



Course Syllabus

Title of the Course

European Idea and European Integration of Georgia

Course Identification Code:

Academic Degree of Higher Education

Baccalaureate Master's degree Ph.D.

Teaching Language

English

Course Author/authors

Surname, Name:	Pazhava Emzar
Workplace:	Georgian Technical University, faculty of Engineering Economics, Media Technologies and Social Sciences, Department of Politics and International Relations. 0171 Tbilisi, Georgia, Kostava st. 77, Building № 6, 816 a.
Position:	Associate Professor
Tel:	599338989
e-mail:	e.fajava@gtu.ge

Surname, Name:	Liza Amilakhvari
Workplace:	Georgian Technical University, faculty of Engineering Economics, Media Technologies and Social Sciences, Department of Politics and International Relations. 0171 Tbilisi, Georgia, Kostava st. 77, Building № 6, 816 a.
Position:	Associate Professor
Tel:	599908884
e-mail:	l.amilakhvari@gtu.ge

Course Description

The aim of the course is to give students a wide knowledge of the essence of European ideas and values. Multilateral relations between Georgia and the European Union, the dynamics of the European integration processes in Georgia.

The lecture course in Georgian is conducted at the Georgian Technical University with the support of the European Union within the framework of the Erasmus + Jean Monnet program.

Course Prerequisites

No prerequisites

Learning Outcomes

№	Knowledge and Skills Acquired as a Result of Studying the Subject
1.	<p>Analyzes the European values, and dynamics of the European integration process in Georgia.</p> <p>Assesses the importance of European integration in the development of the country.</p> <p>Makes a practical project in accordance with pre-defined guidelines on European integration issues to specialists and non-specialists;</p> <p>Collects data on Georgia's European integration.</p> <p>Shares the importance of Georgia's European integration values and actively participates in the dissemination of those values.</p>

Methods of Achieving Learning Outcomes (Teaching and Learning)

Lecture seminar (Team working) Practical laboratory
 Course work/project Consultation Independent work

Activities of the teaching-learning methods:

1. Verbal or oral method
2. Written Method
3. Demonstration method
4. Discussion / debate method
5. Case study method
6. The induction method
7. The deductive method
8. The method of analysis
9. E-learning

Credits: 5

Course Schedule in Accordance to the Students' Weekly Workload (hrs.)

Lecture:	15
Seminar (working in a group):	30
Practical:	-
Laboratory:	-
Course work / project:	-
Practice:	-
Mid-semester/final exam:	2/2
Independent work:	76

Lecture	
№	Title of the theme and its content
1	The concept - Europe and European identity Introduction; At the origins of the European idea; Europe of ancient times; Christian Europe.
2	The ideas of unified Medieval Europe Projects of unified European ideas XIV-XVI centuries;
3	Medieval Europe and Georgia; Medieval Georgia and the European world;
4	European ideas in the XX-XXI centuries Pan-European ideas; Europe after World War II; European integration - processes and models; Europeanization of Georgia at the modern stage;
5	Georgia EU association agreement: Evaluations and analysis Association agreement; Visa liberalization.
6	Transnational projects of Georgia and EU TRACECA projects; INOGATE project.
7	The essence of Europeanization and Georgian reality The essence of Europeanization; Europeanization in Georgian reality; Europeanization as a new political reality.

8	Georgia within the framework of the European neighborhood and the eastern partnership program Partnership and cooperation agreement; Neighborhood policy. Eastern partnership.
9	EU global strategy policy Europe's global strategy;
10	European integration of the south Caucasus countries EU policy in the South Caucasus.
11	Myths and Reality in Georgia-EU Relations Strengthening anti-western campaign in Georgia;
12	Georgian and European values: similarities and differences Georgians and Europeans have identical values.
13	Visegrad countries' experience on Georgia's European integration. Visegrad countries and Georgia; Visegrad countries: concept, history.
14	Georgia and the EU security policy. United European defense and security policy; The main bodies responsible for security and defense.
15	Importance of European Integration for Georgia European integration mechanism; Development of an institutional mechanism to support the European integration process in Georgia.

