

National Defence Academy of Latvia Regulations on State Examinations

Explanation of terms

The following terms are used in the Regulations:

1. **higher education** - a stage of education which, after secondary education, enables the development of a personality based on science or the arts, or on science and the arts, in a chosen field of academic or professional or academic and professional study, and in preparation for scientific or professional activity;
2. **bachelor thesis** - a research carried out independently by a student, which confirms the acquisition of theoretical, practical knowledge and methodological skills in a group of branches of sciences or in a field of study within the scope defined by the study programme;
3. **diploma paper** - a research carried out independently by a student, which confirms the acquisition of theoretical, practical knowledge and methodological skills within the scope of the chosen profession standard and study programme;
4. **master's thesis** - an analytical study carried out independently by the student in the field of science represented by the study programme with an original solution to a theoretical or practical problem, demonstrating the ability to carry out scientific research with theoretical justification and analysis of empirical material;
5. **final thesis** - a bachelor's thesis, diploma thesis or master's thesis, the completion and defence of which is a prerequisite for the award of an academic degree and/or professional qualification;
6. **preliminary defence of the final thesis** - an obligatory part of the study process at the National Defence Academy of Latvia (hereinafter - NDAL), presentation and discussion of the final thesis with the aim to prepare students for successful defence of the final thesis;
7. **State Examination Board** - a group of persons who assess the applicants' preparedness for the professional qualification, as well as the quality and compliance of the diploma thesis, bachelor thesis and master thesis with the

requirements of the study programme and decide on the award of the bachelor's degree, master's degree and/or professional qualification;

8. State Examination

- the State examination of the second-level professional higher education study programme, which includes the development and defence of a diploma thesis;
- the final examination of the professional bachelor's study programme, which includes the development and defence of a bachelor's thesis;
- the final examination of the master's study programme, which includes the development and defence of a master's thesis.

1. General rules

1.1. The Regulations of the NDAL on State Examinations (hereinafter - the Regulations) have been developed in accordance with Section 58 and Section 59 Part one Clause 2 of the Law of the Republic of Latvia on Higher Education Institutions, 26.08.2014. Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 512, the NDAL Constitution, NDAL management decisions and orders.

1.2. The Regulations determine the manner of assessment, organisation and conduct of state examinations in higher professional education study programmes of the NDAL with regard to the applicants' professional preparation, abilities and skills developed during the study process in compliance with the professional standard, accredited field of study and programme, i.e.:

1.2.1. the requirements for the preliminary defence, defence and assessment of bachelor's theses, master's theses and diploma theses,

1.2.2. the procedure for the establishment, operation and decision-making powers of the State Examination Board in relation to the award of a professional qualification and/or a bachelor's or master's degree corresponding to the study programme and field of study, by issuing a diploma of a certain model.

2. State Examination

2.1. The second-level vocational higher education programme culminates in a State examination, which includes the defence of a diploma thesis.

2.2. The professional bachelor's study programme is concluded with a State examination, which includes the defence of the bachelor's thesis.

2.3. The master's study programme is concluded with a State examination, which includes the defence of the master's thesis.

2.4. The right to take the State examination shall be granted to students who have completed the study courses provided for in the study programme, successfully passed examinations and internships, obtained the required number of credit points, elaborated a diploma thesis or a bachelor's thesis or a master's thesis (hereinafter - Final Thesis), and who obtained the grade "passed" at the preliminary defence.

2.5. Final theses shall be deposited in the NDAL archives after the defence.

3. State Examinations Board

3.1. The State Examination of each study programme shall be adopted by the State Examination Board (hereinafter - the Board):

3.1.1. the board of the second-level vocational higher education programme;

3.1.2. the board of the professional bachelor's study programme "Air Forces Military Leadership";

3.1.3. the board of the professional bachelor's study programme "Naval Forces Military Leadership";

3.1.4. the board of the professional bachelor's study programme "Land Forces Military Leadership";

3.1.5. the Board of the Professional Master's Programme.

3.2. The Board evaluates the students' professional higher education and decides on the award of a bachelor's degree, a master's degree and/or a professional qualification.

3.3. The Board, consisting of a **chairperson, a vice-chairperson and at least 3 members**, shall be established for each study programme. The chair of the Board and at least half of its members shall be representatives of professional organisations or employers in the sector.

