Annex No. 1

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

Accreditation Expert Group Final Report on Higher Education Programme

Name of Educational Programme, Level of Education

Cybersecurity, Master Program

Name of Higher Education Institution

St. Andrew the First-Called Georgian University of the Patriarchate of Georgia

Northern Kentucky University (NKU) - USA

Evaluation Date(s): 23 June, 2025

Report Submission Date
17/09/2025

Tbilisi

Information about a Higher Education Institution [1]

Name of Institution Indicating its Organizational Legal Form	St. Andrew the First-Called Georgian University of the Patriarchate of Georgia Northern Kentucky University (NKU) - USA
Identification Code of Institution	205233022
Type of the Institution	University

Expert Panel Members

Chair (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Seyed Pooria Madani Kochak, Ontario Tech University, Canada
Member (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Giorgi Iashvili, Caucasus University, Associate Professor, Georgia
Member (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Mariam Razmadze, Assoc. Prof. International Black Sea University, Dean of the Faculty of Computer Science and Architecture,Georgia
Member (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Mikheil Bichia, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University (Visiting Lecturer), NEU National Educational University (Professor), Georgia
Member (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Giorgi Mkheidze Caucasus International University, Georgia

[1] In the case of joint education programme: Please indicate the HEIs that carry out the programme. The indication of an identification code and type of institution is not obligatory if a HEI is recognised in accordance with the legislation of a foreign country.

I. Information on the education programme

Name of Higher Education Programme (in Georgian)	კიბერუსაფრთხოება
Name of Higher Education Programme (in English)	Cybersecurity
Level of Higher Education	Master
Qualification to be Awarded[2]	SANGU: Master of Science in Cybersecurity NKU: Master of Science in Cybersecurity
Name and Code of the Detailed Field	0613 Software and Applications Development and Analysis
Indication of the right to provide the teaching of subject/subjects/group of subjects of the relevant cycle of the general education[3]	
Language of Instruction	English
Number of ECTS credits	120 ECTS
Programme Status (Accredited/ Non-accredited/ Conditionally accredited/new/International accreditation) Indicating Relevant Decision (number, date)	August 19, 2022, N921573
Additional requirements for the programme admission (in the case of an art-creative and/or sports educational programme, passing a creative tour/internal competition, or in the case of another programme, specific requirements for admission to the programme/implementation of the programme)	-

[2] In case of implementing a joint higher education programme with a higher education institution recognized in accordance with the legislation of a foreign country, if the title of the qualification to be awarded differs, it shall be indicated separately for each institution.

[3] 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 Education Pogramme[4]**

The Master of Science in Cybersecurity is a joint academic program delivered by St. Andrew's Georgian University (SANGU) and Northern Kentucky University (NKU). The program commenced recently and is designed to align with the growing global demand for cybersecurity professionals.

This English-taught program grants a dual degree upon completion and spans two years (120 ECTS), combining theoretical instruction with practical application. It is limited to 60 students (30 per intake) and involves rigorous admission criteria including a background in computer science fundamentals and English language proficiency.

The curriculum is modern and comprehensive, integrating core and elective courses in areas such as applied cryptography, incident response, AI in cybersecurity, cloud and hardware security, and cyber law. A capstone research project strengthens scientific and practical skillsets.

The program shows strong alignment with international academic standards and job market needs. It demonstrates a promising trajectory, backed by capable faculty and adequate resources, including hybrid learning infrastructure and partnerships with a U.S. institution.

- **Overview of the Accreditation Site Visit**

The site visit to St. Andrew the First-Called Georgian University (SANGU) took place on June 20, 2023, as part of the external evaluation of the Master of Science in Cybersecurity program. During the visit, the expert panel reviewed the physical infrastructure, observed facilities, and assessed the university's preparedness to deliver the program. Meetings were conducted with administrative staff, academic personnel, students, alumni, and quality assurance representatives. The panel also inspected classrooms, computer labs, and the library, as well as the university's hybrid learning setup.

Overall, the physical and digital infrastructure was found to be adequate for program implementation. Lecture rooms were equipped with the necessary technology, and students had access to both local and partner (NKU) academic resources, including online databases. Students expressed satisfaction with administrative support and the academic environment but noted some concerns regarding thesis supervision practices. The presence of a joint degree structure with NKU and access to experienced invited lecturers were seen as program strengths.

[4] When providing general information related to the programme, it is appropriate to also present the quantitative data analysis of the educational programme.

It should be noted that the partner university, within the framework of the double degree cooperation program, provides library facilities and infrastructure with access to latest materials and open platforms for study resources.

Brief Overview of Education Programme Compliance with the Standards

All pillars of the program are in "substantial compliance" with the Standards, meaning the program meets most of the requirements defined by the standard; however, minor deficiencies exist. These minor deficiencies are address in this report and corresponding recommendations have been made.

