



IN THE NAME OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

DECISION

OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

**ON THE CASE ON CONFORMITY OF ARTICLE 5, ARTICLE 15,
PART 1 OF THE RA LAW ON EDUCATION AND ARTICLE 6,
PART 1, POINT 2 AND ARTICLE 14, PART 5 OF THE RA LAW
ON HIGHER AND POST-GRADUATE SPECIALIZED
EDUCATION AND THE DECISION No. 597-Ն OF APRIL 26,
2012 OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA
WITH THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA
ON THE BASIS OF THE APPLICATION OF THE HUMAN
RIGHTS DEFENDER OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA**

Yerevan

24 January 2014

The Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia composed of G. Harutyunyan (Chairman), Justices K. Balayan, F. Tokhyan (Rapporteur), M. Topuzyan, A. Khachatryan, V. Hovhannisyan, H. Nazaryan, A. Petrosyan, V. Poghosyan,

with the participation of the representatives of the Applicant: A. Vardevanyan, Head of Legal Analysis Department of the Staff of the RA Human Rights Defender, S. Yuzbashyan and A. Margaryan, executives of the same Department,

representatives of the Respondent: A. Ashotyan, RA Minister of Education and Science, official representative of the National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia, S. Tevanyan, Advisor to the Department of Expertise of the Staff of the RA National Assembly,

pursuant to Article 100, Point 1, Article 101, Part 1, Point 8 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, Articles 25, 38 and 68 of the Law on the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia,

examined in a public hearing by an oral procedure the joint Case con-

cerning the conformity of Article 5, Article 15, Part 1 of the RA Law on Education and Article 6, Part 1, Point 2 and Article 14, Part 5 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education and the Decision No. 597-Ն of April 26, 2012 of the Government of the Republic of Armenia with the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia on the basis of the application of the Human Rights Defender of the Republic of Armenia.

The Case was initiated on the basis of the applications submitted to the RA Constitutional Court by the RA Human Rights Defender on 18.05.2013 and 25.10.2013.

By the Procedural Decision PDCC-87 of 05.11.2013 of the Constitutional Court it was decided to join the Case on conformity of the Decision No. 597-Ն of April 26, 2012 of the Government of the Republic of Armenia with the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia on the basis of the application of the RA Human Rights Defender and the Case on conformity of Article 5, Article 15, Part 1 of the RA Law on Education and Article 6, Part 1, Point 2 and Article 14, Part 5 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education with the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia on the basis of the application of the RA Human Rights Defender, and examine in a public hearing by an oral procedure, also involving the RA National Assembly in the proceeding as the authority, having adopted the RA Law on Education and the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education.

Having examined the report of the Rapporteur on the Case, the explanations of the Applicant and the Respondent, as well as having studied the RA Law on Education and the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education, the Decision No. 597-Ն of April 26, 2012 of the RA Government, and other documents of the Case, the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia **ESTABLISHES:**

1. The RA Law on Education was adopted by the RA National Assembly on April 14, 1999, signed by the President of the Republic of Armenia on May 8, 1999 and came into force on May 14, 1999.

The RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education was adopted by the National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia on December 14, 2004, signed by the President of the Republic of Armenia on January 18, 2005 and came into force on March 2, 2005.

The Decision No. 597-Ն on Approving the Admission Procedure of State and Private Higher Education Institutions of the Republic of Armenia (according to the bachelor's studies), and Declaring the Decision No. 686 of

April 28, 2011 of the Government of the Republic of Armenia null, was adopted by the RA Government on April 26, 2012, signed by the RA Prime Minister on May 16, 2012 and came into force on May 24, 2012.

