analysis plan unclear; Fair (2): Analysis plan needs work; Good (3): Clear analysis plan; Excellent (4): Excellent analysis plan

6. Structure and Presentation (8 points total)

6.1. Organization (4 points)-

Poor (1): The writing lacks clear organizational structure, demonstrates no discernible logical progression between ideas, and fails to establish meaningful connections between sections;

Fair (2): The writing presents a basic organizational framework with attempted transitions between ideas, though connections between sections remain inconsistent;

Good (3): The writing maintains clear organizational structure with logical progression of ideas and establishes effective connections between sections;

Excellent (4): The writing demonstrates sophisticated organizational structure with seamless progression of ideas and creates compelling connections that enhance overall coherence.

6.2. Writing Quality (4 points)-

Poor (1): The writing demonstrates limited use of academic vocabulary, contains numerous mechanical errors, and lacks scholarly tone;

	<p>Fair (2): The writing somewhat demonstrates academic language and development of scholarly discourse;          Good (3): The writing maintains consistent academic tone with appropriate disciplinary vocabulary and demonstrates ability to develop scholarly discourse;          Excellent (4): The writing exhibits refined academic language with precise disciplinary terminology and maintains distinguished scholarly discourse throughout the paper.</p> <p>The candidates must achieve at least 33 points on the written proposal to be eligible for the interview.</p> <p>Interview</p> <p>The interview assessment is conducted by the Dissertation Field Board (minimum 3 members).</p> <p>Interview Assessment Rubric (6 points total)</p> <p>Knowledge of Research Topic (2 points)-</p> <p>Poor (0): Shows minimal understanding of the research topic and related literature          Fair (1): Demonstrates basic understanding but has gaps in knowledge;          Excellent (2): Shows comprehensive understanding of the topic and can discuss related research fluently</p> <p>Ability to Defend the Proposal (2 points)</p> <p>Poor (0): Unable to explain or justify research decisions; defensive or unclear when questioned;          Fair (1): Can explain some aspects of the proposal but struggles with deeper justification;          Excellent (2): Confidently explains and justifies all aspects of the proposal with well-reasoned arguments.</p> <p>Communication and Professional Demeanor (2 points)</p> <p>Poor (0): Poor communication skills, unprofessional manner, or unable to engage in academic discussion;          Fair (1): Adequate communication but could be more polished or professional;          Excellent (2): Excellent communication skills, professional demeanor, and engaging academic discourse.</p> <p>Minimum passing score: 4 points.</p> <p>Final admission decision is based on both the written proposal (minimum 33/64 points) and interview (minimum 4/6 points) scores</p>
<p><b>Purpose of the Programme:</b></p>	<p>The goal of the Doctoral Program in Education Science is to prepare specialists and researchers in the field of education who, based on contemporary educational requirements and challenges at national and international levels, will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Independently conduct in-depth and active research, develop and apply innovations, create new research-based knowledge, write publications in English and effectively communicate research findings</li> </ul>

	<p>through both written publications and oral presentations at academic conferences, sharing it with the academic and scientific community as well as with practitioners and participate in developing democratic society with values;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrate insights from various disciplines, leverage advanced technologies, and adhere to high ethical standards to address complex educational challenges;</li> <li>• Develop leadership skills to manage educational projects, engage in continuous professional development, and cultivate a global perspective on educational issues to improve educational practices throughout their careers;</li> <li>• Gain practical teaching experience in higher education settings, enhancing their ability to effectively communicate complex educational concepts and methodologies;</li> <li>• Actively participate in peer review processes, contributing to the advancement of knowledge in the field and developing critical evaluation skills essential for academic discourse;</li> <li>• Cultivate personal management skills, including stress management techniques, to maintain well-being and productivity in high-pressure academic and research environments;</li> <li>• Develop the capacity to balance research, teaching, and administrative responsibilities while maintaining a commitment to lifelong learning and professional growth.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Learning outcome</b></p>	<p><b>Knowledge and Understanding</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Systematically and critically describes theories, principles, and practices within the field of education sciences, empowering graduates to both extend this knowledge and apply innovative methodologies;</li> <li>2. Possesses a comprehensive understanding of research methodologies in education that equips graduates to author scientific articles in peer-reviewed journals and undertake research projects.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Skills</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Thoroughly designs and executes research endeavors in the field of education sciences while upholding principles of academic integrity to contribute to the advancement of educational theory and practice through publishing peer-reviewed articles in reputable educational journals and developing grant proposals for educational research funding;</li> <li>4. Applies complex statistical methods and appropriate quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques to analyze complex educational data sets, resulting</li> </ol>