Seminar	
№	Title of the theme and its content
1	The concept - Europe and European identity What is Europe; The essence of Europeanization. Discussion
2	Medieval united European Ideas Projects of unified European Ideas in XIV-XVI centuries; Oral assessment
3	Medieval Europe and Georgia Georgia - bridge between the west and the east Oral assessment
4	European ideas in the XX-XXI centuries European integration-processes and models Oral assessment
5	Georgia EU association agreement Visa liberalization; Deep and comprehensive free trade area agreement (DCFTA)

	Oral assessment
6	Transnational projects of Georgia and EU TRACECA projects. Oral assessment
7	The essence of Europeanization and Georgian reality Europeanization as a new political reality Discussion
8	Georgia within the framework of the European neighborhood and the eastern partnership program Partnership and cooperation agreements Oral assessment
9	EU global strategy policy European security and international order Oral assessment
10	European integration of the south Caucasus countries Euro-integration perspectives of south Caucasus countries Discussion
11	Myths and Reality in Georgia-EU Relations Reality and myths in Georgian-European relations
12	Georgian and European values: similarities and differences Identical values of Georgians and Europeans Discussion
13	Visegrad countries' experience on Georgia's European integration Visegrad countries and Georgia Oral assessment
14	Georgia and the EU security policy A united European defense and security policy Oral assessment
15	Importance of European Integration for Georgia Development of an institutional mechanism to support the European integration process in Georgia Discussion

Student Knowledge Assessment System

Grading system is based on a 100-point scale.

Positive grades:

- (A) - Excellent - grades between 91-100 points;
- (B) – Very good - grades between 81-90 points
- (C) - Good - grades between 71-80 points
- (D) - Satisfactory - grades between 61-70 points

- (E) - Pass - the rating of 51-60 points

Negative grades:

- (FX) - Did not pass - grades between 41-50 points, which means that the student is required to work more to pass and is given the right, after independent work, to take one extra exam;

- (F) – Failed - 40 points and less, which means that the work carried out by the student did not bring any results and he/she has to learn the subject from the beginning.

Assessment Forms, Methods and Criteria

Assessment Forms	Assessment Methods and Criteria
Ongoing activity	<p>Maximum assessment point of current activity - 30 points. Current activity is evaluated through oral assessments and discussions, 2 points each, a total of 30 points. 10 oral assessments, 2 points each, a total of 20 points. 5 discussions, 2 points each, a total of 10 points.</p> <p>The criteria for the test with open questions is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1.5-2.0 points. The answer is complete. The issue is precise and comprehensive narrated, terminology preserved, a student is thoroughly aware of the subject, has profoundly and thoroughly mastered basic and additional literature, no mistakes. The problem is perfectly solved, the discussion is at a high level. 2. 1.0-1.5 points. - The answer is complete, however shortened, terminologically correct, no substantial mistakes. The student is well aware of the lessons learned in the program; Has mastered basic literature. The discourse is good. 3. 0.5-1.0 points - The answer is incomplete. Terminology is insufficient. The student possesses the subject required by the program, but lacks the knowledge, the discourse is fragmented. 4. 0.1-0.5 points. - the answer is insufficient. No special terminology is used. The answer is essentially wrong, only individual fragments of relevant subjects are narrated. 5. 0 points – The answer is not relevant to the subject or it is not at all. <p><u>The criteria for evaluating discussions:</u> 2.0 points - actively participates in the discussion. Has the ability to reason and argue his own opinion, at the same time this reasoning and opinion is valid. professional terminology</p>