Article 5 of the RA Law on Education, titled “Principles of state policy in the field of education” prescribes:

“Principles of state policy in the field of education” are as follows:

- 1) humanistic nature of education, priority of universal values, human life and health, free and comprehensive development of the individual, education of civic conscience, national dignity, patriotism, legality and environmental outlook;
- 2) accessibility, continuity, succession and conformity of education with the level, peculiarities and level of training of learners’ development, while providing the mandatory state minimum;
- 3) ensuring the principles of democracy in the field of education;
- 4) integration in the international educational system;
- 5) supporting the educational process of preserving Armenians in Diaspora;
- 6) secular education in educational institutions;
- 7) reasonable autonomy of educational institutions;
- 8) guaranteeing opportunities for the citizens for education in public and private educational institutions;
- 9) ensuring the equal status of educational institutions and the issued graduation certificates.

Part 1 of Article 15 of this Law, titled “General requirements for admission to educational institutions” prescribes: “According to this Law, requirements for admission of learners to pre-school, general secondary, preliminary professional (Craftsmanship), middle professional educational institutions shall be defined by the founder, taking into account the peculiarities of the institution, and requirements for admission of learners to state and private higher education institutions shall be defined by the Government of the Republic of Armenia.”

Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, titled “Autonomy, competence and academic freedom of higher education institutions” prescribes: “Higher education institutions ...shall be independent in the choice of organization of educational process, educational technologies, as well as forms, procedure and periodicity of current evaluation of learners.”

Part 5 of Article 14 of this Law, titled “Admission to Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education Providing Organizations” prescribes: “Admission procedure of the state and private higher education institutions,

according to the bachelor’s studies, shall be defined by the Government of the Republic of Armenia.”

The challenged Decision of the RA Government stipulates:

According to Article 14, Part 5 of the Law of the Republic of Armenia on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education and Article 15, Part I of the Law of the Republic of Armenia on Education, the Government of the Republic of Armenia holds:

1. To approve the admission procedure of the state and private higher education institutions (according to the bachelor’s studies) in accordance with the annex.

2. To declare null the Decision No. 686-Ն of April 28, 2011 of the Government of the Republic of Armenia on Approving the admission procedure of state and private higher education institutions (according to the bachelor’s studies), and on Declaring the Decision No. 238-Ն of March 11, 2010 of the Government of the Republic of Armenia null.

3. This Decision enters into force from the next day of its official announcement.

The annex of the challenged Decision of the RA Government defines the admission procedure of state and private higher education institutions (according to the bachelor’s studies) by the following Chapters: I. General Provisions, II. Registration of unified and centralized examinations, III. Admission of application forms and documents, IV. Registration of professions, V. Correction of application forms and withdrawal of documents, VI. Fixation of application forms for admission, VII. Renewal of the examination ticket of centralized and inter-HEIs examinations, VIII. Organization, conduct and appeal of unified examinations, IX. Organization, conduct and appeal of centralized admission examinations (oral and written), X. Organization, conduct and appeal of grades in inter-HEIs admission examinations, XI. Organization of additional examinations for students who failed to appear at inter-HEIs and centralized examination, XII. Conduct of admission competition to HEIs, XIII. Republican selection committee for admission examinations.

The Constitutional Court considers it necessary to state that despite the Applicant challenged Article 5 of the RA Law on Education entirely, however, the Applicant’s substantiations relate exclusively to the provisions of Point 7 of the given Article. Furthermore, with respect to the above-mentioned Decision of the RA Government the Applicant in essence only challenges the constitutionality of Point 6 of the procedure stipulated by the annex of the given Decision. According to the mentioned Point, “Admission examinations shall be unified, centralized and inter-higher education insti-

tution (HEI) examinations. Admission examinations shall be organized and conducted by “Assessment and Testing Center” state noncommercial organization (hereinafter Assessment and Testing Center).”

2. The positions of the Applicant concerning the challenged laws bring to the following: the principles of autonomy of HEIs are stipulated by the RA Law on Education and the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, and the latter are not enough precisely formulated and their boundaries are not clear. Article 39 of the RA Constitution guarantees the autonomy of education institutions, and the constitutor left the provision of the principles of autonomy of those education institutions to the legislator’s discretion. Provision of such a norm also precludes such a situation in the future, where the HEIs may lose the principles of auto-nomy.