3.4. Depending on the specialisation of the programme of study and the number of cadets, two or more sub-commissions may be set up for the programme of study boards. For each sub-commission, a vice-chair and at least 3 members are confirmed. In the master's programme, several boards may be formed per academic year depending on the number of master's theses to be submitted.

3.5. The same person, who is not a permanent member of the NDAL, may be appointed as the chairperson of the Second-Level Professional Higher Education Programme Board and the Professional Bachelor's Degree Programme Board.

3.6. The chairperson and members of the Board for the Second-Level Professional Higher Education and Bachelor's Degree Programme must have at

least a university degree and relevant work/service experience in the field of military defence.

3.7. The members of the master's programme board must have at least a master's degree or higher academic or second-level professional higher education and relevant service/work experience in the field of defence, and the chairperson must have a PhD or Master's degree and relevant service/work experience in the field of defence.

3.8. The composition of the board shall be submitted by the programme directors to the Department of Study Planning and Support (hereinafter referred to as "DSPS"). The composition of the Board shall be approved by an order of the Commander of the Training and Doctrine Command (hereinafter referred to as "TRADOC").

3.9. If necessary, the Board is entitled to invite independent non-voting experts in the field to defend the Final Theses.

3.10. The Secretary of the Board shall be a non-voting person appointed by the head of the DSPS.

3.11. The Board shall have the power of decision if more than half of its members, one of whom shall be the chairperson or vice-chairperson of the Board, are present at the national examination.

3.12. If necessary, the DSPS at least one month before the start of the national tests:

3.12.1. prepares an order (draft) of the Commander of the National Armed Forces (hereinafter - NAF) on secondment of soldiers to the NDAL to ensure the conduct of the State Examinations and to be included in the Board;

3.12.2. prepare a letter to the State Secretary of the Ministry of Defence (hereinafter - MoD) on the nomination of MoD staff/soldiers for inclusion in the Board.

3.13. The meeting times of the boards and the procedure for the Final Thesis defence are determined by the staff appointed by the head of the DSPS in cooperation with the study programme directors.

3.14. The board shall decide on the assessment of the State examination by summarising the assessments of the members of the Board, the supervisor and the reviewer.

3.15. Each board records its decision in the minutes of the State Examination Board (*see. Annex 1*), signed by all members of the Board and the

Secretary of the Board. The State Examination Board decides on the award of the degree and/or professional qualification.(see. *Annex 2*).

4. Procedure for the State Examination

4.1. The list of students admitted to the State examination shall be approved by the Study Council.

4.2. A person may be enrolled at the NDAL for the State examinations if:

4.2.1. he/she has graduated from the NDAL and passed the State examinations no later than two years ago;

4.2.2. has submitted an application for enrolment to the rector of the NDAL at least two months before the start of the Board's work at the NDAL.

4.3. Before the start of the State examination, the chairperson or vice-chairperson of the Board shall introduce students to the Board, the procedure for the examination and shall announce when and how students will be able to receive information about the assessment in the State examination.

4.4. Foreign students of the master of professional studies programme are allowed to participate in the preliminary defence of their master's theses and in the State examination remotely, using the NDAL technical support.

4.5. Foreign lecturers of the master of professional studies programme, as well as foreign representatives of invited professional organisations or employers may participate in the preliminary defence of the master's thesis and the State examination remotely using the NDAL technical support.

5. Developing and defending a final thesis

5.1. Thesis topics are approved by the NDAL Study Council at least one semester before the defence of the thesis.

5.2. The student chooses the topic of the final thesis from the research areas offered by the NDAL. The student shall agree his/her choice with the supervisor and submit the title of the thesis to DSPS.

5.3. The MPAP shall summarise the submitted the final thesis themes, assess the agreement of the supervisors and submit them to the Study Council for approval.

5.4. The supervisor for each final thesis shall be approved by the Study Council.

5.5. The student has the right to change the topic and/or supervisor of the final thesis no later than three months before the defence of the final thesis by submitting a motivated report to the SC (*see. Annex 3*). The report is examined and approved by the Study Council.