	<p>is used in the discussion. Has a strong ability to argue and oppose. Speaks in a language that is understandable to the audience. Has the ability to see the problem.</p> <p>1.5 points - Participates in the discussion. Has the ability to reason and argue his / her own opinion, at the same time this reasoning and opinion is correct, uses professional terminology. Has the ability to argue and argue logically. However, it lacks self-confidence. Speaks in a language that is understandable to the audience.</p> <p>1.0 points - Participates in the discussion. Cites arguments, though not self-confident in the correctness of the opinion. There are small factual errors in his reasoning. Weakly, but uses professional terminology. The ability to argue and oppose is scarce. Speaks timidly and slightly misunderstood.</p> <p>0.5 points - Rarely participates in discussion. The arguments are weak and often illogical. Reasoning is weak - partly wrong. Terminology is quite scarce. Discusses in fragments. Has no ability to argue and oppose. Speaks incomprehensibly.</p> <p>0 points - does not participate in the discussion.</p>
Mid-semester exam	<p>The sum of points for the current activity and the midterm exam is 60, the minimum competency threshold is 30 points. The midterm exam maximum score is - 30.</p> <p>exam is evaluated through 1 essay - 10 points; 4 open questions, 5 points each, totally 20 points.</p> <p><u>The criteria for evaluating essay:</u></p> <p>9-10 points - The answer is complete. The issue is conveyed accurately and exhaustively. Professional terminology is reserved. The student thoroughly masters the passed material, has deep knowledge of mandatory literature. There is no mistake. Reasoning is at a high level.</p> <p>7-8 points - The answer is complete, but short. Terminologically is correct. There is no substantial error. The student is well versed in the passed material provided by the program, knows the mandatory literature. The reasoning is good.</p> <p>5-6 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is lacking. The student possesses the material provided by the program, but the shortcomings are noted. Reasoning is fragmentary.</p> <p>3-4 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is wrong. Relevant material on the issue is presented partly. The student has insufficiently mastered the required literature. Several essential errors are noted.</p> <p>1-2 points - the answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is not used. The answer is fundamentally wrong.</p>

	<p>Only separate fragments of the relevant material are presented. 0 points. The answer to the question is not relevant or not given at all.</p> <p><u>The criteria for evaluating open question:</u> 5.0 points - The answer is complete. The issue is conveyed accurately and exhaustively. Professional terminology is reserved. The student thoroughly masters the passed material, has deep knowledge of mandatory literature. There is no mistake. The answer to the question is perfect. 4.0 points - The answer is complete, but short. Terminologically is correct. There is no substantial error. The student is well versed in the passed literature provided by the program; has mastered the mandatory literature. 3.0 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is lacking. The student possesses the material provided by the program, but the shortcomings are noted. 2.0 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is wrong. Relevant material on the issue is presented partly. The student has insufficiently mastered the required literature. Several essential errors are noted. 1.0 points - the answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is not used. The answer is fundamentally wrong. Only separate fragments of the relevant material are presented. 0 points. The answer to the question is not relevant or not given at all.</p>
Final / additional exam	<p>Maximum assessment point for the final /additional exam - 40 points. Minimum competency threshold - 21 points. 2 essay, 10 points each, a total of 20 points. 4 open questions, 5 points each, a total of 20 points.</p> <p><u>The criteria for evaluating essay:</u> 9-10 points - The answer is complete. The issue is conveyed accurately and exhaustively. Professional terminology is reserved. The student thoroughly masters the passed material, has deep knowledge of mandatory literature. There is no mistake. Reasoning is at a high level. 7-8 points - The answer is complete, but short. Terminologically is correct. There is no substantial error. The student is well versed in the passed material provided by the program, knows the mandatory literature. The reasoning is good. 5-6 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is lacking. The student possesses the material provided by the program, but the shortcomings are noted. Reasoning is fragmentary.</p>

	<p>3-4 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is wrong. Relevant material on the issue is presented partly. The student has insufficiently mastered the required literature. Several essential errors are noted.</p> <p>1-2 points - the answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is not used. The answer is fundamentally wrong. Only separate fragments of the relevant material are presented.</p> <p>0 points. The answer to the question is not relevant or not given at all.</p> <p><u>The criteria for evaluating open question:</u></p> <p>5.0 points - The answer is complete. The issue is conveyed accurately and exhaustively. Professional terminology is reserved. The student thoroughly masters the passed material, has deep knowledge of mandatory literature. There is no mistake. The answer to the question is perfect.</p> <p>4.0 points - The answer is complete, but short. Terminologically is correct. There is no substantial error. The student is well versed in the passed literature provided by the program; has mastered the mandatory literature.</p> <p>3.0 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is lacking. The student possesses the material provided by the program, but the shortcomings are noted.</p> <p>2.0 points - The answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is wrong. Relevant material on the issue is presented partly. The student has insufficiently mastered the required literature. Several essential errors are noted.</p> <p>1.0 points - the answer is incomplete. Professional terminology is not used. The answer is fundamentally wrong. Only separate fragments of the relevant material are presented.</p> <p>0 points. The answer to the question is not relevant or not given at all.</p>
--	--

