



**NATIONAL CENTER FOR  
EDUCATIONAL QUALITY  
ENHANCEMENT**

## **Accreditation Expert Group Report on Cluster of Higher Education Programmes**

**1. History (BA); 2. Archaeology (BA); 3. History (MA); 4. Archaeology (PhD); 5. Classical  
Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus (MA).**

**LEPL - Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University**

Evaluation Date(s): 20-22 December 2022

Draft Report Submission Date  
13 January 2023

Tbilisi

## Contents

<b>I. Information on the Cluster of Educational Programmes</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. Accreditation Report Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. Compliance of the Programme with Accreditation Standards</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>59</b>

### Information on the Higher educational Institution

Name of Institution Indicating its Organizational Legal Form	LEPL - Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University
Identification Code of Institution	245428158
Type of the Institution	University

### Expert Panel Members

<b>Chair</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organization, Country)	Peter D'Sena, University of Hertfordshire, UK
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organization, Country)	Teimuraz Papaskiri, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organization, Country)	Merab Tchumburidze, Akaki Tsereteli State University, Kutaisi, Georgia
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organization, Country)	Ia Natsvlshvili, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organization, Country)	Vazha Mamiashvili, employer
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organization, Country)	Davit Putkaradze, student

## I. Information on the Cluster of Educational Programmes

	Programme 1	Programme 2	Programme 3	Programme 4	Programme 5
<b>Name of the educational programme</b>	History	History	Archaeology	Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus	Archaeology
<b>Level of higher education</b>	Bachelor's Studies	Master's Studies	Bachelor's Studies	Master's Studies	Doctoral Studies
<b>Qualification to be awarded</b>	Bachelor of Arts (BA) in History	Master of History	Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Archaeology	Master of Archaeology	Doctor of Archaeology
<b>Name and code of the detailed field</b>	0222.1.1 History	0222.1.1 History	0222.1.2 - Archaeology	Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus 0222.1.2 - Archaeology	0222.1.2 - Archaeology
<b>Indication of the right to provide teaching of subject/subjects/group of subjects of the relevant level of general education<sup>1</sup></b>	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Language of instruction</b>	Georgian	Georgian	Georgian	Georgian	Georgian
<b>Number of ECTS credits</b>	240	120	240	120	60 credits learning
<b>Programme Status (Accredited/Non-accredited/Conditionally Accredited/New/International Accreditation) Indicating Relevant Decision (number, date)</b>	Accredited	Accredited	New	Accredited	Accredited

<sup>1</sup> In case of Integrated Bachelor's-Master's Teacher Training Educational Programme and Teacher Training Educational Programme

## II. Accreditation Report Executive Summary

- **General Information on the Cluster of Education Programmes<sup>2</sup>**

The Faculty of Humanities in Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University delivers five programmes with the objective of educating students in the subject areas: history to first degree and masters levels (levels 4 and 5 respectively); archaeology to first degree and masters levels (again, levels 4 and 5); and in archaeology to PhD level (level 7). The five programmes have been assessed jointly in a cluster, as both have all been designed to meet the needs of local and national employers in and around Georgia. Each programme displays an emerging level of internationalisation in both academic content and pedagogic approaches as the specialists in Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University (BSU) have drawn on the best practice of experts from a number of highly-ranked European universities as they have gone through systematic processes of revising their curricula.

The Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and other, related documentation was, with regards to information, plentiful, relevant and up-to-date; and it was passed on to the inspection/expert team in a reasonably timely fashion by the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement. Key documentation was made available in Georgian and English and hence experts were able to gain a text-based overview of all five programmes. Finally, the inspection/expert team were given the opportunity to interview a good range of the clusters' stakeholders, from senior university management, teachers and course designers, to internal and external stakeholders and students. The University's facilities, teaching rooms and learning resource centres were also visited by those experts able to make the visit in person.

- **Expert Panel's Summary of BSU's Argumentative Position**

The Expert Panel have been pleased to see that BSU's response to the draft version of this report, presented in their 'Argumentative Position' document, agreed to accommodate and take forward all of the recommendations suggested by us about Standards 1 to 4 (see below). With regards to BSU's Argumentative Position in relation to the various parts of Standard 5, about Quality Assurance (again, see below), the Expert Panel are minded not to downgrade our recommendations into suggestions. In our view, the Argumentative Position was not strong enough for us to do so; and had we been able to see documentation about how these recommendations been accepted and enacted in practice (for example through modified syllabi), then the case would have been stronger.

### Overview of the Accreditation Site Visit

The site visit took place between the 20th and 22nd December 2022 in hybrid form. The principal focus of the first of those days was a visit to the University's facilities by the Georgian experts, all of whom were able to be on site. However, the Chair of the Expert Panel was unable to travel

---

<sup>2</sup> When providing general information related to the programme, it is appropriate to also present the quantitative data analysis of the educational programme.

from the UK and therefore attended subsequent meetings via a Zoom link provided by the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement (NCEQE).

After the visit to see the facilities, the Expert Panel held a preparatory meeting with the representative of the NCEQE on the evening of the 20<sup>th</sup> in order to discuss and agree the lines of enquiry that would help to illuminate aspects of the SED and other documentation. Over the next two days, the Expert Panel's work was supported by the NCEQE representative and a highly proficient translator, both of whom were physically present in the meeting room in the University. The panel and, specifically, the chair express their thanks to all Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University staff involved in the preparation of the evaluation and the site visit. Thanks also go to the representatives of NCEQE for their smooth organisation of the visit and interviews. The report was then compiled by all of the panel members who, according to their personal centre of expertise, took the lead on one of its constituent sections. The chair of the panel takes this opportunity to thank them for their acuity and active and efficient participation; and most especially as the writing process took place over differently-staged Christmas festivities and, of course, New Year.

- **Brief Overview of Education Programme Compliance with the Standards**

Bachelor and Master programmes in History are in substantial compliance with regards to standards 1 and 5, while Archaeology programmes (BA, MA, PhD) are in substantial compliance with regards to standard 5. Otherwise, presented programmes within the cluster of History and Archaeology are in full compliance with accreditation standard requirements.

- **Recommendations**

**Standard 1.4:**

**Programme 1 (History, BA)** - One ECTS credit should be defined according to the University's regulations as 25 hours and the number of credit hours for the mandatory subjects should be corrected both in curriculum and relevant syllabi.

**Programme 2 (History, MA)** - The elective courses Relations between European Countries and Georgia (XVII-XX Centuries) and Problems of European Union History should be removed from the MA program as they repeat other courses.

**Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)** - One ECTS credit should be defined according to the University's regulations as 25 hours and the number of credit hours for the mandatory subjects should be corrected both in curriculum and relevant syllabi.

**Standard 1.5:**

**Programme 1 (History, BA)** - In order to assure the achievement of learning outcomes, the outdated and/or foreign-language literature should be removed from the following syllabi: 1.

General Ethnology; 2. History of Near East (V-XXI centuries); 3. History of Middle Ages (1); 4. History of Middle Ages (2); 5. History of Byzantine (the title in English should be History of Byzantine Empire or History of Byzantium); 6. History of Russia; 7. New and Recent History of European and American Countries (1) (the correct title in English should start with Modern and Contemporary History); 8. New and Recent History of European and American Countries (2); 9. History of World Civilizations; 10. Modern and Contemporary History of Asian and African Countries; 11. Ancient Centres of Black Sea Coast; 12. History of International Relations; 13. History of Turkey (XX-XXI centuries); 14. Georgian, Georgian Diaspores abroad; 15. International Relations and Conflicts; 16. Sea Strategy in International Politics; 17. Georgia's First Republic.

**Programme 2 (History, MA)** - In order to assure the achievement of learning outcomes, the mandatory literature should be enriched and updated in the following syllabi: 1. Problems of World History; 2. Georgia and Antique World; 3. Relations between Georgia and European Countries (X-XVI Centuries); 4. Relations between Georgia and European Countries (XVII-XX Centuries); 5. Historical Sources and Historiography of Georgia of XIX-XX Centuries; 6. Problems of ethno-cultural history of Georgia; 7. History of the Eastern European Countries at the Boundary of XX-XXI Centuries; 8. Problems of Social and Economic Development of Western European Countries in XVI-XX Centuries.

#### **Standard 4.3:**

##### **General Recommendation:**

- The University should further develop their central system for supporting engagement with and awareness of innovations in pedagogic theory, with a view to developing a larger proportion of academic staff, so that there is improved capacity for implementing innovative practice in teaching, learning and assessment.

#### **Standard 5.1:**

##### **General Recommendation:**

- At faculty level, mechanisms for quality assurance should be strengthened, specifically via the monitoring and filtering of suggestions for programme developments produced by each Working Group.
- The Expert Panel noticed that programmes are passed by the faculty council based on the recommendations of the programme committee, without having been processed and recommended by the faculty quality assurance service.
- The quality assurance service at faculty level should be strengthened with regards to the processes of programme evaluation and approval; and the evaluation of the programmes should be conducted in a more systematic way. Specifically, a mandatory quality assurance service filter at the faculty level is necessary for further improvement of the quality of the programmes. The programmes should then be approved at faculty level by the 'Faculty Council' or equivalent.

- It is recommended that the quality assurance service office develops more effective and closer co-operation with academic personnel and other interested parties in the process of programme developments and modifications. Areas for improvement, include, for example, the evaluation of student workload, the number of credits for study courses, the identification of any repetition or overlapping in syllabi and assessment, etc.

### **Standard 5.3:**

#### **General Recommendation:**

- During the processes of monitoring and review, the quality assurance service should: systematically collect and analyse information about student workload (for example, the amount of study materials); allocate credit to better reflect the amount of course content, student workload, and total weight of methods of assessment for the mid-term and final evaluations of courses. Additionally, monitoring and evaluation tools, such as questionnaires, should elicit more specific data from students about the quality of the supervisory aspects of their programmes.

#### ● **Suggestions for the Programmes' Development**

### **Standard 1.4:**

#### **Programme 1 (History, BA)**

- The technical mistake regarding the syllabus of the course in History of Georgia (X-XIV centuries) should be corrected.

#### **Programme 2 (History, MA)**

- It will be better to replace Donald Rayfield's Book *Edge of Empires: A History of Georgia* with a more appropriate history book as mandatory literature in the course of Professional English. Donald Rayfield is not a professional historian and his book contains a great number of factual mistakes. Hence, it will be better to use other books, by historians, in this case.

### **Standard 2.1:**

**General Suggestion:** The wording of admission preconditions for all programmes is overly complicated and it may sometimes lead to confusion. It would probably be better, for example, if the University presents them as bullet points

### **Standard 2.4:**

**General Suggestion:** It is desirable to diversify the evaluation forms of the mid-term and final exam, in accordance with the individual characteristics of the course and its learning outcomes.

- **Brief Overview of the Best Practices (if applicable)<sup>3</sup>**
  - There are mechanisms for learning about, and integrating best practice from experts in highly reputable Universities across Europe that are teaching in related cognate areas.
  - The University facilities provide a good, quality built environment for study.
  - All programmes have strong links with academic research about the region and nation. Academic staff are well qualified, with many engaged in research of international importance. Moreover, there is the ambition to ensure that the various curricula and methods of teaching and learning better reflect international perspectives.
  - The panel commends the University and each programme for seeking to instil graduate attributes as part of each programme that broadly relate to social responsibility, democratic values and responsible citizenship, not only for the benefit of the students, but also for the region and nation.
  - Students receive swift and useful support from the University’s electronic portal.
- **Information on Sharing or Not Sharing the Argumentative Position of the HEI**
- **In case of re-accreditation, it is important to provide a brief overview of the achievements and/or the progress (if applicable)**

MA programme in History was modified after the last accreditation. It has two modules: the first, about the History of Georgia, as before; but the second module, about the History of Turkey, has been replaced by a module about World History (The Modern and Contemporary History of European and American Countries). This provides students more options in terms of understanding global perspectives and therefore has the potential to increase their interest in the programme as a whole.

**Evaluation approaches for the accreditation experts:**

**The components of the accreditation standards are evaluated using the following two approaches:**

1. Cluster and individual evaluation<sup>4</sup>
2. Cluster evaluation<sup>5</sup>

Standard/Component	Assessment approaches:
<b>1. Educational Programme Objectives, Learning Outcomes and their Compliance with the Programme</b>	
1.1. Programme Objectives	Cluster and individual
1.2 Programme Learning Outcomes	Cluster and individual

<sup>3</sup> A practice that is exceptionally effective and that can serve as a benchmark or example for other educational programme/programmes.

<sup>4</sup> **Evaluation Approaches:** Describe, analyse, and evaluate the compliance of each educational programme grouped in the cluster with the requirements of the corresponding component of the standard. Also, you can specify information about an educational programme that is different from the common and basic characteristics of educational programmes grouped in the cluster.

<sup>5</sup> **Assessment approaches: In case of necessity,** describe, analyse and evaluate compliance of each education programme in the cluster with the requirements of this component of the standard. Also, you can indicate the information on the education programme, distinguished from the general and major characteristics of the education programmes in a cluster.

1.3. Evaluation Mechanism of the Programme Learning Outcomes	Cluster
1.4 Structure and Content of Educational Programme	Cluster and individual
1.5 Academic Course/Subject	Cluster and individual
<b>2. Methodology and Organisation of Teaching, Adequacy of Evaluation of Programme Mastering</b>	
2.1. Programme Admission Preconditions	Cluster and individual
2.2. The Development of Practical, Scientific/Research/Creative/Performing and Transferable Skills	Cluster
2.3. Teaching and Learning Methods	Cluster
2.4. Student Evaluation	Cluster
<b>3. Student Achievements, Individual Work with them</b>	
3.1. Student Consulting and Support Services	Cluster
3.2. Master's and Doctoral Student Supervision	Cluster
<b>4. Providing Teaching Resources</b>	
4.1. Human Resources	Cluster and individual
4.2. Qualification of Supervisors of Master's and Doctoral Students	Cluster and individual
4.3. Professional Development of Academic, Scientific and Invited Staff	Cluster
4.4. Material Resources	Cluster and individual
4.5. Programme/Faculty/School Budget and Programme Financial Sustainability	Cluster and individual
<b>5. Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities</b>	
5.1. Internal Quality Evaluation	Cluster
5.2. External Quality Evaluation	Cluster
5.3. Programme Monitoring and Periodic Review	Cluster

### III. Compliance of the Programme with Accreditation Standards

#### 1. Educational Programme Objectives, Learning Outcomes and their Compliance with the Programme

A programme has clearly established objectives and learning outcomes, which are logically connected to each other. Programme objectives are consistent with the mission, objectives and strategic plan of the institution. Programme learning outcomes are assessed on a regular basis to improve the programme. The content and consistent structure of the programme ensure the achievement of the set goals and expected learning outcomes.