Referring to the reasonable autonomy of education institutions prescribed by Point 7 of Article 5 of the RA Law on Education as a principle, the Applicant states that the legislator did not violate the constitutional guarantee by the term “reasonableness”, however, the Applicant states that no legislative limit is precisely defined by the mentioned Article, therefore, it includes the risk of different interpretations. Consequently, referring to the Judgment of the European Court of Human Rights on the Case of *The Sunday Times v. the United Kingdom* dated 26.04.1979, as well as the Decision DCC-753 of the RA Constitutional Court, the Applicant finds that it raises the issue of contradiction to the principle of legal certainty.

According to the Applicant, the legal regulations of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education also raise the issue of legal certainty. The Applicant finds that the concept “organization of educational process” stipulated by Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, is also indefinite and first of all it may presume the autonomy of the HEI in the field of organization of admission, learning and graduation processes. According to the Applicant, education process begins with the admission of students, which is the main institution that guarantees the autonomy and independence of the HEI, and it is accepted in a number of countries (Finland, the Czech Republic, Estonia, etc.).

As for the challenged provisions of Part 1 of Article 15 of the RA Law on Education and Part 5 of Article 14 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, in the opinion of the Applicant, an issue arises concerning the latter so far as they provided possibility of restriction of the guarantee stipulated by the Constitution by the decision of the Gov-

ernment. The applicant substantiates the mentioned opinion referring to Point 2 of Article 83.5 of the RA Constitution, according to which, restrictions on the rights and freedoms of natural and legal persons, their obligations, shall be determined exclusively by the laws of the Republic of Armenia.

With regard to the challenged Decision of the RA Government, the Applicant finds that the latter contradicts the requirements of Articles 39, 83.5 and 85 of the RA Constitution.

To substantiate his position, and referring to Parts 4 and 5 of Article 39 of the RA Constitution, which accordingly stipulate that the law shall define the principles of autonomy in higher educational institutions, and the procedures for the establishment and operation of educational institutions shall be defined by the law, the Applicant states that the HEIs implement their autonomy on the basis of the principles of self-governance and collegiality. The Applicant also states that according to the legislation, the HEIs are independent in matters relating to both the operation and the financial and economic activity, and comes to the conclusion that in the context of Article 83.5 of the RA Constitution no law provides such restriction of the rights of the HEI as a legal person, and that the decisions of the Government shall be adopted on the basis of the Constitution, international treaties and normative acts of the RA President and for the purpose of ensuring their implementation.

Referring to Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, which stipulates that “Higher education institutions ...shall be independent in the choice of organization of educational process, educational technologies, as well as forms, procedure and periodicity of current evaluation of learners,” the Applicant finds that the notion “organization of educational process” used in the latter, first of all, presumes the autonomy of HEIs in the field of organization of admission, learning and graduation processes. According to the Applicant, education process begins with the admission of students, which is the main institution that guarantees the autonomy and independence of the HEI, and it is accepted in a number of countries. Organization of admission as one of the most important powers of the HEIs, is precisely stipulated by Point 1 of Part 2 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, and the latter particularly states that “Organization of admission procedure and educational process for the students, including foreign citizens and stateless persons, ...according to the educational studies... shall be at the competence of the higher education institution.”

Referring to international practice and, in particular, referring to the Bergen declaration and the report of the “European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education” (ENQA) (ENQA report on “Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area”, Third Edition, 2009, Helsinki, p.11.), pointing out that the principle of autonomy of HEIs is one of the principles of the Bologna Process and the international legal principle in the field of education, the Applicant, based on the above-mentioned, finds that providing such powers only for the “Assessment and Testing Center” and in practice depriving HEIs of competence for the organization of admission examinations by the challenged Decision of the RA Government may entail a real risk of non-legitimate restriction of the principles of self-governance and collegiality of HEIs, following from the principle of autonomy stipulated by the Constitution and accepted by international law.