Main Sources

1. Troitino D. R. "European integration", Nova, N.Y. 2013. 352 p. სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: 327 / 139.
2. Graham E. Democratic credentials of the European Union. Nova, N.Y. 2014. 165 p. სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: 327. 7 / 34.
3. Gardenia Ch, Freight corridors and freight transportation in the european union: Cheryl Gardenia editor. Nova Science, 2014. 159 p. სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: 656.135/5.

Additional Sources

1. European Integration: Perspectives and Challenges - How 'Borderless' Is Europe?, Edited by: István Tarrósy, Ágnes Tuka, Zoltán Vörös and Andrea, E-book of the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence of Pécs, Department of Political Science and International Studies, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pécs, Published by: IDResearch Ltd./Publikon Publishers, 2014, pp. 17-137, 273 – 297, 401-663, ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: CD –6904
2. THE SOUTH CAUCASUS 2018 - FACTS, TRENDS, FUTURE SCENARIOS, 2018, Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, pp. 319 -137, სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: CD - 6904
3. Emerson M., Kovziridze T., Deepening EU–Georgian Relations - What, why and how?, Published by Rowman & Littlefield International, Ltd; 2021, pp.372, სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: CD –6904
4. Kakachia K., Meister S., Fricke B., GEOPOLITICS AND SECURITY, A NEW STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH CAUCASUS, The Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), The Georgian Institute of Politics (GIP), The German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP), 2018, pp. 305, , სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: CD –6904
5. Latcheva R., Datler G., Rossbacher E., The Concept of European Identity: Overused and Underspecified?, 2012, pp.14. სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: CD -6904
6. Oschema K., Medieval Europe – Object and Ideology, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg / University of Berne, pp. 15, სტუ-ს ბიბლიოთეკის კეტერი: CD -
7. Le Goff, J. Birth of Europe. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons. 2005. p. 274
https://www.academia.edu/10353385/Le_Goff_J_The_Birth_of_Europe_2005 Accessed: 25.11.2021
8. Leyser Karl J. Concepts of Europe in the Early and High Middle Ages: Source: Past & Present, No. 137, The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe (Nov., 1992), pp. 25-47Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of The Past and Present Society Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/650850> Accessed: 25.11.2021
9. Pazhava E, Georgia at the origins of the European Orientation. 11 p.
<https://www.dpublication.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/44-163.pdf>
10. Pazhava E, The European orientation of Georgia. 7 p.
11. <https://www.dpublication.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/877-HPS.pdf> Accessed: 25.11.2021
12. European Commission. 2015., Towards a New European Neighborhood Policy.
<https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/neighbourhood/consultation/consultation.pdf> Accessed: 25.11.2021
13. European Commission Report on the Implementation of the European Neighborhood Policy Review. Brussels, 18 May 2017.
https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/2_en_act_part1_v9_3.pdf Accessed: 25.11.2021
14. Borgolte M, Wo endet Europa? Where are the frontiers of Europe? Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 2002
15. Мифы о ЕС и реальность в странах Восточного партнерства С. Капанадзе, Л. Калитеня, С. Григорян, А. Гасанов, И. Сушко, К. Чуря, Тб: GRASS, 2014. 46 ст
16. European Union: A Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy for the European Union, June 2016, available at https://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf (last update 25.09.2021)
17. http://www.weg.ge/sites/default/files/sakartvelo_da_evropis_energetikuli_gertianeba-1.pdf (last update 25.09.2021)

Author/s of the syllabus

Pazhava Emzar
Liza Amilakhvari

Quality Assurance Service of the
Faculty of Engineering Economics, Media Technologies
And Social Sciences

Ekaterine Shakiashvili

Head of the Department of Politics and International
Relations

Tamar Kiknadze

Approved

At the Engineering Economics,
Media Technologies and Social
Sciences Faculty Council Meeting

Chairman of the Faculty Council

Ivane Jagodnishvili