Educational programmes grouped in a cluster are logically interrelated to each other in line with the study fields and evolve according to the respective levels of higher education.

##### 1.1 Programme Objectives

Programme objectives consider the specificity of the field of study, level and an educational programme, and define the set of knowledge, skills and competences a programme aims to develop in graduate students. They also illustrate the contribution of the programme to the development of the field and society.

##### Cluster and individual evaluation

##### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

Each of the five educational programmes included in the cluster was created, according to evidence taken from the University's Self-Evaluation Document, in accordance with current national legislation, the National Qualifications Frameworks and the rules of the European Credit Transfer System. Programmes also share mechanisms for ensuring quality and collecting data from students and elsewhere in order to inform the activities of academic Working Groups, that are tasked to evolve curriculum development (broadly defined).

In terms of the student experience, each programme in the cluster has learning objectives that are structured to ensure a combination of academic progression (the 'deepening and strengthening' of student expertise) and their growing ability to bridge the gap between theory and practice. In order to assess student learning, they are expected to demonstrate their developing knowledge, understanding and academic capacity through both paper and practical exercises. Moreover, each of the five programmes aims to develop students' research skills at a level in keeping with the level or cycle of study; but whatever their level, all students are expected to develop the generic capacity of researching in an independent manner.

Information about cluster-wide practices in teaching and learning were gleaned from both the Self-Evaluation Document and interviews with academic staff and students. Across all five programmes, an emphasis is placed not only on more traditional paper exercises, but also on 'student-oriented' or student-centred learning, with discussions, debates, groupwork, case studies, practicals (stimulated by action-oriented teaching and demonstrations) and 'situational', meaning work-based learning and internships.

#### Programme 1 **Bachelor's Educational Programme in History**<sup>6</sup>

The key objectives of this well-established programme in History have, quite rightly, evolved over the years. Hence, a programme which has traditionally placed its emphasis on the History of Georgia has, in response to student and other stakeholders' feedback moved towards becoming more international in its outlook; some courses have moved from being optional to being mandatory, in order to assure that students have an established core of knowledge; and, importantly, with a mandatory undergraduate thesis, students now become beginner researchers. All of this works to fulfil another key objective - to make the graduating student as employable as possible.

#### Programme 2: **Master's Educational Programme in History**

Even though this is a relatively new programme, it has been dynamic in the way in which it has been prepared to evolve its objectives to give its students the opportunity to go on to become relevant and employable as practitioners and researchers, whether in a subject closely related in their field such as culture, education or heritage, or more generally in other places of work. While the accent remains on the History of Georgia, the objective of preparing students to be more globally aware is continually being reflected in a revised curriculum. Specific details about how this takes place are mentioned elsewhere in this report, suffice to say these objectives are seen in the student experience through the development of both academic knowledge and also their skills in research and their use of English.

#### Programme 3: **Bachelor's Educational Programme in Archaeology**

An overriding objective of this programme has been to respond to the consistent and growing interest in the relevance and importance of archaeological studies and practices in the region. Even though initial interest dates back to the nineteenth century, there has been a strong revival in the past few decades. Importantly, this programme therefore provides a skilled workforce, steeped in theoretical, technical, up-to date knowledge that can fulfil the needs of employers, whether in research, in practical/technical work or in cultural or other institutions. Any of the programme's more granular level objectives derive from these overarching objectives: developing specific skills in excavation; analysis of primary and secondary materials, and so on.

#### Programme 4: **Master's Educational Programme in Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus**

---

<sup>6</sup> Describe, analyze and evaluate the compliance of each educational programme grouped in the cluster with the requirements of the specified component of the standard. Also, you can specify information about the educational programme that is different from the common and basic characteristics of the educational programmes grouped in the cluster.

Please repeat the description and analysis field according to the number of programmes, for example, programme 2 (name, cycle), programme 3 (name, cycle) and so on. (Please consider this reference format when evaluating each subsequent component).

This programme's objectives have evolved over the past decade, after a review which took account of well-considered internal/regional/national considerations and the advice of external, international best practice. Hence, while students continue to become versed in a combination of theoretical and practical elements of archaeology, the curriculum has broadened in terms of content, there are excellent opportunities to hone practical excavation and research skills in the University's satellite sites in Gonio, Pichvnari and Tsikhisdziri, researching for a thesis plays an important part in developing student capacity, and greater emphasis is placed on developing Academic Writing and the Use of English. Put together, these objectives serve to prepare successful graduates to be employable not just regionally and nationally, but also beyond. In presenting students with these opportunities, the programme also works towards the underpinning objectives of developing their students' capacity and confidence to engage in more specialist work either for cultural and scientific institutions or at doctoral level.

#### Programme 5: **PhD Educational Programme in Archaeology**

The doctoral programme serves to prepare the successful student to become an autonomous researcher, ready to deploy their deep, specialist knowledge of the region in a variety of ways, either locally, nationally and even internationally in cultural, research, educational and other contexts. This overarching, ambitious objective plays itself out through a careful and well-structured programme, which is accompanied by a set of educational, professional and networking opportunities. This means, importantly, that the student's own personal, self-identified objectives can be catered for during their time on the programme. For example, should a student wish to become a researcher or academic practitioner, then the programme affords them the opportunity to become a professor's assistant at the same time as working towards their doctorate. Hence, this programme seeks to combine the the dual objectives of creating a proficient, independent and highly skilled researcher in archaeology, and also somebody more knowledgeable about and prepared for their chosen vocation.

#### **Evidences/Indicators**

The Self-Evaluation Document

Interviews with BSU personnel

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes:**

#### **Evaluation <sup>7</sup>**

---

<sup>7</sup> Evaluation is performed for each programme separately.

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component 1.1 - Programme Objectives	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies the requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 1.2 Programme Learning Outcomes

>The learning outcomes of the programme are logically related to the programme objectives and the specificity of the field of study.

> Programme learning outcomes describe knowledge, skills, and/or sense of responsibility and autonomy which students gain upon completion of the programme.

### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

All programmes have an agreed set of learning outcomes each of which have an explicit relationship to knowledge, skills and concepts related to subject and craft knowledge that are relevant and important for developing student capacity. They have been created with the intention that students become proficient in their chosen field and level. This report gives reflections, in the following sections, about the learning outcomes of each programme, but will take the opportunity here to make two specific observations that have cluster-wide relevance.

First, the Expert Panel were very interested in some of the more generic learning outcomes, occasionally referred to in the SED, that seemed to be implicit in the teaching and learning experience. It seems that these generic desired learning outcomes could be described under the umbrella term of ‘responsible citizen’ – for example, developing a person committed to democratic values and social responsibility. We agree that these are vitally important learning outcomes and, indeed, they feature in the mission statements and lists of graduate attributes in the most highly-ranked universities across the world. The University should consider ways in which both they, as an institution, and the students themselves, can capture the ways in which they have worked towards demonstrating these sorts of attributes. HEIs across the world have not found it easy to do this, but there is general acknowledgement that education, especially at tertiary level, should be about more than subject knowledge, but also about interpersonal skills and values. In the meantime, we commend BSU for recognising the importance of educating students beyond the curriculum.

Second (and, again this is mentioned in more detail elsewhere in this report), where need be the University is keen to allow learning outcomes to change and develop over time. The process for doing this is informed by consultations with appropriate stakeholders including students, alumni

and employers; and their views are then considered by subject specialist Working Groups, which have an established place in the scrutiny, creation and revision of learning outcomes within their programme. They compare learning outcomes against benchmarks, and, with progression in mind, consider the level of attainment students should meet. In short, academic-related administrative structures for future proofing learning outcomes are in place.

### **Programme 1: Bachelor's Educational Programme in History**

Evidence from the Self-Evaluation Document (SED) presents an immediate impression of the scale of this programme, with 266 students enrolled in the five-year period between 2017 and 2021. Ultimately, those that graduate (178 in that period, so approximately two-thirds) go on to be variously employed in culture, education, archives, research and other public and private institutions. Indeed, evidence from the SED, as well as interviews with students, staff and employers revealed that graduates from this programme are highly-regarded across the region though, as practiced in other HEIs across Europe, the collection of specific data about first destination employment would be useful in order to substantiate this.

### **Programme 2: Master's Educational Programme in History**

This Master's programme gives a focus to the history of Georgia and, according to the SED, is of particular value because of its role at a time when the nation is in a process of state-building after the Soviet period. The programme's overarching goals of developing an appreciation of humanism and democracy have been combined with recent curriculum developments to raise the profile of global perspectives in the learning experience. For example, a prerequisite student requirement for proficiency in the use of English (B2 level) is designed to enable students to capitalise on research, scholarly activity and networking beyond Georgia; while a new module about *The New and Recent History of European and American Countries* is designed to build intellectual capacity about the nation's international links. In addition to evolving academic content and relevant literature, students are supported by a short course on 'Academic Writing' and given opportunities for internships and the opportunity to be supported in their studies through an Archive Fund.

### **Programme 3: Bachelor's Educational Programme in Archaeology**

The learning outcomes for this programme are designed to develop the knowledge, understanding and, importantly, the practical skills for archaeological practice at bachelor's level. In particular, the intended learning outcomes are geared towards preparing students to be able to cognizant of archaeological standards which deploy modern technology, and therefore support them to becoming suitably equipped to be employable and autonomous. In addition to the core curriculum, students have the option to follow a minor study in other, related humanities subjects such as history, ethnology, geology, geography, etc. An intention is that this approach encourages perspectives which value interdisciplinarity.

## **Programme 4: Master's Educational Programme in Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus**

This Masters is taught by highly qualified academic staff, including foreign specialists, with deep expertise in both the broader theoretical and professional and practical/fieldwork aspects of classical archaeology of the Black Sea and Caucasus region. In addition to the academic core curriculum, the student experience is enhanced by the offer of modules in related speciality subjects such as management, the natural environment and architecture. Moreover, short courses which support Academic Writing and develop greater proficiency in the use of English help students to hone their communication skills not only to be successful in their level of attainment, but also in engaging with scholarship on an international level. The intended outcome is for the successful graduate to be better equipped to be employable in a variety of cultural agencies and research institutions.

## **Programme 5: PhD Educational Programme in Archaeology**

The learning outcomes for this PhD programme have been designed with the overarching objectives of preparing a specialist archaeologist, with research skills consistent with the national qualifications framework, and who is employable in and, potentially, beyond Georgia. The Self-Evaluation Document demonstrates that academic staff are not only very highly qualified and accomplished, but also critically reflective about areas for development. For example, while the programme's overarching objectives (as stated above) are clear, they have identified that subject heads should take more responsibility for acknowledging and tracking the learning outcomes in their own discrete area. Meanwhile (again, according to the SED), senior University staff should consider a strategy for addressing a staff shortage in the key area of teaching about the use of modern technology. This is important in order for the programme to maintain its academic standing both nationally and internationally.

### **Evidences/Indicators**

- The Self-Evaluation Document
- Interviews with BSU staff

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:**

### **Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component 1.2 Programme Learning Outcomes	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 1.3 Evaluation Mechanism of the Programme Learning Outcomes

- Evaluation mechanisms of the programme learning outcomes are defined. The programme learning outcomes assessment process consists of defining, collecting and analyzing data necessary to measure learning outcomes.
- Programme learning outcomes assessment results are utilized for the improvement of the programme.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

Each programme's strategies for teaching and learning and also student perspectives and outcomes/levels of attainment are monitored, analysed and evaluated; and crucially, academic staff – meaning those actually doing the teaching – are involved. Hence, when any changes are made in order to improve the programme, staff know that core data to inform these processes comes, anonymised, from the student cohort. The Expert Panel noted that the processes for conducting final exams were also subject to close monitoring, to ensure fairness and confidentiality. It was unclear whether any benchmarks other than those of the nation and the European framework were being used to inform curriculum development. However, important for this section is the point that the SED categorically states that, with evaluation in mind, student learning outcomes are compared against benchmarks.

As stated above, subject specialist Working Groups regularly scrutinise learning outcomes in their programme. Their work is informed by the perceptions of relevant stakeholders, such as students, alumni and employers.

Finally, it is also worth mentioning that critiques and evaluations of curricula and methods of teaching and learning are carried out in various ways. For example, by collecting stakeholder perceptions via employer and alumni surveys; by comparing practice with 'benchmarked' institutions; by soliciting views from focus groups; and through relevant desk exercises such as curriculum reviews and the statistical analyses of employability rates and patterns and so on.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- The Self-Evaluation Document

- Interviews with BSU personnel

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes:**

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component 1.3 Evaluation Mechanism of the Programme Learning Outcomes	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 1.4. Structure and Content of Educational Programme

➤ The programme is designed according to HEI's methodology for planning, designing and developing of educational programmes.

➤ The programme structure is consistent and logical. The content and structure ensure the achievement of the programme learning outcomes. The qualification to be awarded is corresponding to the programme content and learning outcomes.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

Employers and graduate surveys are used by programmes as a mechanisms for evaluating the appropriateness of what is taught. Hence, it is valid to say that potent a broad set of stakeholders has a say in the structure and content of the courses in this cluster. Specifically, the contents and perspectives gathered from employers and graduate surveys are used by staff and the Working Group in each programme in their ongoing considerations about content, approach and structure. While it is difficult to know the extent or degree to which these external stakeholders' views are actually embraced and actioned, it seems to be fair that the External Panel recognises that the SED showcases these mechanisms on more than one occasion.