		<p>in proficient use of analytical tools for data analysis and accurate interpretation and reporting of research findings in publications and research projects.</p> <p>5. Thoroughly develops and implements innovative teaching and learning strategies that incorporate cutting-edge educational technologies through evaluating and implementing innovative approaches in a real educational setting;</p> <p>6. Critically evaluates and synthesizes existing research in educational psychology, philosophy, and didactics through comprehensive literature reviews in their area of specialization and integration of interdisciplinary perspectives in their research proposals and publications;</p> <p>7. Demonstrates effective project management skills in educational and scientific contexts through planning and execution of the research project within the prescribed timeframe and implementation of stress management techniques in their research and teaching activities;</p> <p>8. Cultivates pedagogical competencies and mentorship capabilities within higher education settings through structured teaching experiences and delivery of educational content across diverse academic contexts;</p> <p>9. Effectively communicates research findings to the academic and non-academic communities through academic presentations.</p>
	<p><b>Responsibility and Autonomy</b></p>	<p>10. Engages in professional development activities while adhering to principles of academic and professional integrity, showcasing originality and autonomy;</p> <p>11. Demonstrates engagement in scholarly communities through active participation in collaborative academic activities, peer feedback, and research evaluation processes.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation Criteria</b></p>	<p>The goal of evaluation is to determine a student's education results qualitatively concerning academic program goals and parameters. Students may be assessed orally and in a written way. A student's knowledge and skills are assessed through a 100-point grading system. It consists of midterm and final evaluations, a sum of which makes up 100 points.</p> <p>The grading system allows:</p>	

a) five types of positive grades:

- (A) Excellent – 91-100 points;
- (B) Very good – 81-90 points;
- (C) Good - 71-80 points;
- (D) Satisfactory - 61-70 points;
- (E) Enough - 51-60 points;

b) two types of negative grades:

- (FX) Fail – 41-50 points, meaning that a student requires some more work before passing and is given a chance to sit an additional examination after independent work;
- (F) Fail – 40 points and less, meaning that the work of a student isn't acceptable and he/she has to study the subject anew.

For the midterm and final evaluations minimal passing grade is set. The final evaluation's minimal passing grade must not exceed 60% of the final evaluation grade. Midterm and final evaluation grade distribution, minimal competence levels, and assessment criteria are described in the corresponding syllabus (50% for midterm and 50% for final). Credit can be awarded only after the attainment of learning outcomes, envisaged by the course syllabus and the following requirements (both have to be fulfilled):

- a) Obtaining minimal competence levels set for midterm and final evaluations;
- b) Obtaining a minimum of 51 points out of 100 points of the final grade.

A student can take an additional (make-up) exam in case he/she scored 41-50 points of the final grade or a minimum of 51 points, but did not obtain a minimum competence level set for final evaluation.

#### Dissertation Defense

- a) The dissertation is assessed by a jury during the defense.
- b) During the defense of the doctorate dissertation, the assessment takes place according to the following rubric:

1. Significance- 10 points

10 points- The research addresses a critical gap in the field with far-reaching implications. It significantly advances understanding in the area of study.

8-9 points- The research addresses an important issue in the field with clear implications. It noticeably contributes to the area of study.

5-7 points- The research addresses a relevant issue in the field with some implications. It makes a modest contribution to the area of study.

3-4 points- The significance of the research is limited. Its contribution to the field is minimal.

<2 points- The research lacks significance and makes no meaningful contribution to the field.

2. Practical value of research- 10 points

10 points- The research has immediate and substantial practical applications. It offers clear, implementable solutions to real-world problems.

8-9 points- The research has clear practical applications. It offers valuable insights that can be applied in real-world contexts.

5-7 points- The research has some practical applications. It offers insights that could potentially be applied in real-world contexts.

3-4 points- The practical applications of the research are limited or not clearly articulated.

<2 points- The research has no discernible practical value.

3. Theoretical value of research- 10 points

10 points-The research significantly advances theoretical understanding in the field. It introduces new concepts or substantially revises existing theories.

8-9 points- The research makes a clear contribution to theoretical understanding in the field. It builds upon or extends existing theories in meaningful ways.