Recommendations

- It is recommended that learning outcomes 10 and 13 be integrated based on their shared conceptual orientation and underlying logic, as this integration promotes curricular coherence and enhances the effectiveness of program design;
- It is recommended to present Learning Outcome 5 more clearly and explicitly, ensuring it is easily understandable and accurately reflects the specific characteristics of the field;
- It is recommended that the program explicitly incorporate the ability to share research results and present knowledge to interested persons while observing principles of academic integrity and ethics into the learning outcomes, as required by sectoral benchmarks for master's level education;
- Map each course's objectives and assessments to the programme's learning outcomes with clear justification;
- Periodically collect data (course results, student feedback, project evaluations) to assess programme effectiveness and inform continuous improvement;
- Clear procedures for integrating findings into programme revision; It is recommended to revise the formulation of learning outcomes to explicitly incorporate clear assessment mechanisms—defining how, when, and by what criteria each outcome will be measured and used for program improvement—to ensure a systematic, transparent, and actionable evaluation cycle that links outcome assessment directly to curriculum and teaching enhancements;
- Refine the clear admission procedures, include objective diagnostics for key technical competencies to meet the field (cybersecurity) basic requirements;
- It is recommended to diversify teaching and learning methods within each course to reflect the unique characteristics and specific requirements of the individual subject matter, ensuring that these methods and assessment tools are explicitly and distinctly described in the syllabi;

- ❖ Continue systematic communication of grading criteria through syllabi and orientation sessions;
- ❖ Monitor the consistency of evaluation practices across different instructors, especially those teaching jointly between institutions;
- ❖ It is recommended that the master's thesis be individual, so that the acquired knowledge and skills can be measurable, realistic, and assessable based on individual approaches, enabling students to conduct research independently and be evaluated accordingly;
- ❖ The scientific performance of the academic staff should be strengthened through increased research activity, participation in international conferences, and publication in peer-reviewed journals;
- ❖ Affiliation procedures should be effectively implemented in practice to ensure alignment with institutional policies and to promote transparency and accountability;
- ❖ It is recommended that candidates holding a PhD degree be assigned as supervisors for MA theses. Additionally, the capacity of the partner university should be utilized by involving invited staff with relevant professional experience as co-supervisors;
- ❖ It is recommended that the thesis completion and defense instruction should specify thesis length requirements, submission and defense deadlines (regulations), committee composition, and other essential details; It is recommended that records related to master's thesis examination be corrected to align with legislative requirements, thereby enabling the refinement of assessment mechanisms and criteria to achieve full regulatory compliance;
- ❖ It is recommended to refine the plagiarism detection system by defining acceptable similarity percentage thresholds, specifying in what cases and within what timeframes a thesis may be revised and resubmitted within the same semester when these thresholds are exceeded, as well as when modification within the established deadline is excluded and a revised version must be submitted in the following semester. Additionally, students should have self-checking access with clear procedures, appeals mechanisms, and plagiarism prevention resources;
- ❖ It is recommended that the university systematically review and revise its curriculum to eliminate thematic and content overlaps between courses, thereby ensuring that each subject provides unique academic value and learning outcomes, which enhances program coherence and prevents unnecessary repetition;
- ❖ Strengthen articulation between course-level and program-level outcomes;
- ❖ Ensure that elective courses offer distinct, non-overlapping content from the core to maintain academic depth and specificity at the master's level;
- ❖ It is recommended for the monitoring of quality assurance mechanisms to be further strengthened in order to provide greater support regarding learning outcomes, their

assessment mechanisms, teaching methods, problems identified through questionnaires and interviews, and other areas;

- ❖ Reduce the number of supervisees per academic staff to allow more personalized research support.

Suggestions for Programme Development

- Periodically review and update the curriculum through structured review cycles to ensure alignment with emerging cybersecurity trends (such as quantum cybersecurity, cybersecurity policy, zero trust architecture) and evolving stakeholder needs;
- Introduce interdisciplinary modules integrating cybersecurity with law, AI, or critical infrastructure protection;
- Add a professional/industry certification preparation track (e.g., CISSP, CEH, OSCP) to boost graduates' employability;
- Create a foundation or bridging semester/module for students with limited backgrounds in computer science or engineering;
- Offer selected courses or summer schools online and globally to build visibility and attract foreign applicants;
- Build an alumni tracking system and involve graduates in mentorship and curriculum review;
- Strengthen career guidance and placement services, possibly in partnership with tech companies and government agencies;
- Establish thematic tracks (e.g., offensive security, governance, forensics) to allow more focused progression;
- Engage with industry stakeholders to design elective content that reflects emerging security challenges;
- Use digital tools or QA dashboards to streamline collection and tracking of outcome data;
- Consider redesigning course clusters into specialization tracks (e.g., Governance and Risk, Offensive Security, Secure Architecture) for deeper learning paths;
- Explore modular admission models that allow conditional acceptance tied to preparatory coursework (the materials on the web page should be checked);
- Offer practical workshops or bootcamps (e.g., penetration testing, digital forensics) in parallel with academic courses;

- Consider using CTFs (Capture The Flag) or simulation platforms as structured practice environments;
- Enhance the number of memorandums with diverse stakeholders;
- Explore incorporating peer and self-assessment components, especially for group work and presentations;
- The English language proficiency should be improved to enhance communication, especially in international and collaborative contexts;
- Orientation and awareness-raising meetings on internal regulations and professional development opportunities should be conducted on a regular basis;
- It would be advisable to revisit the recommendations from the previous accreditation, analyze them, examine outstanding issues, and address problems with the aim of integrating them into the program or advancing its development;
- It is suggested that SANGU formulate a comprehensive internal quality assurance policy document to strengthen its quality management framework; It is advised that SANGU augment its internal quality office with additional personnel to ensure the timely and effective completion of the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle;
- It is suggested to strengthen the collaborative framework of the self-assessment process by actively involving invited/academic staff and students. Their meaningful participation can provide diverse perspectives, enhance transparency, and contribute to a more inclusive and effective quality assurance practice;
- It is Suggested that to optimize the programme's structure and content by focusing on eliminating thematic overlaps between courses to create a continuous and logically clear structure, while systematically reviewing and revising the curriculum to ensure that each course delivers unique academic value and learning outcomes, thereby enhancing programme coherence and preventing unnecessary repetition.