In looking at matters of structure, one of the things that the Expert Panel looked for was the way in which ‘constructive alignment’ (the idea that there should be intellectual and practical connectivity between component parts of the learning and teaching experiences) is evident in each programme. Hence, learning outcomes should relate to teaching, learning and resourcing; and moreover, assessments should be ‘authentic’, meaning they present students with the most appropriate ways to test their attainment. The Expert Panel could see, from the SED and the interviews with staff, that the pedagogic theory of constructive alignment is utilised in practice, though more by intuition than through training. The analysis of structure encouraged the Expert Panel to ask more about the University’s mechanisms for training staff and maintaining their good standing in pedagogic principles and the ways to link them to practice.

The Expert Panel found out that in the programme structures at the BA level the number of credit hours for one ECTS credit is stated to be 30. However, the existing regulations of the HEI define one ECTS credit as 25 hours. This structural issue should be corrected by changing the number of credit hours of the mandatory courses both in structures and relevant syllabi.

### **Programme 1: Bachelor's Educational Programme in History**

This programme, like others in the cluster, has evolved over the past decade. For example, overarching goals, which give value to the greater understanding of international perspectives through the study of ‘World History’, have been embraced by the programme’s new Working Group; hence some of the content has been updated, reading lists refreshed, a bachelor’s thesis was made mandatory, graduate attributes about respect for differing opinions trumpeted and new forms of student evaluation implemented.

At the same time, there is the problem regarding the credit hours for the mandatory courses. In the curriculum of the BA Programme in History, the number of credit hours for one ECTS credit is given as 30. Hence, the 3-credit courses are assigned 90 credit hours, 4-credit courses – 120 credit hours, and 5-credit courses – 150 credit hours. This is a clear contravention of the existing regulations that define one ECTS credit as 25 hours. Since the regulations allow the increasing of the contact hours according to the course content, there is no need to change the number of credits for the mandatory courses and this structural issue should be corrected by changing the number of credit hours.

### **Programme 2: Master's Educational Programme in History**

The SED gives a rationale and fulsome details about why and how this programme’s structure has changed over time. The capstone lament for students is a thesis and, not unnaturally, the curriculum is therefore structured to prepare them for this. A requirement/pre-requisite concerning proficiency in the use of English enhances students’ learning capacities, not least because of the necessity to engage with a curriculum that lays greater store on international content and perspectives in a *World History* module. Moreover, there has been the integration of discrete support for Academic Writing (especially desirable, as writing a thesis is mandatory).

This degree programme has been structured to have connectivity with other programmes: it builds on the broad-based bachelors in History, in terms of knowledge, skills and concepts; and it also acts as a good preparation for those wishing to go on to take doctoral studies elsewhere.

While the structure of the programme is logical, there are two elective courses in the module of World History that should be removed from the programme. The course in Relations between European Countries and Georgia (XVII-XX Centuries) simply repeats, with minor changes in title, some of the topics, and literature of the course in Relations between Georgia and European Countries (XVII-XX Centuries), which is mandatory for the module of History of Georgia. Also, the course in Problems of European Union History repeats the BA level course in History of European Euro-Atlantic Integration. Since the mandatory literature for this course is more appropriate with the BA level, it should remain only in BA programme in History.

### **Programme 3: Bachelor's Educational Programme in Archaeology**

In common with other programmes in the cluster, subject specialist teachers and employers have formed a Working Group in archaeology and have consulted with experts from highly reputable European universities (including Oxford and Exeter, UK) to help in their thinking about curriculum developments in both structure and content.. This intellectual stimulus has been accompanied by the feedback gathered from the survey of their own graduate students.

At the same time, there is the problem regarding the credit hours for the mandatory courses. In the curriculum of the BA Programme in Archaeology, the number of credit hours for one ECTS credit is given as 30. Hence, the 3-credit courses are assigned 90 credit hours, 4-credit courses – 120 credit hours, and 5-credit courses – 150 credit hours. This is a contravention of the existing regulations that define one ECTS credit as 25 hours. Since the regulations allow the increasing of the contact hours according to the course content, there is no need to change the number of credits for the mandatory courses and this structural issue should be corrected by changing the number of credit hours.

### **Programme 4: Master's Educational Programme in Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus**

The Working Group, tasked to develop the whole curriculum, has sought to embrace best practice from scholars and course design used in a number of highly ranked HEIs across Europe. Hence, the curriculum offers a holistic perspective of classical archaeology in two key ways: by contextualising content within political, cultural and social dimensions; and by deploying a range of tasks to engage students and develop their knowledge and understanding.

Stakeholders have had the potential to contribute to the Working Group's thinking in the creation of learning outcomes and subject content; and the BSU portal ([portal.bsu.edu.ge](http://portal.bsu.edu.ge)) has questionnaires designed by the working group which asked students and graduates of the Master's and PhD Programmes in Archaeology, and also relevant employers to assess the credibility and relevance of learning outcomes.

### **Programme 5: PhD Educational Programme in Archaeology**

Maybe an easy way to describe the structure of this well-regarded PhD programme is to say that, in terms of academic content, it goes from the general to the particular. At the inset of their studies, students are presented with insights into archaeological dimensions of Georgia and its near geographical regions. In so doing, the significant direction of travel - intellectually speaking - is to nurture students so that they can move towards being autonomous learners. Consequently, course structure adopts styles of engagement to build their capacity accordingly: hence students attend, participate in, and contribute to seminars, group work, field visits, and also have the option of working as a professor's assistant. Importantly, the opportunity to work and 'rub shoulders' with foreign and visiting research scholars builds networking into the course structure. In short, this PhD programme links structure and content with strategies for learning.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Programs and their curricula;
- Syllabi;
- Self-Evaluation Report;
- Study Process Regulations;
- On-site interviews.

#### General recommendations of the cluster:

#### General suggestion of the cluster:

#### Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:

##### **Programme 1 (History, BA)**

Recommendation(s): One ECTS credit should be defined according to the University's regulations as 25 hours and the number of credit hours for the mandatory subjects should be corrected both in curriculum and relevant syllabi.

##### **Programme 2 (History, MA)**

Recommendation(s): The elective courses Relations between European Countries and Georgia (XVII-XX Centuries) and Problems of European Union History should be removed from the MA program as they repeat other courses.

##### **Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)**

Recommendation(s): One ECTS credit should be defined according to the University's regulations as 25 hours and the number of credit hours for the mandatory subjects should be corrected both in curriculum and relevant syllabi.

#### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component 1.4 Structure and Content of Educational Programme	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 1.5. Academic Course/Subject

- The content of the academic course / subject and the number of credits ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes defined by this course / subject.
- The content and the learning outcomes of the academic course/subject of the main field of study ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes of the programme.
- The study materials indicated in the syllabus ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes of the programme.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The content of the educational programmes grouped in the History-Archaeology cluster is described in each of the corresponding syllabi. These syllabi include following components: the title of the course (in Georgian and English); the course code; course status (faculty:level of study: programme: semester: status – mandatory/elective); author/authors of the course; lecturer/lecturers/responsible persons; goals of the course; number of credits per student’s hourly workload; admission preconditions; teaching and learning methods; student evaluation system and criteria; course learning outcomes; mandatory (basic) and additional (supplementary) literature; content of the course (main themes); and detailed content (topics) of the course.

The course content of all programmes grouped in the History-Archaeology cluster is designed in a manner which complies with the current standards and requirements. Each course has clearly defined and realistic learning outcomes in accordance with the learning outcomes of the relevant programme. The number of credits in each case is justified and corresponds well to the required workload, although the same cannot be said about the credit hours for the mandatory courses on BA level. Less satisfactory is the literature contained in the syllabi which in several cases has to be significantly updated at both BA and MA levels. During the interviews the Head of Quality Assurance Service stated that he can only make recommendations regarding the literature and it is up to the personnel and heads of programmes whether to accept their recommendations or not (See the relevant recommendation for increasing the role of Quality Assurance Service in Standard 5).

#### Programme 1 – Bachelor's Programme in History

The study courses of the BA programme in History are divided into mandatory and elective subjects. The learning outcomes of the courses correspond with the course goals. The learning outcomes and content of mandatory courses align with the learning outcomes of the programme. The course content and number

of credits correspond with the course learning outcomes (for the situation regarding the number of credit hours, see standard 1.4).

The workload of each course is described in detail in the syllabi. Teaching materials cited in the syllabi are mostly based on the attainment of the core subject knowledge and ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, although, as stated above, several syllabi contain outdated literature. There is also another problem: non-Georgian (primarily Russian, sometimes English, and, in one case, Turkish) literature is often cited along with Georgian literature in the mandatory reading. At the same time, it should be noted that knowledge of these foreign languages is not a prerequisite for those courses. Therefore, at BA level the literature should be given in the language of instruction (otherwise there should be a prerequisite describing the necessary level of knowledge in other languages). In short, having these foreign language sources in the resources makes it more difficult for students, without the capacity in those languages, to achieve both the course and programme learning outcomes. Therefore, it should be corrected. Finally, there is one technical error: the syllabus for the course in the History of Georgia (X-XIV centuries) is presented in the wrong form. It should be rewritten in the new format..

### **Programme 2 – Master's Programme in History**

The study courses of the MA programme in History are divided into three types: mandatory courses for both modules, compulsory courses for each and elective courses. The learning outcomes and contents of mandatory courses align with the learning outcomes of the program. The course contents, number of the credits and credit hours correspond with the course learning outcomes.

The workload of each course is described in detail in the syllabus. Teaching materials are mostly based on ensuring attainment of the intended learning outcomes, although the Expert Panel noted that several syllabi contain outdated literature. Also, there are two compulsory courses (The History of the Eastern European Countries at the Boundary of XX-XXI Centuries and Problems of Social and Economic Development of Western European Countries in XVI-XX Centuries), which mostly contain mandatory literature more appropriate for teaching and learning at the BA level. This matter should be corrected. As for the elective courses in Relations between European Countries and Georgia (XVII-XX Centuries) and Problems of European Union History, see the recommendation in standard 1.4.

### **Programme 3 – Bachelor's Programme in Archeology**

The study courses of the BA programme in Archaeology are compiled in accordance with the rules in force at BSU. The distribution of academic courses, by semester, takes account of their complexity, preconditions and logical connectivity and coherence with each other. The academic courses, within the programme, have been constructed in accordance with the European ECTS credit system and the 100-point evaluation scheme. Moreover, courses are designed to ensure that their purpose, learning outcomes and teaching methods meet the overall goals of the educational programme and learning outcomes. The core study courses have coherence, and build, intellectually, on each other; they are consistent in terms of content and focused on building capacity in both theoretical knowledge and taking theory into field practice. The programme, in terms of size, includes 3, 4, and 5 credit courses, which have been created having taken into account how course content matches and fulfils learning outcomes.

Thus, a successful Bachelor of Humanities in Archeology will acquire knowledge in very broad range of subjects all of which develop professional competence through modules such as: An Introduction to Archaeology, The Archeology of the Prehistoric and Historical Age of Georgia, The Archeology of the Ancient East, Biblical Archeology, Numismatics, Glyptic-Toreutics, Archaeological Research Methods, Archeology and Modern Technologies, The Basics of Applied Geophysics, Topography-Cartography, The

Basics of Drawing and Architectural Constructions, The History of Architecture, and Field Archaeological practice, etc. General theoretical competences are deepened through the use of relevant sources, an understanding of the historiography of Georgian history, a general course of cultural history, and also anthropology and architecture, etc.

The learning outcomes of the main field of study of the bachelor's archeology programme are fully aligned with the learning outcomes of the programme. An analysis of each course/subject and its number of credits and allocated hours (both for contact and independent work) determines the ratio between teaching, learning and expectations for student outcomes. Each learning outcome is evaluated through different forms of assessment/ The Expert Panel can confirm that the required reading and other study materials indicated in the course/subject syllabi are based on the current developments in the field. The academic course is described clearly in the syllabus and includes the following information: name of the course; duration; number of credits; distribution of hours; lecturer(s); prerequisites for admission to the course; teaching methods; purpose of the course; learning outcomes and competencies; methods of assessment; literature and other resources; topics week-by-week.

During the analysis of teaching courses, the following issues emerged: variously, 45 or 60 contact hours are provided for 5 credit academic courses; and in some cases the number of hours in the mandatory study courses of the main field of study is determined as follows: 1 credit is allocated 30 hours (which contravenes University regulations).

#### **Programme 4 – Master's Programme in Classical Archeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus**

Study courses in this programme have been created in accordance with BSU's quality assurance regulations. The content and level of the academic courses correspond to the requirements of the 7th level of the Qualifications Framework and are in accordance with the student's optimum workload in order to ensure that the programme's objectives and outcomes are attainable. The allocation of modules in each semester takes into account their academic complexity, to facilitate student progression. The academic courses are compiled according to the European ECTS credit system and the 100-point evaluation scheme. The learning outcomes of the teaching courses are derived from the learning outcomes of the educational programme itself, which was mainly determined according to the sectoral benchmarks for archeology. The study courses envisaged by the programme are designed to ensure that their purpose, learning outcomes and teaching methods meet the goals of the educational programmes and learning outcomes. Main study courses are derived from each other, are consistent with content and focused on the development of skill to use field competences and theoretical knowledge in practice. During the determination of credits, contact and independent hours for each study course, the matter of students being able to achieve the goals and learning outcomes of the educational programme was given close consideration in order to be assured that they could reach the appropriate level of attainment. Usefully, an electronic version of the lecture course/reader has been prepared to support the teaching element of the course. The programme contains 5-credit bearing taught courses, which are designed to take account of the programme's learning outcomes; consequently, specific ways of achieving learning outcomes and criteria for assessment are reflected in each course. The programme was diversified with some focused on theory and other on developing the professional and practical capacities for becoming a practitioner in archeology (See Modules: Problems of the Ancient History of Georgia, the Caucasus and the Black Sea, archeology of each region of the Black Sea and the Caucasus, ancient numismatics, Greek vase painting, urban archeology, colonization issues, etc.). Along with theoretical and craft knowledge, students take courses that allow them to deepen their specialist knowledge (geoarchaeology, archaeological research of speleological monuments, experimental-ethnological method and its application in archeology, graphic fixation of archaeological monuments); and there is also the 10-credit fieldwork element in archaeological

practice. Other, important academic and presentation skills are taught in the mandatory module Academic Writing, which develops students' understanding and application of academic integrity, standards for writing and research, persuasive writing and how to formulate a conclusion.