5-7 points- The research contributes to theoretical understanding in the field. It supports or moderately extends existing theories.

3-4 points- The theoretical contribution of the research is limited or not clearly articulated.

<2 points- The research makes no meaningful theoretical contribution.

4. Novelty- 10 points

10 points- The research presents highly original ideas or approaches that are groundbreaking in the field.

8-9 points- The research presents original ideas or approaches that are innovative within the field.

5-7 points- The research presents some original ideas or approaches, though they may not be entirely new to the field.



3-4 points- The research largely replicates existing ideas or approaches with minimal novelty.  
 <2 points- The research lacks any originality or novelty.

5. Depth of analysis and originality of conclusions- 15 points  
 15-14 points- The analysis is exceptionally thorough and insightful. Conclusions are highly original and well-supported by the analysis.  
 11-13 points- The analysis is comprehensive and thoughtful. Conclusions are original and well-supported by the analysis.  
 10-12 points- The analysis is adequate. Conclusions show some originality and are generally supported by the analysis.  
 6-9 points- The analysis lacks depth in some areas. Conclusions show little originality or are not fully supported by the analysis.  
 <5 points- The analysis is superficial. Conclusions lack originality and are not supported by the analysis.

6. Reliability of results- 15 points  
 15-14 points- Statistical treatment or logical argumentation is rigorous and fully supports the reliability of results.  
 11-13 points- Statistical treatment or logical argumentation is sound and supports the reliability of results.  
 10-12 points- Statistical treatment or logical argumentation is adequate and generally supports the reliability of results.  
 6-9 points- Statistical treatment or logical argumentation has some flaws that affect the reliability of results.  
 <5 points- Statistical treatment or logical argumentation is seriously flawed, compromising the reliability of results.

7. Presentation during defense- 15 points  
 15-14 points- Presentation is exceptionally well-structured, logically argued, and clearly articulated. The basic ideas of the dissertation are presented with outstanding clarity. Visual aids are exceptionally well-designed, highly relevant, and greatly enhance the presentation.  
 11-13 points- Presentation is well-structured, logically argued, and clearly articulated. The basic ideas of the dissertation are presented with good clarity. Visual aids are well-designed, relevant, and enhance the presentation.

10-12 points- Presentation is adequately structured and argued. The basic ideas of the dissertation are presented with reasonable clarity. Visual aids are adequate and generally support the presentation.

6-9 points- Presentation lacks structure or logical flow in some areas. The basic ideas of the dissertation are not always clearly presented. Visual aids are poorly designed or not always relevant, adding little value to the presentation.

<5 points- Presentation is poorly structured and argued. The basic ideas of the dissertation are not clearly presented. Visual aids are irrelevant, distracting, or not used when they would have been helpful.

8. Answering questions during defense- 15 points

15-14 points- Answers to questions are comprehensive, insightful, and demonstrate mastery of the subject. Terminology is used with exceptional accuracy and appropriateness.

11-13 points- Answers to questions are thorough and demonstrate a strong understanding of the subject. Terminology is used accurately and appropriately.

10-12 points- Answers to questions are adequate and demonstrate a basic understanding of the subject. Terminology is generally used appropriately.

6-9 points- Answers to questions are sometimes incomplete or show gaps in understanding. Terminology is not always used appropriately.

<5 points- Answers to questions are inadequate and show significant gaps in understanding. Terminology is used inappropriately.

Assessment criteria # 1-6 are done according to the dissertation and publications.

The assessment of the dissertation finally is done with the following wording:

- a) Excellent (summa cum laude) – 91points and over of maximum point – an excellent performance;
- b) Very good (magna cum laude) – 81-90 points of the maximum point – a result exceeding given requirements in all aspects;
- c) Good (cum laude) – 71-80% of the maximum point – a result exceeding given requirements;
- d) Medium (bene) – 61-70 points of the maximum point – a result satisfying given requirements in all aspects;
- e) Satisfactory (rite) – 51-60 points of the maximum point – a result satisfying given requirements despite some mistakes;