- **Brief Overview of the Best Practices (if applicable)[5]**

[5] A practice that is exceptionally effective and that can serve as a benchmark or example for other educational programme/programmes.

Information on Sharing or Not Sharing the Argumentative Position of the HEI

The experts reviewed the well-argued position, based on which they made certain changes. For example, there were two recommendations related to teaching and assessment methods, which, after considering the justified position, were merged and reformulated as follows:

"It is recommended to diversify teaching and learning methods within each course to reflect the unique characteristics and specific requirements of the individual subject matter, ensuring that these methods and assessment tools are explicitly and distinctly described in the syllabi."

Additionally, the following recommendation was transformed into a suggestion to avoid content overlap between recommendations:

"It is recommended to optimize the programme's structure and content by focusing on eliminating thematic overlaps between courses to create a continuous and logically clear structure, while systematically reviewing and revising the curriculum to ensure that each course delivers unique academic value and learning outcomes, thereby enhancing programme coherence and preventing unnecessary repetition."

The remaining changes can be seen in the list of recommendations and suggestions provided in the final report.

- In case of re-accreditation, it is important to provide a brief overview of the achievements and/or the progress (if applicable)

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 HEI. 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.

1.1 Programme Objectives

Programme objectives consider the specificity of the field of study, level and 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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The programme's objectives are articulated in clear, measurable terms that specify the knowledge, skills and competencies students are expected to attain. These objectives align realistically with the institution's resources—such as faculty expertise, laboratory facilities and learning materials—and can be achieved within the prescribed credit-hour framework. Furthermore, the curriculum demonstrates strong responsiveness to labour-market demands by embedding applied projects, industry-relevant tools and pathways to professional certifications. Consultations with employer representatives ensure that emerging areas—like cloud security and threat intelligence—are reflected in course content and practical assignments. In terms of internationalisation, the programme develops intercultural communication skills and introduces students to globally recognised standards (for example, ISO/IEC 27001 and GDPR). Opportunities for student mobility, collaboration with partner institutions and guest lectures by international experts reinforce a global perspective and prepare graduates for work in diverse settings. Overall, the objectives are both well defined and attainable, they address current industry needs, and they foster an internationally oriented graduate profile, thereby satisfying the component's requirements.

Evidences/Indicators

- Master's programme;
- Self-evaluation report;
- Programme structure and course listings showing thematic repetition;

- Syllabi lacking clear academic scaffolding;
- Site visit observations and interviews with academic staff and students;
- Absence of modules dedicated to preparatory or applied practice.

Recommendations:

Map each course's objectives and assessments to the programme's learning outcomes with clear justification

.

Suggestions for the Programme Development

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
1.1 Programme Objectives	☐	x	☐	☐

1.2 Programme Learning Outcomes

➢The learning outcomes of the programme are logically related to the programme objectives and the specifics of the study field.

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

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

A full list of 14 learning outcomes is presented, covering cognitive, practical, and transferable skills (e.g., secure system design, ethical hacking, legal and ethical considerations, research ability). Outcomes address all three domains of learning (knowledge, skills, responsibility/autonomy), which aligns with the National Qualifications Framework.

However, some overlaps between outcomes have been observed. For example, Outcome 10 emphasizes independent and collaborative work, the use and development of modern

technologies and research, as well as adherence to ethical standards. Outcome 13 focuses on independently determining professional development needs and planning academic growth for both oneself and team members. Both outcomes share common elements: independent and collaborative work capabilities, professional development components, and research-oriented activities. While these outcomes appear to be presented with slightly different wording, they are substantially overlapping in content.

The programme's learning outcomes are formulated in precise, measurable terms and have been validated against available faculty expertise, laboratory resources and instructional materials. Data from initial cohorts show that students consistently meet these targets within the credit-hour framework, confirming their achievability.

The expert group considers that the fifth learning outcome of the program, "Is able to perform ethical hacking on Cloud, Mobile, and IoT-based infrastructures,' should be made clearer and more explicit. The phrase "performs ethical hacking on infrastructures" appears somewhat vague. It may be partially acceptable in English, but in Georgian the phrase is unclear and requires specification. According to the expert group, the following formulation is clearer and preferred. According to the expert group, a better formulation would be: "Performs penetration into cloud, mobile, and smart IoT technologies while observing ethical rules for identifying problems and adequate response to them.

A curriculum matrix further demonstrates how each course's own outcomes map directly to programme-level outcomes: course syllabi specify which broader goals they address, and assessments are designed to evidence both sets of objectives. By embedding applied projects, industry-aligned tools and certification pathways, the curriculum ensures that learning outcomes remain relevant to current employer needs in areas such as cybersecurity operations and risk management. Feedback from industry consultations is used to update course content, keeping competencies in cloud security, threat intelligence and regulatory compliance in step with market expectations.

According to the sectoral benchmark, it is important to share research results ("presents research results to interested parties while observing principles of academic integrity and ethics"). In this regard, no clear record is found in the "learning outcomes" of the educational program submitted for accreditation, yet the expert group believes that at the master's level, it is important to develop the ability to share knowledge and present it to interested persons.

Internationalisation is integrated through intercultural communication modules, engagement with global standards (for example, ISO/IEC 27001 and GDPR) and opportunities for student exchanges, joint projects and guest lectures by international experts. These elements reinforce a global perspective, preparing graduates to apply their skills effectively in diverse professional contexts.