The course/subject learning outcomes of the main field of study in the Master of Archaeology are fully aligned with the programme learning outcomes; and the content also aligns with the learning outcomes in each module. The number of credits and corresponding hours have been determined to take into account the individual characteristics of each module's content and learning outcomes. The times allocated to contact and independent work are given in the syllabi and the ratio between them takes account of the amount of work required. The number of contact hours is fully consistent with the content and learning outcomes of this course/subject. Each learning outcome is evaluated through a variety of types of assessment, with suitable criteria for assessment. The required literature and other study materials specified in the programme course/subject syllabi are based on current research in the field. In the syllabi and concepts, the learning outcomes of the courses are mostly formulated in the present tense and use active verbs: this encourages both staff and students to see them as actionable and relevant. The academic course is described in the syllabus as follows: course name; duration; number of credits; distribution of hours (contact and independent work hours); lecturer(s); prerequisites for admission to the course; teaching methods; purpose of the course; learning outcomes and competencies; main topics; methods of assessment; literature and other resources; topics on a week-by-week basis.

### **Programme 5 – Doctoral Programme in Archaeology**

The courses in this programme have been constructed in accordance with BSU's quality assurance regulations. The content and level of the teaching and learning correspond to the requirements of the 8th level of the qualifications framework. The distribution of modules in each semester takes account of the complexity of the learning outcomes. The academic courses have been constructed in accordance with the European ECTS credit system and the 100-point evaluation scheme. The learning outcomes of the teaching course are derived from the learning outcomes of the programme. The core study courses are coherent, meaning they build knowledge and understanding that support the intellectual development in their own right and for each other; content is at the correct level and is focused on the development of knowledge that develops theoretical understanding and informs practitioner skills. Each module's credit points, contact and independent study hours, format and resources have been carefully allocated to allow students to achieve (and the University to evaluate) the learning outcomes and educational goals. The study literature provided by the syllabuses is up-to-date, relevant to the subject matter and based on the latest developments in the field. There are 5-credit academic courses in the educational programme, which were distributed taking into account the overall content of the course and learning outcomes. Subject content and learning outcomes have been used to inform each module's methods of teaching and evaluation; and modes for attaining learning outcomes, and criteria for assessment are shown in each syllabus. The mandatory reading matter and other learning materials and resources are up-to-date, and some other, relatively recent publications also listed. There are also electronic versions of the lectures amongst the resources.

Each module within the doctorate of Archaeology has learning outcomes that are fully aligned to support students' development towards attaining the programme's overall learning outcomes. The content of each study course/subject corresponds well to its learning outcomes. The number of credits and hours allocated to teaching and learning have been calculated to make the learning outcomes achievable. The times allocated for contact hours and independent work are given in the syllabi, and the ratio between them and the amount allocated are adequate and take into account the particular needs and learning c=outcomes of each course. Learning outcomes are evaluated in different ways, and the criteria for assessment are shown in the syllabus. The directed reading, literature and other study materials listed in the syllabi are based on

up-to-date research in the field. Each syllabus and includes the following information: name of the course; duration; number of credits; the allocation of hours (contact and independent work hours); lecturer(s); prerequisites for admission to the course; teaching methods; purpose of the course; learning outcomes and competencies; main topics; methods of assessment; literature and other resources; topics, week-by-week.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Programmes;
- Syllabi;
- Self-Evaluation Report;
- On-site interviews.

#### General recommendations of the cluster:

#### General suggestions of the cluster:

#### Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:

##### **Programme 1 (History, BA)**

**Recommendation(s):** In order to assure the achievement of learning outcomes, the outdated and/or foreign-language literature should be removed from the following syllabi: 1. General Ethnology; 2. History of Near East (V-XXI centuries); 3. History of Middle Ages (1); 4. History of Middle Ages (2); 5. History of Byzantine (the title in English should be History of Byzantine Empire or History of Byzantium); 6. History of Russia; 7. New and Recent History of European and American Countries (1) (the correct title in English should start with Modern and Contemporary History); 8. New and Recent History of European and American Countries (2); 9. History of World Civilizations; 10. Modern and Contemporary History of Asian and African Countries; 11. Ancient Centres of Black Sea Coast; 12. History of International Relations; 13. History of Turkey (XX-XXI centuries); 14. Georgian, Georgian Diaspores abroad; 15. International Relations and Conflicts; 16. Sea Strategy in International Politics; 17. Georgia's First Republic.

**Suggestion(s):** The technical mistake regarding the syllabus of the course in History of Georgia (X-XIV centuries) should be corrected.

##### **Programme 2 (History, MA)**

**Recommendation(s):** In order to assure the achievement of learning outcomes, the mandatory literature should be enriched and updated in the following syllabi: 1. Problems of World History; 2. Georgia and Antique World; 3. Relations between Georgia and European Countries (X-XVI Centuries); 4. Relations between Georgia and European Countries (XVII-XX Centuries); 5. Historical Sources and Historiography of Georgia of XIX-XX Centuries; 6. Problems of ethno-cultural history of Georgia; 7. History of the Eastern European Countries at the Boundary of XX-XXI Centuries; 8. Problems of Social and Economic Development of Western European Countries in XVI-XX Centuries.

**Suggestion(s):** It will be better to replace Donald Rayfield’s Book *Edge of Empires: A History of Georgia* with a more appropriate history book as mandatory literature in the course of Professional English. Donald Rayfield is not a professional historian and his book contains a great number of factual mistakes. Hence, it will be better to use other books, by historians, in this case.

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component 1.5 Academic Course/Subject	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Compliance of the programmes with the standards

1. Educational Programme Objectives, Learning Outcomes and their Compliance with the Programme	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2. Methodology and Organisation of Teaching, Adequacy of Evaluation of Programme Mastering

Prerequisites for admission to the programme, teaching-learning methods and student assessment consider the specificity of the study field, level requirements, student needs, and ensure the engagement achievement of the objectives and expected learning outcomes of the programme.

### 2.1 Programme Admission Preconditions

The HEI has relevant, transparent, fair, public and accessible programme admission preconditions and procedures that ensure the engagement of individuals with relevant knowledge and skills in the programme to achieve learning outcomes.

---

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The preconditions for admission to the programmes grouped in the cluster are relevant and fair. They are publicly accessible via the University webpage: <https://bsu.edu.ge>. The preconditions are in accordance with Georgian legislation and they ensure the admission of people with relevant knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes of the programmes. At the same time, it is worth mentioning that some of the wording in these sections about admissions can be confusing because some of the wording is over-complicated.

#### **Programme 1 – Bachelor's Programme in History**

The preconditions for the admission to the BA programme in History are:

- Attainment of the General Education diploma;
- Passing National Entrance Exams.

Admission of the foreign citizens takes place according to the Georgian Legislation.

Internal or external mobility is also possible. Information about the prerequisites for admission to the programme via mobility is posted on the University website.

The preconditions for admission to the BA Programme in History are relevant and fair. At the same time, the wording is complicated which may lead to misunderstandings. The preconditions are in accordance with Georgian legislation and they ensure the admission of people with relevant knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme. They are publicly accessible at the University webpage: <https://bsu.edu.ge>

#### **Programme 2 – Master's Programme in History**

The preconditions for the admission to the MA programme in History are:

- Bachelor's or equal Degree;
- Passing National Master Exams;
- Passing the University Entrance Exam in a speciality;
- Passing the University Entrance exam in foreign language (English, German, French, or Russian) – B2 level (or presenting the certificate confirming the B2 level proficiency in those languages).

Admission of the foreign citizens takes place in accordance with Georgian legislation.

Internal or external mobility is also possible. Information about the prerequisites for admission to the programme via mobility is posted on the University website.

The preconditions for admission to the MA programme in History are relevant and fair. At the same time, the wording is complicated which may lead to some misunderstandings. The preconditions are in accordance with Georgian legislation and they ensure the admission of people with relevant knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme. They are publicly accessible at the University webpage: <https://bsu.edu.ge>

### **Programme 3 – Bachelor's Programme in Archaeology**

The preconditions for the admission to the BA programme in History are:

- Attainment of a General Education diploma;
- Passing National Entrance Exams.

Admission of the foreign citizens takes place according to Georgian legislation.

Internal or external mobility is also possible. Information about the prerequisites for admission to the programme via mobility is posted on the University website.

The preconditions for admission to the BA Programme in Archaeology are relevant and fair. At the same time, the wording is complicated which may cause some misunderstandings. The preconditions are in accordance with the Georgian legislation and they ensure the admission of persons with relevant knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme. They are publicly accessible at the University webpage: <https://bsu.edu.ge>

### **Programme 4 – Master's Programme in Classical Archaeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus**

The preconditions for the admission to the MA programme in Archaeology are:

- Bachelor's or equivalent degree;
- Passing National Master Exams;
- Passing the University Entrance Exam in a speciality;
- Passing the University Entrance exam in foreign language (English, German, French, or Russian) – B2 level (or presenting the certificate confirming the B2 level proficiency in those languages).

Admission of the foreign citizens takes place according to Georgian legislation.

Internal or external mobility is also possible. Information about the prerequisites for admission to the program via mobility is posted on the University website.

The preconditions for admission to the MA programme in History are relevant and fair. At the same time, the wording is complicated which may lead to some misunderstandings. The preconditions are in accordance with Georgian legislation and they ensure the admission of people with relevant knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme. They are publicly accessible at the University webpage: <https://bsu.edu.ge>

### **Programme 5 – PhD Programme in Archaeology**

The preconditions for the admission to the PhD programme in Archaeology are:

- Master's degree or equivalent academic degree;
- Passing the University Entrance exam in English – B2 level (or presenting the certificate confirming the B2 level proficiency in English);
- Consent of a potential scientific supervisor;
- Brief abstract of a PhD research project;
- Interview in a speciality area.

Candidates, who are not native Georgian speakers, should confirm the Georgian language proficiency at C1 level.

The preconditions for admission to the PhD programme in Archaeology are relevant and fair. At the same time, the wording is complicated which may lead to some misunderstandings. The preconditions are in accordance with Georgian legislation and they ensure the admission of people with relevant knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme. They are publicly accessible at the University webpage: <https://bsu.edu.ge>

#### **Evidences/Indicators**

- Programmes;
- Self-Evaluation Report.

#### **General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:** The wording of admission preconditions for all programmes is overly complicated and it may sometimes lead to confusion. It would probably be better, for example, if the University presents them as bullet points.

#### **Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:**

#### **Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component 2.1 Programme admission preconditions	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2.2. The Development of Practical, Scientific/Research/Creative/Performing and Transferable Skills

Programme ensures the development of students' practical, scientific/research/creative/performing and transferable skills and/or their involvement in research projects, in accordance with the programme learning outcomes.

### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The components of the educational programmes are consistent in content and, moreover, develop transferable, practical and basic research skills along with theoretical knowledge. The curricula of the training courses take into account theoretical teaching and practical activities. Practical courses at BSU give students the opportunity to apply knowledge and skills in practice in order to better utilise interdisciplinarity to understand the region. Practice and experiential learning helps to consolidate and deepen the theoretical knowledge acquired by the student during the course of their programme.

Students use the material and technical base of the University for scientific research; and in the process of practical and research activities they are guided and evaluated by an appropriately qualified expert in the field. The University has signed memoranda of co-operation with government agencies and educational, scientific, archival and museum institutions, with a view to enhancing both educational and professional practice. Scholarly activity is further encouraged by the Faculty of Humanities, which periodically holds its own scientific conferences.

Students at all three levels, from bachelors to doctoral, are actively involved in various field and laboratory research. For example, every year they participate in archaeological fieldwork, and conduct research and, for example, the photography of artefacts.

The Bachelor's degree programme in history not only develops theoretical knowledge, but also practical, fundamental research, and other transferable skills. The ratio of theoretical learning and practical activities is taken into account in the syllabuses and is reflected appropriately and proportionately in the learning outcomes of training courses.

Students in all three levels of study in each programme participate in scientific conferences in order to work towards the following educational outcomes: the identification of specialised knowledge and practical and creative skills; the application of knowledge gained during the

learning process; the development of scientific and research skills; and, importantly, the encouragement of young researchers. Students are able to conduct research using BSU's resources and its technical bases and sites of BSU. While students are conducting their research and practical activities, they receive guidance from and are evaluated by a competent, qualified person in their field.

The Bachelor's programme in Archaeology has a curriculum specifically geared towards developing students' theoretical, practical and research skills in a manner which allows them to be transferable to a number of professional settings. A variety of teaching and learning methods lead students to apply theoretical knowledge and understanding in order to solve practical and research problems.

Fieldwork and museum practice is especially important in the discipline of Archaeology. The Expert Panel can confirm that BSU's archaeology programmes develop a whole host of vital field-based operational skills: the ability to identify and classify samples of material culture; keep field diaries and museum notebooks; and prepare and present practical reports. The sustainability of practical courses is bolstered and enhanced by each of the Archaeology programmes' use of the facilities in the Batumi Archaeological Museum, the Adjara Museum, the Gonio-Apsaros Museum-Reserve of the Adjara Cultural Heritage Agency. Moreover, there is also the use of the Pichvnari Archaeological Base which has funds allocated to it by the University. To support staff and students in their quest for site-based learning, the University signed memorandums of co-operation with government agencies, and also other educational, research and museum institutions, which provide for the principles and mechanisms of co-operation in this direction.