3. Objecting the arguments of the Applicant concerning the provisions of the laws challenged by this Case, the representative of the Respondent, the official representative of the RA National Assembly finds that the Applicant challenges the issue of conformity of the term “reasonable” prescribed by Point 7 of Article 5 of the RA Law on Education with the Constitution, substantiating that the latter contradicts the principle of legal certainty, and in this regard the Respondent finds necessary to touch upon the essence and the level of certainty of the given term, and accordingly the possibility of the contiguous relevant legal regulations to be foreseeable. According to the Respondent, the above-mentioned term “reasonable” and the terms “proper” and “good-faith” as assessment concepts get the degree of certainty in the context of regulation of each law. That is, in case it is possible to identify, stipulate and foresee, from the general content of the law and the wordings set forth in other articles, the peculiarities of content of each of the mentioned terms referring to social relations in the framework of legal regulation of certain law, the availability of the latter in the law does not contradict the concepts of legal law and rule of law state. According to the Respondent, the availability of such term only provides an opportunity to ensure more flexible legal regulations via the law or sometimes a subordinate act. It is obvious that, according to the Applicant, raising the issue of conformity of the Decision No. 597-Ն of the RA Government with the RA Constitution, the Applicant manifested an approach, which did not even question the fact that the currently challenged norms and, in particular, the term “reasonable” follow from the RA Constitution. The Respondent finds that the availability of the term “reasonable” men-

tioned in the challenged act does not arise any issue from the standpoint of certainty. Touching upon Part 1 of Article 15 of the RA Law on Education, the Respondent expresses the position, according to which the latter stipulates that the RA Government, as the competent public authority, may define the requirements for admission to state and private higher education institutions. That is, the scope of the regulation of the given provision is to vest the appropriate body with some functions for organization of admission of learners. The relevant articles of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education more precisely stipulate the legal regulation of the relations concerning the admission of the learners. Thus, Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the above-mentioned Law stipulates the scope of autonomy of the HEI in the field of organization of educational process, and Part 5 of Article 14 once again points out the competent body which shall stipulate the admission procedure of HEIs. Moreover, the Respondent finds that raising the issue of conformity of Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education with Article 39 of the RA Constitution, the Applicant did not submit such substantiation which would prove the contradiction between the given challenged norm and the principle of autonomy of HEIs stipulated by Article 39 of the RA Constitution. According to the Applicant, all the accents made are aimed to disclosure of the concept “learning process” and discussion of the issue of inclusion of the stage of organization of admission examinations in learning process. Vesting the RA Government with the authority to stipulate the admission procedure of HEIs or stipulate the requirements for admission of learners is not anyhow considered to be a restriction of the rights of HEIs; it simply assumes realization of certain functions via solving procedural issues or defining certain standards.

Objecting the arguments of the Applicant concerning the part of the challenged Decision by this Case, the representative of the Respondent, the official representative of the RA Government finds that the challenged Decision of the RA Government is in conformity with Articles 39, 83.5 and 85 of the RA Constitution and the relevant norms of International Law.

To substantiate his position, the Respondent states that the challenged Decision of the RA Government was adopted within the framework of the powers of the RA Government, based on the requirements of Part 5 of Article 14 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, and Part 1 of Article 15 of the RA Law on Education which vest the RA Government with the power to stipulate the admission procedure of state HEIs and the requirements for admission to state and private HEIs.

Touching upon the argument of the Applicant, according to which the

notion “organization of educational process” used in Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education, first of all, presumes the autonomy of HEIs in the field of organization of admission, learning and graduation processes, the Respondent refers to Point 1 of Part 2 of Article 6 and Point 7 of Part 1 of Article 21 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Professional Education; Parts 1 and 2 of Article 14 of the RA Law on Education and Points 1, 6 and 14 of the procedure established by the challenged Decision of the RA Government, and finds that the admission is not a part of learning process, and the concepts “organization of admission” and “organization of admission examinations” are different.