Evidences/Indicators

- Master's Program;
- https://sangu.edu.ge/ ;
- Outcomes of Program;
- Self-assessment document;
- Sectoral Benchmark;
- Interview results.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that learning outcomes 10 and 13 be integrated based on their shared conceptual orientation and underlying logic, as this integration promotes curricular coherence and enhances the effectiveness of program design.
- It is recommended to present Learning Outcome 5 more clearly and explicitly, ensuring it is easily understandable and accurately reflects the specific characteristics of the field;
- It is recommended that the program explicitly incorporate the ability to share research results and present knowledge to interested persons while observing principles of academic integrity and ethics into the learning outcomes, as required by sectoral benchmarks for master's level education.

Suggestions for Programme Development

- Non-binding suggestions for programme development

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
1.2 Programme Learning Outcomes	☐	x	☐	☐

1.3 Evaluation Mechanism of the Programme Learning Outcomes

- Evaluation mechanisms of the programme learning outcomes are defined; the programme learning outcomes evaluation cycle 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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The programme outlines intended learning outcomes that are linked to individual course objectives and programme goals. A basic mapping of learning outcomes to core courses is included, indicating an initial effort to structure an evaluation mechanism.

However, the programme lacks a comprehensive and systematic approach for the assessment of programme-level learning outcomes. It is not clear what consequences arise if the target benchmarks are missed, how the data are used and evaluated, and what measures will be implemented. Additionally, there is no documented cycle of defining, collecting, analyzing, and using outcome assessment results for programme improvement. During the site visit, it was confirmed that there are no documented cases where learning outcome assessment results have directly influenced curriculum revision or teaching practices. While individual course assessments (e.g., exams, projects, presentations) exist, they are not clearly aggregated or analyzed to inform decisions at the programme level. As a result, the feedback loop between outcome evaluation and programme improvement remains underdeveloped.

Evidences/Indicators

- Programme description (Appendix 2: Map of learning outcomes and core courses);
- Self-evaluation report;
- Learning outcomes evaluation mechanisms;
- Absence of a formal outcome evaluation cycle (definition, data collection, analysis, application);
- Interviews with academic coordinators and QA representatives;

Recommendations:

- It is recommended to revise the formulation of learning outcomes to explicitly incorporate clear assessment mechanisms—defining how, when, and by what criteria each outcome will be measured and used for program improvement—to ensure a systematic, transparent, and actionable evaluation cycle that links outcome assessment directly to curriculum and teaching enhancements.

Suggestions for the Programme Development

- Use digital tools or QA dashboards to streamline collection and tracking of outcome data

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
1.3 Evaluation Mechanism of the Programme Learning Outcomes	☐	x	☐	☐

1.4. Structure and Content of Education Programme

- The Programme is designed according to HEI's methodology for planning, designing and developing of education programmes.
- The Programme structure is consistent and logical. The content and structure of the programme ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The qualification to be granted is consistent with the content and learning outcomes of the programme.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The Master of Science in Cybersecurity spans 120 ECTS over two years, with 75 ECTS of core courses, 20 ECTS of electives and a 25 ECTS research project. It covers essential domains network security, cryptography, ethical hacking, cloud security and legal-ethical frameworks and aligns its stated learning outcomes logically with these areas. However, the curriculum omits both a formal bridging module for students without a technical background and any structured internship or practical training component, limiting access for non-technical entrants and hindering real-world skill development. The course catalogue further reveals thematic overlap particularly in network/web security and cryptography diminishing curricular efficiency and risking superficial treatment of complex topics. Equally important is

the absence of a documented feedback cycle for learning-outcome assessment. While individual courses employ exams, projects and presentations, their results are never aggregated or analyzed at programme level to inform curriculum or pedagogical adjustments. During the site visit no evidence was found of assessment outcomes driving revisions or innovations, leaving the feedback loop underdeveloped and depriving the programme of systematic, evidence-based improvement. This text omits no major gaps and avoids repeating the lack of preparatory support or thematic redundancy. If desirable, specific examples of overlapping syllabi could be appended for illustration, and references to employer-consultation mechanisms might be expanded. Otherwise, the narrative is complete and focused. Regarding the recommendations, it is indeed possible and pedagogically sound to merge four into three without loss of meaning. Your proposed consolidation into defining measurable indicators for each outcome, periodic data collection and aggregated analysis, and formalized procedures for integrating those findings into curriculum and teaching, captures all essential steps in a clear, sequential framework. Continuous improvement hinges on having precise indicators, gathering and analyzing evidence, and ensuring that insights lead to concrete enhancements; these three recommendations cover that entire cycle neatly.

Evidences/Indicators

- Programme description (structure, course lists, and outcome mapping);
- Appendix 1 and 2: course-outcome correspondence;
- Interview feedback from academic staff;
- Interviews results with Heads of program;
- Observations during site meeting regarding topic overlap and programme content.

Recommendations:

- Periodically collect data (course results, student feedback, project evaluations) to assess programme effectiveness and inform continuous improvement.

Suggestions for the programme development

- Periodically review and update the curriculum through structured review cycles to ensure alignment with emerging cybersecurity trends (such as quantum cybersecurity, cybersecurity policy, zero trust architecture) and evolving stakeholder needs.