The Master's programme in Ancient Archeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus has training courses which develop student's theoretical knowledge and understanding as well as their practical, research and transferable skills. A suitably qualified supervisor supports students to prepare a thesis. However, students are also obliged to either present a report at a conference which has either a scientific or practical focus or publish in the collection of University's compendium of the works by students and young scientists. The student completes a master's thesis under the supervision of a qualified specialist. At the next academic level, the PhD programme in Archaeology allows students, working under appropriately qualified supervision, to engage in research projects that lead to the completion of a doctoral dissertation.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Educational programme /syllabus;
- Interviews with students and professors;
- Regulations for holding the student university scientific conference at BSU, decision of the representative council of February 26, 2018 No. 02. Link: [https://bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_9713\\_1.pdf](https://bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_9713_1.pdf);
- Decision No. 03 of February 26, 2018 of the Representative Council on establishing a one-time incentive monetary award for participation in various events by university students at BSU. Link: [https://bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_9640\\_1.pdf](https://bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_9640_1.pdf);
- The procedure for submitting and financing student initiatives and projects at BSU. Decision No. 01 of April 25, 2017 of the Representative Council. Link: [https://bsu.edu.ge/upload/studenturi\\_proqtebis\\_dafinansebis\\_wesi\\_2019\\_2020.pdf](https://bsu.edu.ge/upload/studenturi_proqtebis_dafinansebis_wesi_2019_2020.pdf);

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:**

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with the component

Component 2.2. The Development of practical, scientific/research/creative/performing and transferable Skills	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2.3. Teaching and Learning Methods

The programme is implemented by using student-centered teaching and learning methods. Teaching and learning methods correspond to the level of education, course/subject content, learning outcomes and ensure their achievement.

### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

As the cluster shares a number of academic staff, it is not unnatural for a number of teaching and learning methods to be commonly deployed across the five programmes (with obvious finessing to take account of the differing levels of attainment expected and the sizes of groups). For this reason, the following, individual programme sections, below, will be notable for their brevity - and the many good, shared teaching, learning and assessment practices stated here. (The exception to this brevity will be the section about teaching and learning in the PhD, where personalised learning techniques are both distinctive and noteworthy.)

To begin: methods of teaching and learning are aligned to learning objectives designed to increase students' capacities to perform historical and archaeological enquiry at an appropriate intellectual and practical level. Testimony to this is found in the overall outcomes of many students, who either go into working in roles associated with educational, cultural and other heritage industries or progress to working at higher, more challenging levels. There is the use of direct assessment via: written examinations (both mid-term and final): a mandatory thesis; tests; through problem-

based learning exercises or project work; plus through essays and presentations. The lecture remains a key method, as does the seminar and other forms of small group teaching. In common with the teaching of humanities subjects elsewhere, there is the analysis of written and other source materials in order to address a problem. Students would most usually be expected to express their findings in written form, such as via a report or essay. It was not clear, however, from the documentation, whether the pedagogic technique of assessment for learning was used so that students could use assignments themselves as a way to develop, rather than just demonstrate knowledge and understanding. Teaching strategies also include demonstrations, audio and visual resources and study visits to museums, archives and libraries. The SED's claim of interactive methods, with students collaborating with each other and presenting work in a variety of ways was borne out in one of the interviews with staff. More, however, could have been said about the claim of 'action-oriented teaching - the active involvement of a professor and a student in the teaching process', though a discussion with students strongly implied that this manifested itself particularly during fieldwork and field visits to museums, archives and the like.

One further matter is noteworthy. The SED suggests that a deliberate strategy of aligning teaching with learning outcomes has taken place. Each of the five programmes demonstrates, through its own syllabus, the ways in which its learning outcomes are to be achieved through a combination of content, student learning and evaluation. This is followed by the suggestion of what, in the USA, is called 'backward design', in other words, strategies for teaching are subsequently devised in order to guide students towards the successful attainment of those learning outcomes. Certainly, one of the key tasks of each Working Group is to ensure that there is alignment between teaching and content. The Expert Panel were keen to explore how well teaching staff were prepared to deploy constructive alignment in planning, teaching and assessment and furthermore and more generally, to explore what sort of pedagogic training they received so that they could link pedagogic theory to practice. The SED makes the claim that, periodically, training supports staff in this way, and that it contributes to their professional development profile. From the interviews, the Expert Panel could not find corroborative evidence to suggest that pedagogic training was taken up *en masse* by staff. The panel is of the view that one way to make positive strides forward for better aligning learning outcomes, and teaching and learning with authentic assessment is by having more systematic, centralised training that receives adequate recognition by the University.

### **Programme 1: Bachelor's Educational Programme in History**

This programme has been very responsive to student and other stakeholders' views about the importance of teaching and learning in the student experience and so, in the past few years the University has committed more hours to many of the courses; some that were optional have been brought into the core curriculum; and, in common with cluster-wide practice, the thesis is mandatory. Mindful of the attrition rates - approximately two-thirds of starters study to completion - this programme may wish to consider strategies for learning and teaching which are likely to help to reduce the student drop-out rate.

### **Programme 2: Master's Educational Programme in History**

In addition to the generic information in the cluster overview section, above, it is worth noting that the SED claims that up to 60% of contact hours in this programme are devoted to group work. In common with the first degree programme, discussion and debate play an important part in the learning experience, as does problem-based learning, case analysis. The capstone to learning, as in other programmes, is the thesis.

### **Programme 3: Bachelor's Educational Programme in Archaeology**

The SED suggests that teaching and learning methods are very varied throughout all of the archaeology programmes. Methods include traditional forms of teaching, such as the lecture and seminar, textual analysis, as well as summarising and analysing materials, whether for a report or essay. There is also a particular emphasis on interactive and practical methods designed to shape their professional practice of a working archaeologist. There is also, as stated in the SED, an emphasis on groupwork/ co-operative learning, learning through case studies, demonstration, experiential and action-oriented learning. In archaeology, there is also the very practical dimensions of professional practice which are taught via fieldwork, which students carry out twice during their studies.

### **Programme 4: Master's Educational Programme in Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus**

Teaching strategies include the discussion and analysis of case studies; group work; problem-based and 'situational', meaning site-based studies and visits; though it is noteworthy that innovative practice has not meant the death knell of well-established, traditional forms of learning, such as independent research and report writing.

### **Programme 5: PhD Educational Programme in Archaeology**

As well as the training they receive to work on their thesis, PhD students are given many opportunities to enhance their research and scholarly activity through a range of co-curricular activities organised by the department - via doctoral student's seminars, excellent fieldwork sites (including Gonio and Pine), and by becoming a professor's assistant. As with others studying across the cluster, there is an expectation that students hone their English language skills, but, notably, in this programme students also have the possibility to learn from and collaborate with foreign specialists. This combination facilitates their ability to conduct research and work internationally.

Learning (and associated outcomes) for the PhD are assessed directly (through exercises, such as problem-based learning) and indirectly (via discussions/debate); and throughout the programme, even though learning is at doctoral level, demonstrating knowledge in practice still carries enormous weight.

#### **Evidences/Indicators**

- The Self-Evaluation Document

- Interviews with BSU staff

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:**

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with the component

Component 2.3. Teaching and learning methods	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2.4. Student Evaluation

Student evaluation is conducted in accordance with the established procedures. It is transparent, reliable and complies with existing legislation.

### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

Based on the self-evaluation document (SED), the documentation attached to it and the information obtained as a result of the accreditation visit, the Expert Panel determined that the evaluation of students is carried out according to BSU's established procedures and is transparent and in accordance with relevant legislation. According to the University's educational process regulatory document and study course syllabi, a multi-component system of knowledge assessment is used to assess learning outcomes during the semester, namely through mid-term assessments and final examinations, the sum of which represents the final assessment grade, out of 100 points. Depending on the educational programme, both oral and written techniques (including tests, open questions, term paper(s), presentation(s), etc.) are used to assess students' knowledge. The final exam establishes whether or not a student has reached a minimum competence level (meaning no less than 60%, according to legislative guidelines). It is worth noting that in the syllabus of all training courses points/marks are distributed in the following way: 20 points allocated to the mid-term exam; 40 points for the final assessment; and the remaining 40 points for the ongoing assessment, which is generally comprised of different components, each utilising a variety of methods for assessment depending on the course. Criteria for assessment are identical across most courses. The Expert Panel suggest that it is desirable to diversify the forms

of assessment/evaluation deployed in the mid-term and final exam, in accordance with the needs of the course and its learning outcomes.

During the accreditation visit, it was agreed that the types of assessment, in terms of components and methods, are transparent; and they are published on the electronic learning portal and known to students in advance. Moreover, academic staff are familiar with modern assessment methods, and are said to be supported by the institution to develop skills to carry out the task. The University has implemented effective mechanisms for evaluation and sharing feedback. In order to make the student evaluations objective, exam scripts are coded in order that it be anonymised, and when feedback is returned to students, it is through the BSU electronic portal.

Educational programmes are completed with the student's defence of their thesis, which is generally evaluated in the same semester of submission by established rules and regulations. The University has systems in place for ensuring the following important features for all theses: the protection of intellectual property, copyright, ethical practice and standards of scientific research using plagiarism prevention measures. To this end, students and staff are informed before the final hand-in date about the principles of academic integrity, and, for example, all master's theses are checked using anti-plagiarism software. Students are also informed about the appeal procedure and its mechanisms.

With regards to the doctoral programme the Expert Panel noticed one area that the University should discuss and attend to. In the syllabus 'professor's assistantship' the Expert Panel discovered a contravention of the current Rule for Evaluation of Student Learning Outcomes at BSU: there is a single evaluation of the professor's assistantship and it does not contain a component for final evaluation. (Importantly, the professor's assistantship is a part of a study component and not a research component of the doctoral programme; and according to Georgian regulations there is a necessity for there to be two forms of evaluation - mid-term and final). Additionally, learning outcomes in this syllabus have been designed with reference to the old qualification framework (with its 6 categories of Learning Outcomes instead of the 3 new categories in the current qualification framework).

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Master's educational programme and syllabi;
- programme self-evaluation document;
- Resolution No. 111 of October 8, 2015 "On approval of the regulation of the educational process" (amended by resolution N61 of the BSU Academic Council dated August 9, 2016, amended by resolution N20 of the BSU Academic Council dated April 5, 2017).  
[https://www.bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_4958\\_1.pdf](https://www.bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_4958_1.pdf)
- Resolution # 23 of February 20, 2018 "On approval of instructions for conducting examinations";
- Resolution No. 06-01/71 of the BSU Academic Council of July 8, 2019 "On the approval of the rule of academic integrity protection at BSU";
- Results of the conducted interview.

#### General recommendations of the cluster:

**General suggestions of the cluster:** It is desirable to diversify the evaluation forms of the mid-term and final exam, in accordance with the individual characteristics of the course and its learning outcomes.

**Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:**

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with the component

Component 2.4 - Student evaluation	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Compliance of the programmes with the standards

2. Methodology and Organisation of Teaching, Adequacy Evaluation of Programme Mastering	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 3. Student Achievements, Individual Work with Them

The programme ensures the creation of a student-centered environment by providing students with relevant services; promotes maximum student awareness, implements a variety of activities and facilitates student engagement in local and / or international projects; proper quality of scientific guidance and supervision is provided for master's and doctoral students.

### 3.1 Student Consulting and Support Services

Students receive consultation and support regarding planning of the learning process, improvement of academic achievement, and career development from the people involved in the programme and/or structural units of the HEI. A student has an opportunity to have a diverse learning process and receive relevant information and recommendations from those involved in the programme.

## Cluster and individual evaluation

### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

Following an analysis of the relevant documents, interviews with the University administration, programme leaders, teaching staff and students and graduates, it was determined that students receive counselling on the planning of educational processes, their academic attainment, and are given advice about teaching and employment.

Interviews with academic and invited staff revealed that those involved in the implementation of the educational programmes ensured the provision of appropriate information to the students. The hours, for this provision of academic/personal tutoring support, is included in their annual workload. Other interviews, with students, confirmed that they actively participate in local projects, research and conferences. Both staff and students benefit from the University's co-operation with other HEIs and its use of the EU's Erasmus+ exchange projects..

The University has a well-organised, modern electronic management system, which is actively used by both students and academic staff, and the system effectively provides relevant feedback and services to students. The student portal is distinguished by its multifunctional capabilities, which communicates effectively, provides access to information and altogether makes it easy to use student services. Through the student portal, the University, together with the faculty, provides information to graduate students about vacancies, connects them with potential employers, recommends selected candidates, and helps with professional advancement.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- educational programme;
- programme self-evaluation document (SED);
- procedures related to the University's student services;
- Results of the conducted interview.

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:**

#### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with the component

Component 3.1 Student consulting and support services	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3.2. Master's and Doctoral Student Supervision

- A scientific supervisor provides proper support to master's and doctorate students to perform the scientific-research component successfully.
- Within master's and doctoral programmes, ratio of students and supervisors enables to perform scientific supervision properly.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

A thesis is a mandatory component within both the master's programme for History and Archaeology.

The cluster also features a doctoral programme in Archaeology; and supervisors of the doctoral thesis can either be a BSU professor or associate professor or a BSU scientific official with a doctorate or equivalent academic degree (principal scientific employee/senior scientific employee). The scientific supervisor must also have research experience in the scientific field related to the dissertation topic and relevant publications approved by the academic council, including at least one indexed in the Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics), ERIH PLUS (European Reference Index of the Humanities), Scopus databases. Interviews with supervisors and students of master's and doctoral theses confirmed that in the process of writing a thesis, a master's and doctoral student does receive supervision from a qualified supervisor and, if necessary, one or more co-supervisors who have had their relevant scientific and research experience relevant to the research topic confirmed [according to the 'Regulating Rule of BSU Educational Process' approved by the Resolution N111 of the Academic Council of BSU dated October 8, 2015].

The selection of dissertation research topics is based on a process of reconciling the opinions of the student and their potential supervisor. A potential supervisor and ultimately the supervisor are selected on the basis of the specific nature of the research topic. The supervisor then has regular consultations with the student, for which consultation hours are allocated in their workload. The frequency of consultations varies, depending on the nature of the research topic and student need. The supervisor advises the student both in the preparation of the theoretical aspects of the subject and also about the scientific and practical elements of research and scholarly activity. The supervisor not only advises the student in the research process, but also helps in the process of participating in relevant scientific events and presenting their results. Within the framework of the visit, master's and doctoral theses provided by the institution were studied: most of which were interesting in terms of topic and met standards.