Based on the above-mentioned, the Respondent finds that the HEIs do not organize the admission examinations, except for the cases stipulated by Point 14 of the procedure established by the challenged Decision of the RA Government, which relate to inter-HEIs examinations.

Referring to international practice the Applicant mentioned and stating that the content of the concepts “autonomy of HEIs” and “academic freedom” is not entirely revealed by the RA legislation, and stating that the principle of autonomy of HEIs is perceived differently, and even very often it is perceived inconsistently, which is conditioned by educational traditions of many countries; as well as pointing out the current 3 systems of organization of admission examinations in the framework of the European Union, which include provision of admission criteria both by the HEI or with the participation of the HEI, and by external body, the Respondent finds that the mentioned 3 systems are now considered in the framework of autonomy of HEIs, depending on the peculiarities of the policy conducted in relevant domain of the certain state.

4. It follows from the study of the application on the provisions of the laws challenged by this Case, that in the conditions of availability of the requirement of Point 8 of Part 1 of Article 101 of the RA Constitution, an application has been submitted to the RA Constitutional Court, which concerns the issue of conformity of Part 1 of Article 15 of the RA Law on Education and Part 5 of Article 14 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education not so much, in essence, with the provisions of Chapter 2 of the RA Constitution, as Point 2 of Article 83.5 of the RA Constitution, which is beyond the competence of the Applicant.

The main part of the issues could be resolved within the framework of constitutional competence of homogeneous application of the law, generating also equivalent law enforcement practice.

At the same time, based on Point 1 of Article 32 of the RA Law on the Constitutional Court, the Constitutional Court finds that the proceeding of the Case is subject to dismissal in regard to the part of the challenged Decision No. 597-Ն of the RA Government by the reasoning, that in the mentioned part the Applicant raises an issue which is beyond the competence of the Constitutional Court, namely, the issue of legitimacy and conformity of the Decision of the RA Government with the RA laws is essentially raised. By virtue of Point 4 of Part 1 of Article 15 of the RA Law on Human Rights Defender the Applicant could file a sue in court for fully or in part acknowledging the challenged Decision No. 597-Ն of the RA Government void, which could be considered as means of possible protection of the rights of HEIs.

In this regard the Constitutional Court considers it necessary to state that Article 191 of Administrative Procedure Code of the Republic of Armenia states that “The following cases on challenging normative legal acts of state and local self-government bodies and their public officials, shall be under the jurisdiction of the Administrative Court:

Cases on challenging the conformity of normative legal acts of the President of the Republic of Armenia, the Government of the Republic of Armenia, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia, departmental normative legal acts, as well as normative legal acts of the Council of Elders and the Head of Community with the normative legal acts having higher legal force (except for the Constitution).”

Part 3 of Article 192 of the given Code stipulates that “On the cases stipulated by Article 191 of instant Code, the Human Rights Defender may also bring an action before the Administrative Court...”

It is obvious that in such case the Constitutional Court must be guided by the requirement of Article 5 of the RA Constitution and take into account that in the framework of administrative justice the issue of legitimacy of the Decision of the RA Government must first be the subject of litigation in relevant competent court.

5. Touching upon the provisions of Article 5 of the RA Law on Education, and Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education, as well as based on study of the Applications by instant Case, the challenged legal norms and the documents attached to the Applications, the Constitutional Court states that the Applicant in essence raises the issue before the Constitutional Court, why the “Assessment and Testing Center” state noncommercial organization organizes and conducts admission examinations instead of autonomous HEIs.