	<p>f) Insufficient – 41-50 points of the maximum point – a result not satisfying given requirements because of serious mistakes;</p> <p>g) Completely unsatisfactory (sub omni canone) – 40 points and less of the maximum point – a result absolutely not satisfying given requirements.</p> <p>The student is awarded the academic degree of doctor in case of obtaining any of the above-mentioned grades considered by items from a) to e); in case of getting the grade considered by item f) – the student has a right to present the rewritten doctorate dissertation during the first year; and in case of getting the grade considered by item g) – the student has no right to present the same doctorate dissertation.</p> <p>Artificial Intelligence Usage Policy</p> <p>Artificial Intelligence Usage Policy for PhD Program Courses: The program recognizes the role of artificial intelligence tools in academic research while maintaining strict academic standards. Students are allowed to use artificial intelligence tools for specific support functions (reference management, proofreading, and research question refinement). Productivity enhancement through artificial intelligence is acceptable for tasks such as meeting summaries, project planning, and administrative documentation. However, students must explicitly disclose all artificial intelligence tool usage in their work by citing the tools used and maintaining detailed logs of significant AI interactions. Strictly prohibited are: generating original research findings, submitting AI-generated content as original work, creating literature review content without verification, developing theoretical frameworks, or generating research questions. Students must independently verify all AI-generated information and maintain original copies of AI interactions. For assessment purposes, appropriate use of AI tools, original critical thinking, independent research capability, and proper documentation of AI assistance will be evaluated. Violation of this policy is considered academic misconduct. Students are recommended to discuss the use of artificial intelligence tools with their lecturers and supervisors. All written assignments are checked for plagiarism (Turnitin Software).</p>
<p><b>Field of Employment:</b></p>	<p>PhD graduates in Educational Sciences are well-positioned for various career paths due to their advanced expertise in education sciences, research methodologies, and practical applications in teaching. Program graduates have the opportunity to pursue careers in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research and Academia (Academic and Research Positions, Higher Education Teaching, etc.);</li> <li>● Education Administration;</li> <li>● Educational Consultancy and Training;</li> </ul>

- Governmental and Non-Governmental Educational Institutions (Policy Development and Educational Reform, Program Coordination);
- International Organizations and Educational NGOs.

#		Course / Module / Internship / Research Component	Status	Prerequisite	Credit number	Distribution of credits per courses and semesters		Distribution of Hours							
						I Year		Contact Hours					Total number of contact	Independent work	Total number of hours
						I Semester	II Semester	Lecture	Seminar / Group Work /	Midterm exam(s)	Final exam				
	<b>I</b>	<b>Compulsory Courses</b>			<b>50</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>125</b>	
1	EDU742	Advanced Research Methods	Compulsory	N/A	8	8		17	28	0	0	45	155	200	
2	EDU758	Research in Educational Psychology, Philosophy, and Didactics	Compulsory	N/A	7	7		8	20	2	2	32	143	175	
3	EDU757	Learning-Teaching Innovations and Educational Technologies	Compulsory (Hybrid Mode) <sup>1</sup>	N/A	7	7		12	12	2	6	32	143	175	
4	EDU760	Statistics in Educational Research	Compulsory (Hybrid Mode)	EDU742	8		8	14	14	0	0	28	172	200	
5	EDU754	Seminar in Article and Dissertation Writing	Compulsory	EDU742 EDU758	7		7	0	28	2	2	32	143	175	
6	EDU761	Management of Educational and Scientific Projects	Compulsory (Hybrid Mode)	EDU742	7		7	15	13	0	0	28	147	175	
	<b>II</b>	<b>Internship Component</b>			<b>6</b>										

<sup>1</sup> The hybrid learning model will be implemented only upon received of renewed accreditation (estimated 2025-2026 academic year)

7	EDU756	Professor Assistantship	Compulsory	EDU757	6		6	0	7	0	0	7	143	150
	<b>III</b>	<b>Elective Courses</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>125</b>
1	EDU762	Educational Leadership, Management, and Administration	Elective	N/A	5	5		14	14	0	0	28	97	125
2	EDU759	Research in Educational Sociology	Elective	N/A	5	5		7	21	0	0	28	97	125
3	EDU733	Curriculum, Syllabus, and Course Development	Elective (Hybrid Mode)	N/A	5	5		14	14	0	0	28	97	125
4	EDU753	Legal Regulations of Education	Elective	N/A	5	5		15	13	2	2	32	93	125
5	EDU755	Professional Development and Soft Skills for Educational Researchers	Elective (Hybrid Mode)	N/A	5	5		13	15	0	2	30	95	125
6	DIS700	Dissertation	Research Component	All compulsory courses	From semester 3 <									
	<b>Total</b>				<b>55</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>1143</b>	<b>1375</b>