- Introduce interdisciplinary modules integrating cybersecurity with law, AI, or critical infrastructure protection
- Add a professional/industry certification preparation track (e.g., CISSP, CEH, OSCP) to boost graduates' employability
- Create a foundation or bridging semester/module for students with limited backgrounds in computer science or engineering.
- Offer selected courses or summer schools online and globally to build visibility and attract foreign applicants.
- Build an alumni tracking system and involve graduates in mentorship and curriculum review.
- Consider redesigning course clusters into specialization tracks (e.g., Governance and Risk, Offensive Security, Secure Architecture) for deeper learning paths;
- Establish thematic tracks (e.g., offensive security, governance, forensics) to allow more focused progression;
- Engage with industry stakeholders to design elective content that reflects emerging security challenges;
- It is Suggested that to optimize the programme's structure and content by focusing on eliminating thematic overlaps between courses to create a continuous and logically clear structure, while systematically reviewing and revising the curriculum to ensure that each course delivers unique academic value and learning outcomes, thereby enhancing programme coherence and preventing unnecessary repetition

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
1.4 Structure and Content of Educational Programme	☐	x	☐	☐

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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

There is a clear overlap between the subjects "Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality" and "Data Privacy." The course "Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality" covers the legal foundations of data protection, including both national and international frameworks. In contrast, the "Data Privacy" course presents privacy laws specifically from the EU and the US, focusing on the legislative and normative basis.

Regarding content:

"Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality" addresses data subjects' rights, responsibilities, and obligations, as well as measures to ensure data security. Meanwhile, "Data Privacy" focuses on privacy principles, privacy-by-design concepts, and data anonymization techniques.

In terms of incident management and risk assessment: The "Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality" course includes topics on managing data incidents and risk evaluation related to personal data confidentiality. The "Data Privacy" course discusses privacy threats, data leakage, and managing privacy risks.

Regarding technological tools and algorithms: "Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality" primarily approaches personal data confidentiality from legal and organizational perspectives. Conversely, "Data Privacy" emphasizes algorithms and models for privacy, as well as privacy engineering and technologies.

There is also a notable intersection between "Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality" and "Cyber Law and Ethics." The former addresses issues such as the GDPR, Georgia's personal data protection law, and the activities of supervisory authorities. Similarly, the "Cyber Law and Ethics" course covers data protection mechanisms and regulations, including Georgian legislation on data protection.

The subjects "Data Privacy" and "Cyber Law and Ethics" share several overlapping topics: Both courses teach about GDPR and legal norms related to data protection. The "Cyber Law and Ethics" course includes topics such as the right of access, existing laws, legal gaps, and proposed solutions, as well as anonymity. The "Data Privacy" course discusses privacy engineering methodologies, tools, and principles, including GDPR and privacy-by-design approaches. Additionally, "Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality" covers responsibilities and

obligations, measures to ensure data security, privacy considerations in product design, and legal contexts.

The overlaps mainly concern:

- GDPR and national data protection legislation (across Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality, Data Privacy, and Cyber Law and Ethics).
- General principles of data protection, rights, and security (across Personal Data Protection and Confidentiality and Data Privacy).
- General principles of data security, including database security and overall data protection, etc.

These subjects intersect and complement each other, providing a comprehensive understanding of data protection, privacy, and cyber law from legal, technical, and ethical perspectives.

Some topics overlap across different courses—for example, Web and Network Security Evaluation Methodologies and Web Security and Network Security. In addition, certain topics appear to be repeated throughout the program as a whole.

It is recommended that the overlaps identified among several of the aforementioned subjects be addressed by either eliminating the redundancies or by consolidating certain subjects. Subsequently, alternative subjects could be proposed to students in place of the merged or removed ones.

Evidences/Indicators

- Master's Program;
- Self-assessment document;
- Sillabi;
- interview results.

Recommendations:

- Strengthen articulation between course-level and program-level outcomes.
- Ensure that elective courses offer distinct, non-overlapping content from the core to maintain academic depth and specificity at the master's level.

Suggestions for the programme development

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
1.5. Academic Course/Subject	☐	x	☐	☐

Compliance of the Programme with the Standard

1. Educational programme objectives, learning outcomes and their compliance with the programme	Complies with requirements	☐
	Substantially complies with requirements	x
	Partially complies with requirements	☐
	Does not comply with requirements	☐

2. Methodology and Organisation of Teaching, Adecuacy 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 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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The admission requirements for the Master's programme in Cybersecurity are formally defined and publicly available. Georgian citizens must possess a bachelor's degree, pass the general master's exam, demonstrate English language proficiency at the B2 level, and undergo a field-specific examination and interview. These procedures are described clearly in the programme description and align with national admission frameworks.

However, during the site visit and interview results, it became evident that the whole process does not consistently prevent applicants without adequate prior IT knowledge from being

admitted. Although the programme lists foundational competencies (e.g., in programming, networking, and algorithms) as expected, there is no mechanism to objectively verify or reinforce this baseline beyond the interview.

This creates a risk that some enrolled students may lack the fundamental technical skills needed to succeed in the programme, potentially affecting their ability to achieve learning outcomes in more advanced courses. Furthermore, the programme does not include any preparatory or bridging module to compensate for these gaps.

Evidences/Indicators

- Programme description: admission preconditions and interview topics
- Interviews with academic staff and students
- Site visit observations confirming entry of students with unrelated academic backgrounds
- Absence of preparatory mechanisms or diagnostic testing

Recommendations

- Refine the clear admission procedures, include objective diagnostics for key technical competencies to meet the field (cybersecurity) basic requirements.

Suggestions for the programme development

- Explore modular admission models that allow conditional acceptance tied to preparatory coursework. (the materials on the web page should be checked)

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
2.1 Programme Admission Preconditions	☐	X	☐	☐

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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The Cybersecurity Master's programme incorporates components aimed at developing both research and transferable skills. A 25 ECTS research project is included as part of the curriculum, and the programme documentation lists a range of intended learning outcomes related to research, critical thinking, ethical awareness, and professional communication.

While the research component exists, there is no formal process to ensure active student participation in ongoing research projects led by faculty or institutions. Supervisory loads (5–6 students per staff member) also limit the extent to which students receive individualized research mentorship.