In regard to the above-mentioned issue raised by the Applicant, the Constitutional Court considers it necessary to state the following: **firstly**, Part 4 of Article 39 of the RA Constitution is first of all aimed at effective and full realization of the right to education as provided by Part 1 of the same Article; **secondly**, the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia does not anyhow predetermine the boundaries of autonomy of HEIs, and the disclosure of its content and securing the stipulation of its boundaries was provided at the legislator's discretion by virtue of Part 4 of Article 39 of the Constitution; **thirdly**, any legal principle by its content differs from the norms having certain regulatory significance, and its content is revealed by the latter; **fourthly**, emphasizing the right to education in the development of society and guaranteeing it on constitutional level, the state undertakes the obligation to ensure quality education, which also simultaneously predetermines the possibility and necessity for both the state and the HEI to carry out activities in the field of education; **five**, the realization of educational policy, including the guaranteeing of a minimum level of quality of education follow from the obligation of the state to ensure quality education; **six**, Article 5 of the RA Law on Education prescribes the principles of state policy in the field of education, and defines the term "reasonable" in regard to the autonomy of HEIs, and an attempt was made to reveal the scope of the activities carried out by the state and the HEI in the field of education; **seven**, stipulating by Article 5 of the RA Law on Education the "Principles of state policy in the field of education," the legislator considered them as a single interconnected system, which are holistic only in unity, and none of them can be absolute and each of them is aimed to mutually reinforce the others and form a harmonious whole. In practice, however, by the RA Law on Education and the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education the legislator tried to outline the boundaries of administrative, financial, organizational and academic freedom of HEIs via uncertain order.

The Constitutional Court agrees with the opinion regarding the approach that a reasonable autonomy of HEIs does not presume absolute independence of HEIs. The framework of reasonable autonomy of HEIs is conditioned by the framework of the policy conducted by the state aimed to ensure quality education based on the law. Therefore, the Constitutional Court does not consider reasonable the circumstance that legal uncertainty is available in the provisions of Article 5 of the RA Law on Education. Simultaneously, **the RA Constitutional Court shares the concern of the Applicant that the wordings in the disputed laws could for the most part comply with the principle of legal certainty and**

not cause ambiguity. However, no attempt was made to overcome this ambiguity within the framework of homogeneous application of the law, and the interpretations are discretionary in nature. Nonetheless, the comparative analysis of the norms of the law indicates that within the concern of the Applicant, and together with the availability of the issue of legislative reforms, no issue of constitutionality is present.

The Constitutional Court does not consider the Applicant's arguments regarding the legal uncertainty of the concept "organization of educational process" stipulated by Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education by the reasoning, that in Point 1 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the same Law the admission of learners to HEIs is separated from the organization of educational process.

Besides, the Constitutional Court considers it appropriate to state that the expressions "organization of admission" and "organization of educational process" cannot have the same content, and the organization and conduct of unified, centralized and inter-HEIs examinations by other bodies is just aimed at providing harmonious standards for organization and conduct of admission examinations (according to the bachelor's studies) both in state and private HEIs, stipulating the minimum quality level below which it is impossible to guarantee the necessary conditions for the provision of higher education by respective professions. The provisions of Article 5 of the RA Law on Education and Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education do not create any obstacle for stipulating additional standards or requirements for admission, thus guaranteeing inalienable autonomy of the certain HEI.

Based on the result of the consideration of the Case and being governed by Article 100, Point 1, Article 101, Part 1, Point 8, Article 102 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, Article 32, Points 1 and 2, Article 60, Point 1, Articles 63, 64 and 68 of the Law of the Republic of Armenia on the Constitutional Court, the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Armenia **HOLDS:**

1. To dismiss the proceeding of the Case in regard to the part of Part 1 of Article 15 of the RA Law on Education and Part 5 of Article 14 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education, as well as in regard to the part of the Decision No. 597-Ն of April 26, 2012 of the Government of the Republic of Armenia.

2. Within the framework of legal positions in the instant Decision, the provisions of Article 5 of the RA Law on Education and Point 2 of Part 1 of Article 6 of the RA Law on Higher and Post-graduate Specialized Education are in conformity with the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia.

3. Pursuant to Article 102, Part 2 of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia this Decision is final and enters into force from the moment of its announcement.

Chairman

G. Harutyunyan

24 January 2014

DCC - 1136