Data related to the supervision of master's/doctoral students
---

Programme 2 (MA History), 4 (MA Archaeology), 5 (PhD Arch) <sup>8</sup>	
Number of master's/doctoral theses supervisors	12, 6, 4
//Number of doctoral thesis supervisors	4
Number of master's students	34
//Number of doctoral students	5
Ratio - supervisors of master's theses/master's students	0,39; 2
Ratio - supervisors of doctoral theses/doctoral students	0,8

### Evidences/Indicators

- educational program;
- program self-evaluation report;
- Results of the conducted interview.

General recommendations of the cluster:

General suggestions of the cluster:

Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with the component

Component 3.2. Master's and Doctoral Student Supervision	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Compliance of the programmes with the standards

<sup>8</sup> In case of necessity please add the appropriate number of tables for the educational programmes grouped in a cluster.

3. Student Achievements, Individual Work with them	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4. Providing Teaching Resources

Human, material, information and financial resources of educational programme/educational programmes grouped in a cluster ensure the sustainable, stable, efficient and effective functioning of the programme and the achievement of the defined objectives.

##### 4.1 Human Resources

- Programme staff consists of qualified persons who have necessary competences in order to help students to achieve the programme learning outcomes.
- The number and workload of programme academic/scientific and invited staff ensures the sustainable running of the educational process and also, proper execution of their research/creative/performance activities and other assigned duties. Quantitative indicators related to academic/scientific/invited staff ensure programme sustainability.
- The Head of the Programme possesses necessary knowledge and experience required for programme elaboration, and also the appropriate competences in the field of study of the programme. He/she is personally involved in programme implementation.
- Programme students are provided with an adequate number of administrative and support staff with relevant competence.

##### Cluster and individual evaluation

##### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

Staff of all the programmes grouped in the History-Archaeology cluster of BSU consists of qualified specialists. The personnel files (CVs, publications, participation in conferences, and other activities) of both academic and invited staff confirm that all of them are qualified scholars who possess the required competences to ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The ratio between academic and invited staff and between staff and students provided in the quantitative indicators is important in proving the programmes' sustainability. The workload of the academic and invited staff ensures that they can properly conduct their research activities alongside performing their duties in the educational/teaching and learning process. The heads of all programmes have the necessary qualities and experience in programme elaboration and development. Moreover, all three of them are personally participating in the implementation of the programmes.

##### Description and Analysis

## Programme 1 – Bachelor's Programme in History

The full staff for BA programme in History consists of 37 lecturers. 30 of them represent the academic staff (11 professors, 14 associate professors, and 5 assistant professors), while 7 are invited lecturers (one among them holds a scientific position). It should be mentioned that the Self-Evaluation Document gives incorrect data about this and the number of professors is given quantitatively, and the list of personnel is only available in Georgian. Everyone from the academic staff is affiliated with Batumi State University. The personnel files (CVs, publications, participation in conferences, and other activities) of both academic and invited staff confirm that all of them are qualified scholars who possess the required competences to ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The ratio between academic and invited staff and between staff and students provided in the quantitative indicators is important in proving the programme's sustainability. The workload of the academic and invited staff ensures that they can properly conduct their research activities alongside performing their duties in the educational/teaching and learning process.

The heads of programme possess the necessary qualities of academic leadership and are already experienced in programme elaboration and development. All three of them are personally participating in the programme.

The programme is administered by the Faculty of Humanities. Both the administrative and support staff possess the necessary competences to provide the adequate support for the students enrolled in the programme.

<b>Programme 1 (History, BA)</b>				
<b>Number of the staff involved in the programme (including academic, scientific, and invited staff)</b>	<b>Number of Programme Staff</b>	<b>Including the staff with sectoral expertise</b>	<b>Including the staff holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction</b>	<b>Among them, the affiliated academic staff</b>
<b>Total number of academic staff</b>	<b>37</b>			
<b>- Professor</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>- Associate Professor</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>- Assistant-Professor</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>- Assistant</b>				

<b>Invited Staff</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Scientific Staff</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

## **Programme 2 – Master's Programme in History**

The full staff for MA programme in History consists of 22 lecturers. 21 among them represent the academic staff (7 professors, 12 associate professors, and 2 assistant professors), while 1 is an invited lecturer. (It should be mentioned that Self-Evaluation Document misses one Associate Professor in this case and the number of professors is given quantitatively and the list of personnel, which is only available in Georgian.) Everyone from the academic staff is affiliated with Batumi State University. The personnel files (CVs, publications, participation in conferences, and other activities) of both academic and invited staff confirm that all of them are qualified scholars who possess the required competences to ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The ratio between academic and invited staff and between staff and students provided in the quantitative indicators is important in proving the programme's sustainability. The workload of the academic and invited staff ensures that they can properly conduct their research activities alongside performing their duties in the educational/teaching and learning process.

The heads of programme possess the necessary qualities of academic leadership and are already experienced in programme elaboration and development. Both personally participating in the programme.

The programme is administered by the Faculty of Humanities. Both the administrative and support staff possess the necessary competences to provide adequate support for the students enrolled in the programme.

<b>Programme 2 (History, MA)</b>				
<b>Number of the staff involved in the programme (including academic, scientific, and invited staff)</b>	<b>Number of Programme Staff</b>	<b>Including the staff with sectoral expertise</b>	<b>Including the staff holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction</b>	<b>Among them, the affiliated academic staff</b>
<b>Total number of academic staff</b>	<b>22</b>			
<b>- Professor</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>- Associate Professor</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>

- Assistant-Professor	2	2	2	2
- Assistant				
Invited Staff	1	1	1	
Scientific Staff				

### Programme 3 – Bachelor's Programme in Archaeology

The full staff for BA programme in Archaeology consists of 42 lecturers. 30 among them represent the academic staff (1 professor-emeritus, 13 professors, 12 associate professors, and 4 assistant professors), while 12 are invited lecturers (one among them holds a scientific position). Everyone from the academic staff is affiliated with Batumi State University. The personnel files (CVs, publications, participation in conferences, and other activities) of both academic and invited staff confirm that all of them are qualified scholars who possess the required competences to ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The ratio between academic and invited staff and between staff and students is important in proving the programme's sustainability. The workload of the academic and invited staff ensures that they can properly conduct their research activities alongside performing their duties in the educational/teaching and learning process.

The heads of programme possess necessary qualities and academic leadership and are already experienced in programme elaboration and development. Both personally participate in the programme.

The programme is administered by the Faculty of Humanities. Both the administrative and support staff possess the necessary competences to provide support for the students enrolled in the programme.

<b>Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)</b>				
<b>Number of the staff involved in the programme (including academic, scientific, and invited staff)</b>	<b>Number of Programme Staff</b>	<b>Including the staff with sectoral expertise</b>	<b>Including the staff holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction</b>	<b>Among them, the affiliated academic staff</b>
<b>Total number of academic staff</b>	<b>42</b>			

- Professor	14	7	7	14
- Associate Professor	12	5	7	12
- Assistant-Professor	4	1	3	4
- Assistant				
Invited Staff	11	10	10	
Scientific Staff	1	1	1	

#### **Programme 4 – Master's Programme in Classical Archaeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus**

The full staff for MA programme in Classical Archaeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus consists of 16 lecturers. 7 among them represent the academic staff (1 professor-emeritus, 2 professors, 3 associate professors, and 1 assistant professor), while 9 are invited lecturers (one among them holds a scientific position). It should be mentioned that the Self-Evaluation Document gives correct data, while quantitative data and the list of personnel cite one invited lecturer as an assistant professor. Everyone from the academic staff is affiliated with Batumi State University. The personnel files (CVs, publications, participation in conferences, and other activities) of both academic and invited staff confirm that all of them are qualified scholars who possess the required competences to ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The ratio between academic and invited staff and between staff and students provided in the quantitative indicators is important in proving the programme's sustainability. The workload of the academic and invited staff ensures that they can properly conduct their research activities alongside performing their duties in the educational/teaching and learning process.

The heads of programme possess necessary qualities and are already experienced in programme elaboration and development. Both personally participate in the programme.

The programme is administered by the Faculty of Humanities. Both the administrative and support staff possess the necessary competences to provide support for the students enrolled in the programme.

**Programme 4 (Classical Archaeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus, MA)**

<b>Number of the staff involved in the programme (including academic, scientific, and invited staff)</b>	<b>Number of Programme Staff</b>	<b>Including the staff with sectoral expertise</b>	<b>Including the staff holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction</b>	<b>Among them, the affiliated academic staff</b>
<b>Total number of academic staff</b>	<b>16</b>			
<b>- Professor</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>- Associate Professor</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>- Assistant-Professor</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>- Assistant</b>				
<b>Invited Staff</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	
<b>Scientific Staff</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

### **Programme 5 – Doctoral Programme in Archaeology**

The full staff for the PhD programme in Archaeology consists of 13 lecturers. 6 among them represent the academic staff (1 professor-emeritus, 2 professors, 2 associate professors, and 1 assistant professor), while 7 are invited professors. Everyone from the academic staff is affiliated with Batumi State University. The personnel files (CVs, publications, participation in conferences, and other activities) of both academic and invited staff confirm that all of them are qualified scholars who possess the required competences to ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The ratio between academic and invited staff and between staff and students provided quantitatively is important in proving the programme’s sustainability. The workload of the academic and invited staff ensures that they can properly conduct their research activities alongside performing their duties in the educational/teaching and learning process.

The heads of programme possess necessary qualities and academic leadership and are already experienced in programme elaboration and development. All three of them personally participate in the programme both as lecturers and supervisors.

The programme is administered by the Faculty of Humanities. Both the administrative and support staff possess the necessary competences to provide support for the students enrolled in the programme.

**Programme 5 (Archaeology, PhD)**

<b>Number of the staff involved in the programme (including academic, scientific, and invited staff)</b>	<b>Number of Programme Staff</b>	<b>Including the staff with sectoral expertise</b>	<b>Including the staff holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction</b>	<b>Among them, the affiliated academic staff</b>
<b>Total number of academic staff</b>	<b>13</b>			
<b>- Professor</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>- Associate Professor</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>- Assistant-Professor</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>- Assistant</b>				
<b>Invited Staff</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	
<b>Scientific Staff</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

**Evidences/Indicators**

- Programs;
- Personal files of academic/administrative/invited and support staff;
- Quantitative indicators of programs;
- Lists of program personnel;
- Workload scheme of academic and invited personnel;
- Self-Evaluation Report.

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:**

**Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with the component

Component 4.1 Human resources	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.2 Qualification of Supervisors of Master's and Doctoral Students

Master's and Doctoral students have qualified supervisor/supervisors and, if necessary, co-supervisor/co-supervisors who have relevant scientific-research experience in the field of research.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The Master and Doctoral programs have highly qualified supervisors with all the necessary skills and experience. All of them are skilled researchers with publications in the relevant fields. If needed, the invited staff with academic degrees and scholarly publications from Georgian or foreign universities can be appointed as co-supervisors.

#### Programme 2 – Master's Programme in History

According to the quantitative data, only 12 members of the full staff of the program are considered as MA theses supervisors. There is no list which defines them, although the academic personnel of MA program in History, who have the degrees in relevant fields, have all the necessary skills and experience for supervising MA theses. All of them possess the knowledge of modern methods and are skilled researchers with publications.

Programme 2 - Master's Programme in History			
Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral theses	Theses supervisors	Including the supervisors holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction	Among them, the affiliated academic staff
Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral theses	12	12	
- Professor			

- Associate Professor			
- Assistant-Professor			
Invited Staff			–
Scientific Staff			–

#### Programme 4 – Master's Programme in Classical Archaeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus

According to the quantitative data, only 6 members of the full staff of the program are considered as MA theses supervisors. There is no list which defines them, although the academic personnel of MA program in Classical Archaeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus, who have the degrees in relevant fields, have all the necessary skills and experience for supervising MA theses. All of them possess the knowledge of modern methods and are skilled researchers with publications.

Programme 4 (Classical Archaeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus, MA)			
Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral theses	Theses supervisors	Including the supervisors holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction	Among them, the affiliated academic staff
Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral theses	6	6	
- Professor			
- Associate Professor			
- Assistant-Professor			
Invited Staff			–
Scientific Staff			–

#### Programme 5 – Doctoral Programme in Archaeology

Only four members of the full staff – 1 professor-emeritus, 1 professor, 1 associate professor, and 1 assistant professor (he is mentioned as Doctor of History from the Department of History, Archeology and Ethnology of BSU in SER) are considered as supervisors. All of them possess the knowledge of modern methods. They are skilled researchers with publications in the relevant fields. Based on the PhD students’ needs, the university can invite a co-supervisor. There is also a possibility to invite foreign co-supervisor. The co-supervisor can be appointed if such a person holds an academic degree and has scholarly publications in relevant field. At the same time, according to the Doctoral Statute of BSU, PhD Thesis can be supervised only by professor, associate professor, chief researcher, or senior researcher In BSU. This explains the fact that the assistant professor is mentioned just as a Doctor of History in the SED.

<b>Programme 5 (Archaeology, PhD)</b>			
<b>Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral theses</b>	<b>Theses supervisors</b>	<b>Including the supervisors holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction</b>	<b>Among them, the affiliated academic staff</b>
<b>Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral theses</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>- Professor</b>	2	2	2
<b>- Associate Professor</b>	1	1	1
<b>- Assistant-Professor</b>	1	1	1
<b>Invited Staff</b>			–
<b>Scientific Staff</b>			–

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Programmes;
- Personal files of academic/administrative/invited and support staff;
- Quantitative indicators of programs;
- Lists of programme personnel;
- BSU Doctoral Statute;
- Self-Evaluation Report.

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

### General suggestions of the cluster:

### Recommendations and suggestions according to the programmes:

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with this standard component

Component 4.2 Qualification of supervisors of master's and doctoral students	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 4.3 Professional Development of Academic, Scientific and Invited Staff

- The HEI conducts the evaluation of programme staff and analyses evaluation results on a regular basis.
- The HEI fosters professional development of the academic, scientific and invited staff. Moreover, it fosters their scientific and research work.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The professional development of staff executing the programmes grouped in the cluster along with the visiting staff can be divided into two main groups. On the one hand it is composed of regular evaluation of staff scientific and teaching performances. On the other, it relates to the University's policy and practice which has led to a system of rewards and incentives to stimulate staff development, professional growth and progress.