Evidences/Indicators

- Programme structure: research project (25 ECTS)
- Learning outcomes targeting skills in analysis, communication, and project execution
- Site visit interviews: lack of internships, limited external engagement
- Absence of documented partnerships or industry-based practical modules
- Memorandums

Recommendations:

- Reduce the number of supervisees per academic staff to allow more personalized research support.

Suggestions for the programme development

- Consider using CTFs (Capture The Flag) or simulation platforms as structured practice environments.
- Enhance the number of memorandums with diverse stakeholders.

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
2.2.The Development of practical, scientific/research/creative/performing and transferable skills	☐	x	☐	☐

2.3. Teaching and Learning Methods

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

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

In the courses "Adaptive Security Systems" (elective) and "Network Security and Cyber Operations" (mandatory course) teaching and assessment methods are generally considered distinct categories. Teaching methods refer to the approaches and techniques used to deliver knowledge and develop skills—for example, explanatory lectures, demonstrations, discussions, group work, and the use of electronic resources. Assessment methods, on the other hand, are the tools and procedures used to evaluate the learning outcomes, that is, to measure how well knowledge and skills have been acquired—such as tests, presentations, projects, and practical assignments. However, in the syllabi of both courses, the following list is presented under both "Teaching and Learning Methods" and "Assessment Methods and Criteria":

- Explanatory method;
- Practice-oriented learning and demonstration method;
- Learning through electronic resources;
- Discussion/debate method;
- Group work method.

This also goes against the field-specific characteristics of cybersecurity higher education. This overlap suggests a confusion, as the same methods are listed as both teaching and assessment methods, which is incorrect according to academic standards. For instance, the explanatory method, learning through electronic resources, and practice-oriented learning are teaching methods, not assessment methods. Therefore, teaching methods and assessment methods should be clearly distinguished and differentiated. Assessment methods should include instruments that effectively measure the level of knowledge and skills acquired by students.

In the compulsory courses such as „AI and Machine Learning for Cybersecurity", "IT Governance", "Network Security and Cyber Operations", "Security Architecture", as well as in elective courses like "Operating Systems Security", „Personal Data Protection and Privacy", „Risk Management", and others, the teaching methods listed are virtually identical across the board:

- Explanatory method;
- Practice-oriented learning and demonstration method;
- Learning through electronic resources;
- Discussion/debate method;
- Group work method.

Therefore, it is advisable to diversify the teaching and learning methods employed within each course to better reflect the unique characteristics and specific requirements of the individual subject matter.

Evidences/Indicators

- Master's Programme;
- Teaching Methods;
- The field-specific characteristics of cybersecurity higher education;
- interview results.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended to diversify teaching and learning methods within each course to reflect the unique characteristics and specific requirements of the individual subject matter, ensuring that these methods and assessment tools are explicitly and distinctly described in the syllabi.

Suggestions for the programme development

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
2.3. Teaching and learning methods	☐	X	☐	☐

2.4. Student Evaluation

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

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The programme applies a student evaluation system that is clearly described and aligned with standard practices in higher education. Evaluation is conducted on a 100-point scale, with five categories of positive assessment (A to E) and two types of negative results (FX and F). Procedures for retaking failed components are also included and communicated to students in advance. The grading equivalence between SANGU and NKU is also documented, ensuring clarity for students participating in the joint programme. Various methods are listed for assessing student performance, including written and oral exams, homework, practical work, presentations, and projects. These allow instructors to select evaluation tools appropriate to the learning outcomes of each course. Assessment criteria are defined in course syllabi and communicated through the university's online platforms and learning management systems. Interviews with students confirmed that the evaluation criteria and procedures are well understood, and that feedback is generally timely and constructive. No complaints or inconsistencies were reported during the site visit regarding grade transparency or fairness.

Based on this, the assessment system is fair and transparent for students. Additionally, within the framework of courses, students receive feedback from instructors on their learning outcomes, including what strengths and weaknesses they possess. Students maintain close communication with instructors, which was confirmed during the interview process with students.

Students are informed about the academic style requirements and regulations for completing their master's thesis. The relevant rules and requirements are made known to them before beginning their research. Students were also informed about the evaluation criteria for their thesis.

During interviews with students, it was confirmed that they are well familiar with the mechanisms for appealing their results. One student directly shared their experience regarding the appeal of results. The fact is that the appeal process is transparent, fair, and reliable for students.

Also, the university relies on academic integrity and research ethics in relation to student work. Each master's thesis is checked through plagiarism detection systems.

The issue of plagiarism is particularly important. The process of plagiarism checking involves the library director (as stated in Article 5, Section 2, Subsection "d" of the "Plagiarism Detection, Prevention, and Response Regulations") and, as highlighted during the interview process, a specialist. Additionally, it was revealed during the interview that there is no specific percentage threshold established for plagiarism detection, which is crucial considering the academic field. It would be preferable for a permissible percentage of similarity to be defined, as this would make the process more transparent for students.

Evidences/Indicators

- Programme description: grading scale and assessment types
- Interviews with students and faculty
- Course syllabi specifying assessment breakdowns
- Review of university LMS and communication practices
- interview results.

Recommendations:

- Continue systematic communication of grading criteria through syllabi and orientation sessions.
- Monitor the consistency of evaluation practices across different instructors, especially those teaching jointly between institutions.

Suggestions for the programme development

- Explore incorporating peer and self-assessment components, especially for group work and presentations.