5.6. The topic of the final thesis may be clarified and reformulated by the student in agreement with the supervisor within the study field. The updated topic titles are submitted to the DSPS no later than 5 working days after the pre-defence.

5.7. The supervisor of the final thesis may be:

5.7.1. NDAL lecturer, researcher, civilian employee (also from other institutions) or NAF serviceman with a master's/PhD degree, first/second level professional higher education, academic higher education, who is a specialist in the relevant field and has the necessary experience in the field of military defence and supervision of final thesis.

5.8. The duties of the supervisor of the final thesis are:

5.8.1. assist the student in defining and/or refining the research direction and the topic of the final thesis;

5.8.2. advise the student in the initial and final planning and structure of the final thesis;

5.8.3. advising students on the choice of scientific literature and other sources of research;

5.8.4. help define the object and methods of research

5.8.5. review individual parts of the final thesis and the final thesis as a whole, pointing out changes and additions that are needed;

5.8.6. review the final thesis submitted for defence and ensure that the student has completed the final thesis in accordance with the relevant NDAL guidelines;

5.8.7. review and sign the final thesis submitted for defence, if they consider that the student has carried out the research independently and is therefore admissible to defend the final thesis.

5.9. The supervisor of the final project has the following rights:

5.9.1. participate in the pre-defence and defence of the final thesis;

5.9.2. withdraw from the conduct of the final thesis if there is a justifiable reason for doing so;

5.9.3. refuse to consider a final thesis submitted after the deadline for submission;

5.9.4. to refuse further progress of the final thesis if the content and presentation of the final thesis does not comply with the NDAL Methodological Guidelines or if it contains demonstrable signs of plagiarism but the student fails to remedy them.

5.10. At least four weeks before the final thesis defence, during the final thesis pre-defence, cadets shall present the progress and first results of the final thesis.

5.11. For the pre-defence of the final thesis the student must:

5.11.1. the relevance and novelty of the final thesis;

5.11.2. objectives, aims, hypothesis/research questions, subject, object, methods;

5.11.3. theoretical and empirical work

5.11.4. summarise the sources used in the final thesis.

5.12. During the preliminary defence, the level of readiness of the final thesis is assessed, i.e. the topicality of the topic and the research part of the final thesis, the relevance of the aims, objectives, scientific methods to the topic of the final thesis and the relevance of the presentation of the final thesis to the methodological guidelines approved by the NDAL.

5.13. During the pre-defence, the student has the opportunity to receive recommendations for improving the final thesis from independent experts - members of the pre-defence committee - and answers to questions that are unclear to the student.

5.14. During the preliminary defence, the final thesis is not marked in points, but is marked pass/fail.

5.15. If the student has not consulted with his/her supervisor by the date of the pre-defence or has not complied with the milestones of the final thesis, the supervisor has the right to withdraw the student from the supervision of the final thesis.

6. Submission of the final thesis for defence

6.1. The student shall submit two copies of the final thesis, prepared and bound in a computer file, signed by the supervisor and an electronic version of the final thesis to the persons responsible for the DSPS within the deadlines set. The supervisor of the thesis certifies with his/her signature that the thesis complies with the methodological guidelines and that the content of the thesis is appropriate to the topic, and declares it suitable or unsuitable for defence.

6.2. Reviewers are appointed and approved for the independent evaluation of each final thesis:

6.2.1. The reviewers of bachelor theses must be from a relevant scientific discipline with at least a higher academic/professional qualification and relevant work/service experience in the field;

6.2.2. Thesis reviewers must be highly qualified professionals with higher academic or professional education and relevant work/service experience in the field;

6.2.3. Master's thesis reviewers must be highly qualified specialists in their field with at least a master's degree.

6.3. The final thesis will be peer-reviewed within five working days. The final thesis may not be defended without a review. If no review is received and the reviewer refuses to write it, another reviewer will be assigned by the head of the DSPPS and approved by the Study Council.

6.4. The reviewer submits the review with the evaluation of the thesis and the recommended score on a 10-point scale to the DSPPS no later than three calendar days before the Final Thesis Defence (*see Annex 4*). The negative review must be submitted to the DSPPS at least five working days before the final thesis defence.