In particular staff can develop their research based on the following clusters of activities (SED-pp. 104-106): the:

“Execution of the scientific component of the educational program’ comprises: Scientific work; Scientific research projects; Scientific conference/forum/symposium/congress; Editing and reviewing of various scientific publications/papers; scientific consulting and expert activities; Public scientific-popular activity.”

Meetings with the University's key administrative staff revealed that the cluster's support systems are well established and very competent. The University has suitably qualified employees,

working in administrative units, who manage key functions such as the library and its associated learning resource systems, manage the Faculty Quality Assurance Service and the student centre, and oversee the maintenance of BSU's scientific and educational laboratories. Hence, all programmes are provided with material and technical resources of the necessary quantity and quality to achieve the goals and learning outcomes. The library stores all the basic literature and other study materials (including via electronic resources) mentioned in the syllabi. Students are aware of the availability of resources and know how to use them. The essential literature indicated as necessary for each programme is available in the library.

Evidence from the Self-Evaluation Document (SED) and also from the interviews carried out during the External Panel's visit shows that the University has a centralised system for developing staff knowledge and understanding about teaching and learning through the provision of short courses and other support. The University helps and supports staff to participate via live and online seminars, webinars, professional development workshops; and there is funding to support project initiatives and individual publication. The Expert Panel sought more information, during the interviews, about staff engagement with professional development in teaching and learning; about whether courses were mandatory, how course content was determined; and whether, in their view, there had been any impact of course content on the student learning experience. Courses had supported staff to be better equipped with the increased use of technology necessitated by remote working during the pandemic. However, it appeared that staff were more motivated by and engaged with professional development courses that built their capacity to research, rather than teach. It is worth noting that it has increasingly been the case, for the past two decades and more, for higher-ranking universities (which, in terms of curriculum development, BSU has sought to learn from) for academic staff to be active in linking pedagogic theory and relevant innovations in education to their professional practice. This would allow them, for instance, to better take into effect some of the claims in the SED about aligning learning outcomes with teaching and (in particular) with relevant forms of assessment, including 'authentic assessment'. As stated later in this report, in section 5.3:

*'Academic staff conduct their own evaluation about their engagement with continuing professional development in pedagogic theory and practice. The outcomes of their reflections are collated and analysed and used to inform the training needs of staff. It is then for the University to take the lead sponsoring and staging relevant and appropriate in-service courses or seminars to meet collective needs.'*

This point is worthy of repetition, since as well as acting on staff suggestions, it would be advisable for the University to be pro-active in determining training needs.

## Evidences/Indicators

- Component evidences/indicators, including the relevant documents and interview results

### General recommendations of the cluster:

- The University should further develop their central system for supporting engagement with and awareness of innovations in pedagogic theory, with a view to developing a larger proportion of academic staff, so that there is improved capacity for implementing innovative practice in teaching, learning and assessment.

### General suggestions of the cluster:

### Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes (if any):

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with this standard component

Component 4.3 Professional development of academic, scientific and invited staff	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 4.4. Material Resources

Programme is provided with necessary infrastructure, information resources relevant to the field of study and technical equipment required for achieving programme learning outcomes.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The programmes grouped in the History-Archaeology cluster are implemented within the Department of History, Archaeology, and Ethnology of the Faculty of Humanities. The lectures are conducted in the 1<sup>st</sup> building of BSU (35 Ninoshvili St). All the lecture halls and cabinets are equipped with modern technical appliances including multimedia resources. There are several libraries and computer classes that can be used by the students of the programmes. They contain all the necessary literature for studying in BSU. The readers prepared by the professors are available both through the library resources and the students' electronic portal of BSU (<https://www.portal.bsu.edu.ge/>). Students of all programmes grouped in the History-Archaeology cluster can carry out an archaeological practice/fieldwork. in either of the Gonio-

Apsarosi, Tsikhisdziri, and Kobuleti-Pichvnari archaeological bases. The archival practice is conducted at the Archival Agency of the Autonomous Republic of Adjara. Both academic staff and students can publish their research in the scholarly editions/journals that already exist at BSU. Among them is the Herald of Oriental Studies which is indexed by European scientific resources. The students have access to numerous electronic resources to which BSU holds subscriptions: EBSCOhost, Cambridge Journals, JSTOR, Sage publications, etc. (The SED also mentions Oxford Journals, but as it was found out during the visit, the University no longer subscribes to this resource - it was mentioned because of the technical error.) All of the above assures the achievement of programme learning outcomes.

### **Programme 1 – Bachelor's Programme in History**

See Cluster description.

### **Programme 2 – Master's Programme in History**

See Cluster description.

### **Programme 3 – Bachelor's Programme in Archaeology**

See Cluster description.

### **Programme 4 – Master's Programme in Classical Archeology of the Black Sea and the Caucasus**

See Cluster description.

### **Programme 5 – PhD Programme in Archaeology**

See Cluster description.

#### **Evidences/Indicators**

- Self-Evaluation Report;
- Tour of infrastructure;
- On-site interviews.

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes:** Please, write the developed recommendations and suggestions according to the individual programmes (if any)

#### **Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with this standard component

Component 4.4 Material resources	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4.5. Programme/Faculty/School Budget and Programme Financial Sustainability

The allocation of financial resources stipulated in the programme/faculty/school budget is economically feasible and corresponds to the programme needs.

##### Cluster and individual evaluation

##### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The programme self-evaluation team, in co-operation with the relevant service office, compiled the budget (primary cost estimation) of each educational programme in the cluster. The financial support of educational programmes in the University is provided by the BSU unified budget. The financial sustainability of the academic educational programmes operating in BSU is demonstrated by the income-expenditure categories reflected in the University budget. In the budget's expenditure component, the following are calculated: compensation of labour/wages; computer equipment; the maintenance of the existing infrastructure; and utility costs. The Expert Panel noted that some of the technical base is filled with equipment purchased with monies awarded by international projects operating at faculty level.

The financial sustainability of the cluster is supported and assured by the central BSU budget. The BSU budget for 2022 shows that financial resources are allocated to each faculty, with monies devoted to specific activities. The cluster's budget allocation takes into account all costs incurred by the University for training, research and general maintenance. Evidence gathered from documentation, the interviews with University representatives, and the External Panel member's site-visit indicate that the University's policy to increase the budget over the past few years has ensured the sustainability of these programmes. Indeed, the Expert Panel could see that it is a University strategy to support whatever they deem to be core programmes should they be struggling financially.

The cluster's programmes are self-sufficient in terms of salaries; University documentation shows that the overall budget covers both the remuneration of the academic staff and invited lecturers involved in the implementing the programmes and also the costs for maintaining and improving associated resources (including infrastructure and technical). Testimony of the value that the University places on this cluster can be seen in the fact that their salary rates rank favourably against other top institutions. It also provides support for academic staff and students to engage in international capacity-building activities. Importantly, the University's budget also maintains a

policy of continuing development, for example by including costs for the ongoing renewal of literature. The programme budgets are part-funded by tuition fees; and, accordingly, the University's aim is to nurture regional, national and international interest over time which will better support the financial sustainability of the programmes. This latter point is relevant, as it is important to note that BA and MA programmes are currently partly subsidised by the government. Despite the difficult pandemic period, salaries were increased by twenty percent both in 2020 and 2021. In the current year they are planning a 10 percent increase. Estimates of the primary costs for each individual programme in the cluster has been based on the 'Rule for setting tuition fees for BSU educational programs' approved by the decision of the BSU Representative Council of July 15, 2021 N 07-01/36; and the indirect costs in the budget of each individual educational programme - the costs related to programme implementation and development - are 40% of revenue.

The University's budget includes funded support of the academic staff's academic development and some non-direct costs for their professional development. For example, staff can benefit from University-based English language courses and accommodation and attendance at conferences. Evidence from interviews also pointed to the special financial rewards to encourage research and publication in highly ranked peer-reviewed journals. However, the Expert Panel noted that visiting lecturers/specialists are not able to share all the benefits provided to established staff, though they are able to participate in University grant contests and take maternity leave.

#### **Description and Analysis - Programme 1 BA History**

The programme's budget allocation takes into account total revenues (GEL 450,000 tuition fees for the whole student period of study - four years) and total costs (GEL 373,381 for the whole study period - four years). Total costs for the cluster's programmes consists of direct costs (the salaries of University academic and visiting staff ) and indirect costs amounting to 40 percent of total revenue (those related to programme implementation and development). Overall, the budget shows a surplus of GEL 76,619.

#### **Description and Analysis - Programme 2 MA History**

The programme's budget allocation takes into account total revenues (GEL 45,000 in tuition fees for the whole student period of study - two years) and its total costs (GEL 31,380 for that time). The total costs of the programme consists of direct costs (the salaries academic and visiting staff) and the indirect costs (those related to the programme amounting to 40 percent of total revenue). Overall, this budget shows a surplus of GEL 13,620.

#### **Description and Analysis - Programme 3 BA Archaeology**

The programme's budget allocation takes into account total revenues (GEL 135,000 in tuition fees for the whole student period of study - four years) and total costs (GEL 127,082 for that time). The total costs of the programme consists of direct costs (the salaries of University academic and visiting staff) and indirect costs (costs related to programme implementation and development amounting to 40 percent of revenue). Overall, this budget shows a surplus of GEL 7,918.

## Description and Analysis - Programme 4 MA Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus

The programme's budget allocation takes into account total revenues (GEL 22,500 in tuition fees for the whole student study period - two years) and total costs (GEL 15,690 for that time). The total costs of the programme consists of direct costs (salaries of University academic and visiting staff) and indirect costs (costs related to programme implementation and development amounting to 40 percent of revenue). Overall, this budget shows a surplus of GEL 6,810.

## Description and Analysis - Programme 5 PhD Archaeology

The programme's budget allocation takes into account total revenues (GEL 27,000 in tuition fees for the whole student study period - three years) and total costs (GEL 15,300 for that time). The total costs of the programme consists of direct costs (the salaries of University academic and visiting staff) and indirect costs (costs related to programme implementation and development amounting to 40 percent of revenue). It shows a surplus of GEL 11,700.

### Evidences/Indicators

Unified budget of BSU;

Individual budgets of educational programmes included in the cluster;

Order of the head of the BSU administration on approving the budget of individual educational programmes included in the cluster;

Regulation of BSU, Financial and Economic Department. [https://bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_5436\\_1.pdf](https://bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_5436_1.pdf)

Rule for setting tuition fees for BSU educational programs, approved by the decision of the BSU Representative Council of July 15, 2021 N 07-01/36;

The University's Self-Evaluation report;

Interviews with the University/faculty administration, heads of programmes, academic and invited personnel, students, graduates and employers.

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes:**

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with this standard component

Component 4.5 Programme/faculty/school budget and programme financial sustainability	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
---	-------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------------

Programme 1 (History, BA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (History, MA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, MA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, PhD)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Compliance of the programmes with the standards

4. Providing Teaching Resources	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (name, level)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 5. Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities

In order to enhance teaching quality, programme utilizes internal and external quality assurance services and also periodically conducts programme monitoring and programme review. Relevant data is collected, analysed and utilized for informed decision making and programme development.

#### 5.1. Internal Quality Evaluation

Programme staff collaborates with internal quality assurance department(s)/staff available at the HEI when planning the process of programme quality assurance, developing assessment instruments, and implementing assessment process. Programme staff utilizes quality assurance results for programme improvement.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

##### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The University has internal quality assurance mechanisms in place with procedures and rules for the elaboration, approval and development of educational programmes; regulations for evaluating staff performance; the systematic monitoring of students' academic performance; and mechanisms for receiving feedback from students, graduates, and employers. Market research about the labour market and the employment rate of graduates inform the focus of the evaluation of educational programmes in order to identify their requisite strengths and weaknesses. The principles and

policies of the University's quality assurance systems are demonstrated in their mechanisms and tools. [Without repeating too much of the detail contained within the SED, the Expert Panel can confirm that the University's 'Rules for the elaboration, approval and development of BSU educational programmes' regulates the mechanisms for programme evaluation and development. Moreover, the activities of the Quality Assurance Service at BSU are regulated by the Decision of the BSU Representative Council № 10 of July 17, 2017 [1] 'On the approval of the Provision of the Quality Assurance Service' and the Resolution of the BSU Academic Council №06-01 91 of August 14, 2019 'On the approval of the quality assurance policy of BSU'.]

Planning the effective implementation and support for the development and monitoring of educational programmes at BSU is co-ordinated at both University and Faculty level by their Quality Assurance Services, and then by co-ordinators in individual departments. BSU started preparations for cluster programme accreditation in 2020 and by February 2020 The Humanities Faculty Council, created the working groups for the development and preparation for accreditation of the educational programmes. The Expert Panel noted that the scheduling for accreditation had to be altered out of necessity - for example, the roles of participating personnel changed (student graduation, employers had moved on). Consequently, working groups were refreshed and, where appropriate, work plans amended and approved. Finally, we noted that processes were correctly followed: the Faculty Curriculum Committee was approved by order of the University Rector; working groups in each educational programme prepared the educational programmes, syllabi and documentation required for the accreditation; and the self-assessment report met the necessary standards.

The work plans describe in detail the work to be performed, persons responsible for the implementation of the programme, indicators and expectations and deadlines for implementation. Participants underwent training on accreditation standards in 2019 and worked on the programmes and self-evaluation in times of pandemic, hence many meetings were held online. According to the work plan, the working group met regularly, collaborated on the main part of the self-assessment report, met students, graduates and employers as necessary; and then specific tasks were allocated according to individuals' areas of expertise and responsibility. In brief, tasks included the construction of programme goals and learning outcomes, the creation of curriculum maps, agreement about benchmark and performance indicators, descriptors of teaching and learning methods. Outcomes about these and other matters were then discussed with the Curriculum Committee. To assure consistency in practice, the quality assurance service of the faculty co-ordinated the work of both the working group and the curriculum committee. The heads of the educational programmes co-ordinated the entire process of work on the self-evaluation report, documentation necessary for accreditation was submitted to the Faculty Curriculum Committee for review and evaluation, and the Dean of the Faculty took overall responsibility for organising and implementing the programmes. During the whole process, the working group received support from relevant central University administrative units, as well as the staff ultimately tasked with implementing the programme. In particular, these groups provided data and indicators and other information in a timely manner for the self-evaluation report. The Curriculum Committee confirmed the quality of work and ultimately the programmes were submitted to the Faculty Council on October 25, 2022 for consideration and subsequently approved at the meeting of the BSU Academic Council on October 25, 2022.