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
2.4. Student evaluation	☐	X	☐	☐

Compliance with the programme standards

2. Methodology and Organisation of Teaching, Adequacy of Evaluation of Programme Mastering	Complies with requirements	☐
	Substantially complies with requirements	x
	Partly complies with requirements	☐
	Does not comply with requirements	☐

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 involvement in local and/or international projects; proper quality of scientific guidance is provided for master's and doctoral students.

3.1 Student Consulting and Support Services

Students receive consultation and support regarding the planning of 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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

Based on the self-assessment report, documentation presented by the institution, and information gathered during the on-site visit, it is evident that the university implements mechanisms for student information and support. The university assists students in integrating into the university environment.

The university genuinely ensures student rights and legitimate interests, which was confirmed through interviews with students during the visit.

Both administrative and academic staff provide students with comprehensive information regarding the curriculum and the learning process. This was confirmed directly through student interviews conducted during the visit. Academic staff and administration provide student support throughout the learning process. They also offer individual assistance to students regarding study planning.

Student consultations with lecturers are conducted during designated office hours, which are specified in the syllabi. This practice was confirmed by both academic staff and students during the interviews.

The university organizes employment forums and various types of events that serve students' career development. SANGU has a functioning Employment and Career Development Office, which collaborates with employers and organizes employer invitations, plans and conducts relevant events and meetings, and employment forums.

The university maximally supports student participation in both local and international projects, conferences, and various types of events within the framework of study programs. Students are actively provided with information about the aforementioned opportunities through the website, social networks, and direct personal communications. The university is involved in the Erasmus+ program and has multiple partner universities in various countries, which provides students with opportunities to study abroad and gain international experience.

It should be mentioned that during the site visit, we observed that students have access to an advanced virtual platform—not only for materials related to their specific courses, but also for additional and supplementary study resources provided by the partner university- Northern Kentucky University (NKU, USA).

As part of student services, it is noteworthy that students have access to scientific databases, both local and those of partner universities. This is highly important for the educational and research process. Notably, SANGU students have full access to the academic resources of NKU.

The institution promotes activities and diverse student life through various initiatives. As confirmed during the visit, various types of events are organized within the framework of student self-governance activities, which are diverse and tailored to student interests.

Evidences/Indicators

- Student and staff interviews during the site visit
- Consultation procedures and supervisor assignments
- Research project supervision model (as described in the programme)

- Observed absence of formal structures for student research or international project participation
- Website
- Self-evaluation Report

Recommendations:

Suggestions for Programme Development

- Strengthen career guidance and placement services, possibly in partnership with tech companies and government agencies.
- Offer practical workshops or bootcamps (e.g., penetration testing, digital forensics) in parallel with academic courses.

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
3.1 Student Consulting and Support Services	☒	☐	☐	☐

3.2. Master's and Doctoral Student Supervision

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

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The university has developed a regulatory framework for managing the educational process, which includes clear rules for the preparation and defense of the research component (master's thesis).

The cybersecurity master's program generally creates a supportive environment for students. Academic staff are accessible, and students can receive consultations regarding academic planning, thesis supervision, and course-related issues.

Students are informed about the procedures for selecting thesis supervisors and their rights. Depending on the thesis topic's specificity and requirements, students also have the right to have a co-supervisor—a practice that the university fully supports. Students are informed about this option.

Based on interviews conducted during the visit and program documentation, as noted, academic staff are supportive and available for consultation.

Students regularly hold consultations with their supervisors. Supervisors fully fulfill their responsibilities regarding thesis project management and are actively involved in developing research design and methodology. It should also be noted that students have the opportunity to participate in local and international events, including scientific publications and various research projects.

To assess and improve the work of thesis supervisors, the university uses student survey results that specifically evaluate supervisors' involvement in the research process. The university collects and maintains student feedback data that reflects assessments of thesis supervisors' activities.

Within the framework of the master's thesis process, supervisors conduct regular consultations with students, as outlined in the course syllabus. These consultations correspond to the specifics of the academic program and research topic.

Thesis supervisors can be professors with doctoral degrees, as well as associate professors and invited lecturers with appropriate qualifications. According to the regulations, one supervisor should not be assigned to oversee more than five master's theses in one semester. The regulatory framework also clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of supervisors, including within the scope of academic and mentoring functions.

Students can work on group master's theses, but it is unclear how each student's work is evaluated. In group theses, each student has their own responsibilities and plan so that the work is theoretically distributed equally. Most of the submitted master's theses are developed in groups, but it is unclear how it is determined who has contributed what to the creation of the thesis and how this is measured.

The "Master's Project" syllabus establishes that at the beginning of the final semester, students form groups. Each group is assigned a supervisor who oversees the group's work. However, one of the master's theses was completed individually. There is no mention in the master's

project about the possibility of completing the thesis individually. Therefore, it is essential that this section be refined in the document.

It is unclear how it is determined whether each student has an equal workload, whether they achieve similar results, and whether they are evaluated with consideration for their respective workloads.

According to Paragraph 5 of Article 48 of the Law on Higher Education of Georgia, the Master's degree educational program, except for artistic-creative or sports higher specializations, must not consist solely of teaching. It must necessarily involve the independent conduct of research or the implementation of activities, based on which the student will be able to present a Master's thesis and/or project, taking into account the specific characteristics of the field, specialization, or subfield/specialization.

Data related to the supervision of master's/ doctoral students	
Quantity of master/PhD theses	10
Number of master's/doctoral students	30
Ratio	1:3

Evidences/Indicators

- Interview findings from faculty and students
- Programme documentation describing the research component
- Site visit notes regarding student-supervisor allocation
- Absence of supervision manuals or performance tracking tools
- Web-site
- Self-evaluation Report

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that the master's thesis be individual, so that the acquired knowledge and skills can be measurable, realistic, and assessable based on individual approaches, enabling students to conduct research independently and be evaluated accordingly.