6.5. The review assesses the structure and scope of the thesis, the topicality of the topic, the theoretical and practical significance of the thesis, the relevance of the thesis to the stated aims and objectives, the quality of the conclusions, proposals and recommendations, the logic of the text, the use of scientific terminology, the style and grammatical correctness of the language, the compliance of the presentation with the requirements, as well as the main shortcomings and unanswered questions after the review, if any.

6.6. The supervisor of the final thesis shall submit a written evaluation of the final thesis to the DSPPS no later than five working days before the final thesis defence (*see Annex 5*).

6.7. The student has the right to get acquainted with the evaluations of the final thesis reviewer and supervisor two calendar days before the final thesis defence. After reading the review, the student has the right to withdraw from the defence of the final thesis in order to revise and defend the final thesis within two years from the date of completion of the study programme.

6.8. If the reviewer evaluates the final thesis negatively (evaluation lower than 4 points - almost average), then the final thesis will be submitted for additional review to another specialist in the relevant research field by decision of the Study Council. If the second review is positive, the student has the right to defend the thesis. In case both reviews are negative, the student is not allowed to defend the final thesis and is matriculated as failing the state examination with the right to elaborate the final thesis with a new topic and to pass the state examination within two years from the moment of study programme completion.

6.9. The reviewer's written evaluation of the final thesis is read out at the final thesis defence.

7. Final thesis defence and assessment in the state examination

7.1. The defence of the final thesis is open to the public.

7.2. Before the start of the state examination, the chairperson or vice-chairperson of the board shall acquaint the board with the procedure and criteria for marking the state examination.

7.3. During the final thesis defence, the student may use a pre-prepared outline and/or presentation materials.

7.4. The final thesis defence involves:

7.4.1. student report (7-10 min.), in which the author of the final thesis includes:

- 1) title of the work, justification of the relevance of the research;
- 2) research objectives, hypothesis and/or research question(s), research object and subject, research methods, research objectives;
- 3) main conclusions of the theoretical part;
- 4) empirical results and interpretation;
- 5) conclusions and proposals
- 6) the practical relevance of the study.

7.4.2. Reviewer's presentation or reading of the review - no more than 5 minutes.

7.4.3. The author's answers to the reviewer's questions and the questions of the members of the board.

7.4.4. Closing speech by the supervisor - maximum 3 minutes if the supervisor is present at the board meeting.

7.4.5. Closing speech by the author of the final paper - no longer than 3 minutes if the author wishes.

7.5. The board, when deciding on the evaluation of the final thesis, shall take into account:

- 7.5.1. the student's knowledge and skills in defending their thesis;
- 7.5.2. the quality of the student's answers to the questions posed by the members of the Board and the comments and/or questions raised in the review;
- 7.5.3. The theoretical and practical significance of the final thesis;
- 7.5.4. the quality of the student's research;

7.5.5. other aspects related to the objectives of the study programme and the professional standard.

7.6. The final mark for the final thesis was the arithmetic mean of the supervisor's mark, the reviewer's mark and each member of the Board's mark. If the final thesis has two reviewers (negative and positive), the arithmetic mean of the reviewers' scores is calculated.

7.7. If the majority of the members of the board give negative marks, then the final mark of the State Examination Board is negative. If the evaluations of the members of the Board are equally divided (e.g. 2 positive and 2 negative), the chairperson of the Board or the vice-chairperson of the board, if the chairperson of the board is not present at the defence of the final thesis, shall have the casting vote.

7.8. If the supervisor of the final project is present, he/she will not evaluate the final project he/she supervises.

7.9. A student whose final thesis is found to contain plagiarism shall be suspended from the state examination and shall be matriculated as having failed to defend the final thesis and to pass the state examination.

7.10. Re-taking of the state examination shall be permitted after a period of six months at the earliest, provided that the person:

7.10.1. completed the NDAL study programme no later than two years ago;

7.10.2. has been admitted to the State examination after completing the study programme;

7.10.3. has a final thesis on a new topic;

7.10.4. has submitted an application for matriculation to the rector of the NDAL at least one month before the start of the Board's work.

7.11. The final thesis is considered defended if it has been evaluated positively by the board, i.e. with at least 4 "almost satisfactory" on a 10-point scale. If the defence of the final thesis is negatively evaluated, the student shall be expelled for failing the state examination, with the right to elaborate the final thesis with a new topic and to pass the state examination within two years from the moment of expulsion.