## Evidences/Indicators

- o "Regulation of the quality assurance service of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, approved by the decision No. 10 of July 17, 2017 of the BSU Representative Council  
[https://bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_5450\\_1.pdf](https://bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_5450_1.pdf) ;
- o Resolution No. 06-01/91 of BSU Academic Council on August 14, 2019 "On Approval of BSU Quality Assurance Policy";
- o "On approval of the procedure for evaluating the activities of BSU academic and visiting staff" approved by Resolution No. 46 of June 29, 2017 of the BSU Academic Council;  
[https://bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_8568\\_1](https://bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_8568_1)
- o Resolution No. 06-01/92 of BSU Academic Council dated August 14, 2019 "On approval of the procedure for evaluating the activities of BSU academic and visiting staff" Regarding making changes and additions to the Resolution No. 46 of June 29, 2017 of the BSU Academic Council";
- o Electronic portal of staff self-evaluation, APA: [www.apa.bsu.edu.ge](http://www.apa.bsu.edu.ge);
- o Resolution No. 06-01/54 of the Academic Council of BSU dated July 14, 2022 "On the approval of the rules for the development, approval and development of educational programmes of BSU".
- o The procedure for evaluating the scientific-research activity of the staff;
- o Surveys of students, graduates, academic and invited personnel;
- o Survey of employers;
- o Academic performance statistics;
- o Minutes of the session of the Curriculum Committee created for the purpose of developing the educational programmes of the Faculty of Humanities of BSU;
- o Resolutions of the Academic Council of BSU No. 06-01/125-126-127-128 of October 25, 2022 "On approval of the educational programme of the Faculty of Humanities of BSU" (Appendix 16:6);
- o Additional documents requested by expert panel: BSU Rule of Administration of Electronic Teaching; Screenshots from BSU portal indicating survey of students opinion about the quality of electronic courses;
- o Self-Evaluation report of the university;
- o Interviews with the university/faculty administration, heads of programmes, academic and invited personnel, students, graduates and employers.

### General recommendations of the cluster:

- At faculty level, mechanisms for quality assurance should be strengthened, specifically via the monitoring and filtering of suggestions for programme developments produced by each Working Group.
- The Expert Panel noticed that programmes are passed by the faculty council based on the recommendations of the programme committee, without having been processed and recommended by the faculty quality assurance service.
- The quality assurance service at faculty level should be strengthened with regards to the processes of programme evaluation and approval; and the evaluation of the programmes should be conducted in a more systematic way. Specifically, a mandatory quality assurance service filter at the faculty level is necessary for further improvement of the

quality of the programmes. The programmes should then be approved at faculty level by the ‘Faculty Council’ or equivalent.

- It is recommended that the quality assurance service office develops more effective and closer co-operation with academic personnel and other interested parties in the process of programme developments and modifications. Areas for improvement, include, for example, the evaluation of student workload, the number of credits for study courses, the identification of any repetition or overlapping in syllabi and assessment, etc.

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes (if any):**

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with this standard component

Component 5.1 Internal Quality Evaluation	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
<b>Programme 1 (History, BA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 2 (History, MA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 4 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, MA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 5 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, PhD)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 5.2. External Quality Evaluation

Programme utilizes the results of external quality assurance on a regular basis.

#### Cluster and individual evaluation

#### Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

To assist in the maintenance of standards, BSU’s programmes have deployed external advisors and evaluations for over a decade as part of their toolkit for quality assurance. Hence, in the wake of evaluations which followed national guidelines, plus recommendations from previous accreditations in 2011 and 2012, staff took forward a number of valuable suggestions for fundamental change and development. Each self-evaluation working group also acted on the evaluations of and recommendations for their programme by colleagues from another Georgian higher education institutions. The working groups discussed their recommendations in History

(from peers in Kutaisi Akaki Tsereteli State University) and Archaeology (Sokhumi State University). For example, the number of student contact hours was increased, adding new subjects for elective courses were added, increased credit points were allocated to more labour-intensive courses, and some subjects changed from being elective to become mandatory. More generally, as the programmes evolve, reading lists have been updated and resources have been uploaded onto the University’s portal in a timely manner.

**Evidences/Indicators**

- Component evidences/indicators, including the relevant documents and interview results
  - Minutes of accreditation board meetings of previous accreditations in 2011 and 2012;
  - External peer evaluation reports from other Georgian Higher Educational Institutions;
  - The University’s Self-Evaluation Document;
  - Interviews with the university/faculty administration, heads of programmes, academic and invited personnel, students, graduates and employers.

**General recommendations of the cluster:**

**General suggestions of the cluster:**

**Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes (if any):**

**Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with this standard component

Component 5.2 External Quality Evaluation	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
<b>Programme 1 (History, BA)</b>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 2 (History, MA)</b>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)</b>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 4 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, MA)</b>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 5 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, PhD)</b>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5.3. Programme Monitoring and Periodic Review**

Programme monitoring and periodic evaluation is conducted with the involvement of academic, scientific, invited, administrative, supporting staff, students, graduates, employers and other stakeholders through systematic data collection, study and analysis. Evaluation results are applied for the programme improvement.

**Cluster and individual evaluation**

## Summary and Analysis of the Compliance of the Educational Programmes Grouped in a Cluster with the Requirements of the Standard Component

The periodic evaluation of the programmes includes the monitoring of many aspects of the educational process such as: the evaluation of personnel involved in its implementation; an assessment of the necessary resources (including technical); the administration; stakeholder surveys; and constant monitoring of the ways of achieving the learning outcomes defined by the programme and target benchmarks. The University's quality assurance policy determines the direction of quality development across the institution. Its guidance to staff is stated as based on the principles of continuity, transparency, academic integrity and accountability. Its mission is to create a sustainable culture of quality assurance through the active participation of staff, students, support staff and employers in ongoing cycles of evaluation.

The Quality Assurance Office at BSU uses an electronic portal to conduct different, confidential surveys to get feedback from students, graduates, employers, and staff. The portal enables the students to express their ideas about the learning process, lecturers, and concerns. Thus, lecturers are able to receive both qualitative and quantitative feedback about their work in order to make better informed improvements.

BSU have carried out systematic evaluations of staff performance since 2017. (Details available via the electronic platform: [www.apa.bsu.edu.ge](http://www.apa.bsu.edu.ge)). Staff are evaluated by the Faculty's Quality Assurance Office in the following three ways: an analysis of their academic performance with regards to the creation, upgrading and delivery of the curriculum; an assessment of the the quality of their research performance; and via other co-curricular and managerial service (professors, in particular, are strongly encouraged to participate in extracurricular activities). The evaluation of academic research was updated in 2019 to integrate compulsory requirements and include the indexing of scientific papers in international databases in order to make processes more transparent and fair.

Additionally, a special platform on the student portal ([www.apa.bsu.edu.ge](http://www.apa.bsu.edu.ge)) allows academic and visiting lecturing staff to make a self-evaluation of their scientific/research activity at the end of each academic year. After data is entered on that site, it is checked and verified by senior managers in the University (such as the University's Scientific Research Service, a Deputy Rector, Dean, Head of the Department, Head of the Educational Programme, and the faculty's quality assurance service). Confirmation leads to appropriate recognition, some of that through incentives such as funding towards attendance at events/conferences, and seminars to promote continuing professional development or the financing of research for articles to be published in high-ranking, indexed journals. It is important, however, to add that anonymised data from surveys of the perceptions of students and other stakeholders, such as employers, also play a key role in the evaluation of the overall performance of staff. The University states that evaluations have an important part to play in the ongoing employment of their staff.

Academic staff conduct their own evaluation about their engagement with continuing professional development in pedagogic theory and practice. The outcomes of their reflections are collated and analysed and used to inform the training needs of staff. It is then for the University to take the lead sponsoring and staging relevant and appropriate in-service courses or seminars to meet collective needs.

The Expert Panel made a number of enquiries about staff practice and its consistency with the University's quality assurance protocols. For example, the documentation and interviews with staff pointed towards a potential issue in online communications with students. The Expert Panel enquired about directed reading and an absence of a textbook section next to the topics set to students. The concern revolves around the practice of uploading weekly materials in a portal and consequently increasing students' workload without the University's Quality Assurance service being able to monitor and assess what the implications for the balance and allocations of credits should be. Another enquiry - about staff cognisance of relevant benchmarks - was answered to satisfaction. As stated elsewhere in this report, the processes of curriculum development are informed both by internal and national benchmarks and best practice from some of the most highly-ranked educational institutions in Europe. This practice was corroborated both via the additional documentation supplied to the panel for the and MA programmes, and also the minutes of the PhD Working Group.

Reviews of teaching also take place. The Quality Assurance service periodically monitors and attends academic lectures, normally with notice, but sometimes without warning. Staff also have the practice of peer-reviewing each other's lectures, with a system of collegial feedback and follow-up. Information about forthcoming inspections are issued via the BSU portal and it is not uncommon for the Head of the Department, a colleague, and a member of the Quality Assurance team to attend the lectures; and it is deemed to be of especial interest when new methods or textbooks are on display.

The Quality Assurance service also carry out student surveys, most recently about the efficacy of their mid-term exams. Students evaluations use a 5-point Likert scale normally at the end of each module, rather than in mid-term; but there is also scope for qualitative, open-text feedback both via these surveys and, more generally, through their portal. The Expert Panel felt assured that data collection met internal ethical guidelines, and was anonymised to maintain student confidentiality. Experts were agreed that it would be desirable for student surveys could be enhanced by the addition of questions soliciting an evaluation of research supervision. It emerged, from interviews with the Quality Assurance team that the University has recently generated a set of regulations about the duties of thesis supervisors at all levels and so taking this necessary step forward should not be particularly onerous..

#### **Evidences/Indicators**

- o "Regulation of the quality assurance service of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, approved by the decision No. 10 of July 17, 2017 of the BSU Representative Council  
[https://bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_5450\\_1.pdf](https://bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_5450_1.pdf) ;
- o Resolution No. 06-01/91 of BSU Academic Council on August 14, 2019 "On Approval of BSU Quality Assurance Policy";
- o "On approval of the procedure for evaluating the activities of BSU academic and visiting staff" approved by Resolution No. 46 of June 29, 2017 of the BSU Academic Council;  
[https://bsu.edu.ge/text\\_files/ge\\_file\\_8568\\_1](https://bsu.edu.ge/text_files/ge_file_8568_1)
- o Resolution No. 06-01/92 of BSU Academic Council dated August 14, 2019 "On approval of the procedure for evaluating the activities of BSU academic and visiting staff" Regarding making changes and additions to the Resolution No. 46 of June 29, 2017 of the BSU Academic Council";
- o Electronic portal of staff self-evaluation, APA: [www.apa.bsu.edu.ge](http://www.apa.bsu.edu.ge);

- o Resolution No. 06-01/54 of the Academic Council of BSU dated July 14, 2022 "On the approval of the rules for the development, approval and development of educational programmes of BSU".
- o The procedure for evaluating the scientific-research activity of the staff;
- o Surveys of students, graduates, academic and invited personnel;
- o Survey of employers;
- o Minutes of the session of the Curriculum Committee created for the purpose of developing the educational programmes of the Faculty of Humanities of BSU;
- o Resolution No. 06-01/90 of the Academic Council of BSU on August 14, 2019 "On the approval of the policy of conducting scientific researches of BSU";
- o Decision No. 07-01/21 of the BSU Representative Council of April 20, 2022 "On approval of the rules for financing the professional development of the BSU staff and encouraging them to publish articles";
- o Resolution No. 06-01/54 of the BSU Academic Council of July 14, 2022 "On the approval of the rules for development, approval and development of BSU educational programmes";
- o Self-Evaluation report of the university;
- o Interviews with the university/faculty administration, heads of programmes, academic and invited personnel, students, graduates and employers.

#### General recommendations of the cluster:

- During the processes of monitoring and review, the quality assurance service should: systematically collect and analyse information about student workload (for example, the amount of study materials); allocate credit to better reflect the amount of course content, student workload, and total weight of methods of assessment for the mid-term and final evaluations of courses. Additionally, monitoring and evaluation tools, such as questionnaires, should elicit more specific data from students about the quality of the supervisory aspects of their programmes.

#### General suggestions of the cluster:

#### Recommendations and Suggestions according to the programmes (if any):

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programmes with this standard component

Component 5.3. Programme Monitoring and Periodic Review	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
<b>Programme 1 (History, BA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 2 (History, MA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Programme 4 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, MA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Compliance of the programmes with the standards

5. Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
Programme 1 (History, BA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 2 (History, MA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 4 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, MA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme 5 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, PhD)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Attached documentation (if applicable):

Name of the higher education institution: LEPL – Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

#### Compliance of the programmes with the standards

Contents  Standard	1. Educational Programme Objectives, Learning Outcomes and their Compliance with the Programme	2. Methodology and Organisation of Teaching, Adequacy Evaluation of Programme Mastering	3. Student Achievements, Individual Work with them	4. Providing Teaching Resources	5. Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities
Programme 1 (History, BA)	Substantially complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements
Programme 2 (History, MA)	Substantially complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements
Programme 3 (Archaeology, BA)	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements

<b>Programme 4 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, MA)</b>	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	<b>Substantially</b> complies with requirements
<b>Programme 5 (Classical Archaeology of Black Sea and Caucasus, PhD)</b>	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	complies with requirements	<b>Substantially</b> complies with requirements

Signatures

Chair of Accreditation Experts Panel

Full name, signature: Peter D'Sena

Of the member(s) of the Accreditation Experts Panel

Vazha Mamiashvili

Full name, signature: Teimuraz Papaskiri

Full name, signature: Merab Tchumburidze

Full name, signature: Ia Natsvlishvili

Full name, signature: Davit Putkaradze