7.12. The decision of the board with the mark, date and number of the final thesis shall be entered on the last page of the final thesis. The accuracy of the entries shall be certified by the signatures of the Secretary of the Board and the supervisor of the thesis.

8. Appeal hearing

8.1. The student has the right, no later than on the next working day after the announcement of the results of the State examination, by 10.00. 12.00 to submit a reasoned appeal to the vice-rector of the NDAL against the board's action and/or decision.

8.2. The student has the right to appeal against:

8.2.1. The assessment arrangements for the State examination;

8.2.2. Board's irregularities;

8.2.3. The Board's assessment.

8.3. The Rector of the NDAL shall order the composition and convening of the Appeals Board, if necessary. The Appeals Board shall be composed of a chairperson and two members.

8.4. The vice-rector of the NDAL shall instruct the Appeals Board to issue a written opinion on the objections raised in the appeal within three working days.

8.5. In the course of the appeal, the Appeals Board shall request written opinions from all members of the board on the objections raised. Each member of the board shall prepare and submit a written opinion to the chairman of the Appeals Board by noon on the following working day. 17.00.

8.6. The Appeals Board is entitled to call upon experts in the relevant field to give opinions (without voting rights) during the appeal.

8.7. The secretary of the Appeals Board shall be a person designated by the head of the DSPP (without voting rights).

8.8. The student has the right, after the appeal has been heard and before the final decision of the Appeals Board has been communicated, to examine the Appeals Board's opinion and, if necessary, to make representations.

8.9. The specific opinions of the members of the Appeals Board, as well as the final decision of the Appeals Board on the appeal, are recorded in the minutes.

8.10. The Appeals Board shall, in deciding on the student's appeal, take into account:

1. the facts of the student's appeal;
2. the content of the student's final thesis and compliance with the final thesis Methodological Guidelines;
3. A timetable for the final thesis agreed between the supervisor and the student;

4. the external expert's opinion on the final thesis and reviews;
5. The supervisor's and reviewer's evaluations of the final thesis;
6. other documents, if necessary.

8.11. Irregularities in the functioning of the board shall be taken into account:

1. the facts of the student's appeal;
2. the provisions of these Regulations governing the work of the Board - rights, obligations, conditions for completing documents;
3. the external expert's opinion on the quality of the Board's work;
4. other documents, if necessary.

8.12. The decision of the Appeals Board on the appeal is final. It shall be drawn up no later than one calendar week from the date of convening of the Appeals Board and notified in writing to the appellant.

Final provisions

1. The NDAL vice-rector shall be responsible for familiarising the Boards with these Statutes before each board's work. The supervisor of the relevant course of study shall acquaint students with these Regulations at least three months before the State examination.

2. The Regulations of the State Examinations of the National Defence Academy of Latvia (approved by the NDAL Senate Decision No.2 of 2/2020; in force by the NDAL Rector Order No.35 of 15.04.2020) are invalid.

National Defence Academy of Latvia

Study field

MILITARY DEFENCE

Minutes No. ___

**On the State Examination at the
National Defence Academy of Latvia**

(Date, month, year - from to)

RIGA

(Year)



NATIONAL DEFENCE ACADEMY OF LATVIA

REPORT OF THE STATE EXAMINATION BOARD In Riga

Date __. __. ____

No ____

On the State Examination at the
National Defence
Academy of Latvia __. __. 202__.

On the basis of the Order of the rector of the National Defence Academy of Latvia
(hereinafter - NDAL) _____ No. ____ "On State Examinations at the NDAL",
the _____
(full title of the study programme)

State Examination Board shall be composed of:

Chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname)

Vice-chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname)

Members of the Board:

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

(rank, if any, name, surname)



NATIONAL DEFENCE ACADEMY OF LATVIA

(Full title of the study programme)

No.	Name, surname	Personal code	Theme of the thesis	Assessment
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				

Chairman of the Board

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname)

_____ (signature)

Vice-chairman of the Board

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname)

_____ (signature)

Members of the Board:

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname)

_____ (signature)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname)

_____ (signature)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname)

_____ (signature)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname)

_____ (signature)

**National Defence Academy of Latvia
State Examination Board**

DECISION

In Riga

_____. of _____. _____

No. ____

Based on the results of the thesis defence, the NDAL second- level professional higher education programme "Command Staff Officer".

The State Examination Board decided to award the professional qualification of Lieutenant to the following persons:

1. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
2. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
3. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
4. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

Chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

Vice-chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

Members of the Board:

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

**National Defence Academy of Latvia
State Examination Board**

DECISION

In Riga

_____ . of ____ . _____

No. ____

Based on the results of the thesis defence, the NDAL second- level professional higher education programme "Command Staff Officer".

The State Examination Board decided not to award the professional qualification of Lieutenant to the following persons:

1. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

2. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

The decision is based on the following grounds _____
(justification)

Chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

Vice-chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

Members of the Board:

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

**National Defence Academy of Latvia
State Examination Board**

DECISION

In Riga

_____ . _____ . _____

No. _____

Based on the results of the bachelor thesis defences, the NDAL professional bachelor's degree programme _____ .
(title of the programme)

The State Examination Board decided to award the professional qualifications of Lieutenant and the Bachelor's degree to the following persons:

1. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
2. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
3. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
4. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

Chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

Vice-chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

Members of the Board:

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

(rank, if any, name, surname)

(signature)

**National Defence Academy of Latvia
State Examination Board**

DECISION

In Riga

_____ . _____ . _____

No. _____

Based on the results of the bachelor thesis defences, the NDAL professional bachelor's degree programme _____ .
(title of the programme)

The State Examination Board decided not to award the professional qualification of Lieutenant to the following persons:

1. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

2. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

The decision is based on the following grounds _____ .
(justification)

Chairman of the Board

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

Vice-chairman of the Board

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

Members of the Board:

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

**National Defence Academy of Latvia
State Examination Board**

DECISION

In Riga

_____. of _____. _____

No. ____

On the basis of the results of the Master's thesis defence, the NDAL professional master's study programme "Military Leadership and Security"

The State Examination Board decided to award the following persons the master's degree:

1. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
2. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
3. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)
4. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

Chairman of the Board

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

Vice-chairman of the Board

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

Members of the Board:

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

_____ (rank, if any, name, surname) _____ (signature)

**National Defence Academy of Latvia
State Examination Board**

**DECISION
In Riga**

_____. of ____.

No. ____

On the basis of the results of the Master's thesis defence, the NDAL professional master's study programme "Military Leadership and Security"

The State Examination Board decided not to award the professional qualifications of Lieutenant and the bachelor's degree to the following persons:

1. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

2. _____
(Name, surname, personal ID)

The decision is based on the following grounds _____
(justification)

Chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

Vice-chairman of the Board

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

Members of the Board:

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

Secretary of the Board (non-voting)

(rank, if any, name, surname) (signature)

To NDAL Study Council

AF/NF/LF ML/CSO
2nd/4th/5th year
rank, name, surname

REPORT

In Riga

On changing the theme/supervisor of a
bachelor thesis/diploma thesis

Please change the topic/leader of your bachelor thesis/diploma project.

Name of previous topic and supervisor:

Title and supervisor of the new topic:

Justification for the change of topic/supervisor:

(date)

(Cadet's signature)

Approved:
Supervisor:

(rank, name, surname)

(date)

(signature)

Approved:
Head of the course:

(rank, name, surname)

(date)

(signature)

Professional bachelor's study programme "Type of forces Military Leadership"

REPORT OF BACHELOR THESIS REVIEWER

Cadet's name,
surname:

Title of the bachelor's
thesis:

Structure of the thesis	Evaluation criteria ¹	U	W	S	E
Theme	Relevance, importance and compliance with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structure of the thesis	Relevance of the content of the work to the topic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Compliance with the minimum requirements for the structure of a bachelor thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature used	Relevance of the choice of literature sources to the chosen topic of the bachelor thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The bibliographic description of the literature is in accordance with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The formatting of the reference list complies with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The use of references in the thesis complies with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction	Justification of the topicality of the subject and the issues to be addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The aim and objectives of the work are clearly stated and justified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The object and subject of the study are clearly defined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Clearly defined hypothesis and/or research questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The thesis sets out the limitations of the study (if any)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research methodology	Justification for the choice of research methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Relevance of the research methodology to the objective and hypothesis/research questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Theoretical part	Clear and logical structure of the part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Analysis of the literature used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The problem identified is justified at the level of theory, based on an analysis of the literature and other sources of information used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Relation of theory to the empirical part of the thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	A summary is given at the end of the section	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Empirical part	Clear and logical structure of the part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Logical and clear synthesis, analysis, interpretation and evaluation of research results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The results of the study are clearly stated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Structure of the thesis	Evaluation criteria ¹	U	W	S	E
	Possible solution alternatives are evaluated according to the hypothesis and/or research questions formulated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Practical research in line with the thesis topic and theoretical part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The research has practical applications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conclusions and proposals	Conclusions from the analysis of the theoretical and practical parts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The proposals are based on the findings of the study	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The proposals are concrete and workable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The confirmation/denial of the hypothesis or the answers to the research questions are clearly defined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conclusion	The structure of the final report complies with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall design of the thesis	Sufficient overall volume of thesis and proportionate volumes of its parts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The technical presentation of the work complies with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	References to all sources of information used in the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The text and results are presented in a visually accessible way (tables, graphs, charts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The thesis is grammatically and stylistically correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Correct use of terminology, appropriate academic language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall evaluation of the bachelor thesis and its justification (main results, shortcomings, findings, contribution, practical relevance):

Reviewer's questions to the author:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

I recommend rating the thesis with using *mark* on a 10-point scale.

Reviewer:

_____ (academic degree, academic position, rank, name, surname)

Riga, _____

_____ (signature)

Professional bachelor's study programme "Type of forces Military Leadership"

REPORT OF BACHELOR THESIS SUPERVISOR

Cadet's name,
surname:

Title of the bachelor's
thesis:

Structure of the thesis	Evaluation criteria ²	U	W	S	E
Theme	Topicality, significance and compliance of the topic with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structure of the thesis	Relevance of the content of the thesis to the theme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Compliance of the thesis with the mandatory requirements of the structure of the bachelor thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature used	Compliance of the choice of literary sources with the chosen topic of the bachelor thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The bibliographic description of the literature is constructed in accordance with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The design of the literature list complies with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The use of references in the paper complies with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction	Justification of the topicality of the theme and the issues to be studied	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The purpose and tasks of the thesis clearly formulated and justified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The object and subject of research are clearly formulated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Clearly defined hypothesis and/or research questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	There are certain restrictions on research in the paper (if any)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research methodology	Justification for the choice of research methodology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Relevance of the research methodology to the paper objective and hypothesis/research questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Theoretical part	Clear and logical structure of the part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Analysis of the literature used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The identified problem is justified at the level of theory, based on the analysis of the literature and other sources of information used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The relationship of the theory with the empirical part of the paper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Summary is given at the end of the part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Empirical part	Clear and logical structure of the part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Logical and clear compilation, analysis, interpretation and evaluation of research results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Structure of the thesis	Evaluation criteria ²	U	W	S	E
	The results of the study are clearly formulated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Possible alternatives to solutions have been evaluated according to the hypothesis put forward and/or the formulated research questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Practical study is consistent with the topic and theoretical part of the paper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The results of the study have practical application	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Findings and proposals	Findings follow from the analysis of the theoretical and practical part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The proposals follow from the study and are based on findings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The proposals are concrete and workable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Hypothesis confirmation/negation or answers to research questions are clearly defined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conclusion	The final structure meets the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall design of the thesis	Sufficient total amount of thesis and proportionate volumes of its parts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The technical design of the paper complies with the requirements of the NDAL Methodological Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The text refers to all sources of information used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The presentation of the text and the results are provided in a visually perceptible way (tables, graphs, diagrams)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The paper is grammatically and stylistically correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Correct use of terminology, appropriate academic language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall assessment of the bachelor thesis and its justification (main results, identified shortcomings, opinions, contribution, practical significance):

Evaluation of cooperation between the manager and the cadet (plannedness, purposefulness, etc.):

I recommend evaluating the paper with *mark* a 10-point scale.

Scientific supervisor of the thesis:

_____ (scientific degree, academic position, rank, given name, surname)

Riga, _____

_____ (signature)