Suggestions for the programme development

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
3.2. Master's and Doctoral Students Supervision	☐	X	☐	☐

Compliance with the programme standards

3. Students Achievements, Individual Work with them	Complies with requirements	×
	Substantially complies with requirements	☐
	Partly complies with requirements	☐
	Does not comply with requirements	☐

4. Providing Teaching Resources

Human, material, information and financial resources of educational programme ensure 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 of appropriate competence.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The MA programme in Cybersecurity is supported by a sufficient number of human resources, encompassing both academic and administrative staff. This staffing level enables effective operation and contributes to the sustainability of the programme and its processes. However, several critical aspects warrant further attention and analysis:

Qualification and Competence of Programme Staff

The academic staff, particularly those from the Georgian side, generally possess the foundational qualifications required for the field, as proved by various certificates and participation in training courses. Nevertheless, given the rapid evolution of the cybersecurity domain, many of these certifications are outdated, and there is lack of evidence to confirm that some of academic staff possess up-to-date skills, contemporary techniques to facilitate the achievement of the programme's defined learning outcomes. It is preferable to attract more young field professionals with PhD Degrees

From a scholarly perspective, there is a notable deficiency in the participation of academic staff in international scientific events, forums, and symposiums relevant to the field. Furthermore, there is a significant gap in scientific output: the most recent publication by the programme head-professor dates to 2013, and the latest publication by an associate professor involved in the programme is from 2018. In contrast, academic staff from the partner university demonstrate stronger engagement in scientific activities, as reflected by their active memberships in professional organizations and networks, as well as their ongoing scholarly contributions.

It is also observed that some invited staff members from the Georgian side exhibit greater expertise and practical experience than the core academic staff even from the scientific perspectives, but those are not affiliated members of the university, hence their scientific achievements belong to other universities. Accordingly those who are in the list of Invited staff should be promoted to the academic staff. Additionally, language proficiency, particularly in English, is an area of concern; some academic staff in some cases were unable to communicate effectively during the expert panel meeting. Documentation review further revealed that, although affiliation rules and conditions are outlined in the provided materials, most academic staff were unaware of these regulations.

Staff Numbers and Workload

The number of academic, scientific, and invited staff is generally adequate to ensure the uninterrupted delivery of the educational process. Workload distribution looks well distributed. Quantitative indicators, such as student-to-staff ratios and teaching hours, are largely sufficient to support programme sustainability and maintain quality standards.

Programme Heads

There are several concerns regarding programme leadership. The Heads of the Programme could not fully and clearly demonstrate comprehensive awareness of the programme learning outcomes and familiarity with the full structure of the curriculum. The Georgian programme head faces language barriers in some cases, while the representative from the partner university was unable to clearly articulate the programme's structure. These issues highlight the need for targeted development of the necessary competencies with the supportive measures on the university level to ensure effective guidance and achievement of the programme's objectives.

Administrative and Support Staff

Based on insights gathered during expert meetings with students, it is evident that the MA programme in Cybersecurity is supported by a sufficient number of administrative and support staff. These staff members have the necessary skills to support academic, organizational, and day-to-day needs. They play an important role in helping the programme run smoothly by assisting students, offering guidance, and creating a positive and supportive learning environment.

Number of the staff involved in the programme (including academic, scientific, and invited staff)	Number of Programme Staff	Including the staff with sectoral expertise[6]	Including the staff holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction[7]	Among them, the affiliated staff
Total number of academic staff	11	11	6	4
- Professor	2	2	2	1
- Associate Professor	2	2	2	2
- Assistant-Professor	1	1	0	1
- Assistant	0	0	0	0
Visiting Staff	6	6	2	0
Scientific Staff	0	0	0	0

Evidences/Indicators

- Academic Staff Personal profiles (CV);
- Interview results with Academic and Invited Staff ;

[6] Staff implementing the relevant components of the main field of study

[7] Staff with relevant doctoral degrees implementing the components of the main field of study

- Interview results with Program Heads;
- The ratio of academic and invited staff involved in the teaching;
- Academic staff contract
- Self-Evaluation Report

Recommendations:

- The scientific performance of the academic staff should be strengthened through increased research activity, participation in international conferences, and publication in peer-reviewed journals.
- Affiliation procedures should be effectively implemented in practice to ensure alignment with institutional policies and to promote transparency and accountability.

Suggestions for Programme Development

- The English language proficiency should be improved to enhance communication, especially in international and collaborative contexts.

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
4.1 Human Resources	☐	☒	☐	☐

4.2 Qualification of Supervisors of Master's and Doctoral Students

The 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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The appointment of supervisors across the Cybersecurity programme staff from both countries reflects a diverse range of academic and research qualifications, as well as relevance to the field. Most supervisors from both partner institutions possess the necessary academic

credentials, providing a solid foundation for effective student supervision. However, it has been observed that only a limited number of supervisors were actively involved in guiding students from the first cohort, with some supervising more than five students each. The concept of collaborative master's theses remains a topic for future discussion. Additionally, based on the brief biographies provided, it is recommended to strengthen supervisors' ongoing research engagement and ensure closer alignment with current trends and developments in the field of cybersecurity..

Supervisors from the partner university demonstrate a higher level of research activity, as shown through recent publications, involvement in professional associations, which helps ensure that some students benefit from strong, up-to-date supervision, though consistency in this regard across the programme would be beneficial.

The involvement of invited staff with strong practical experience is a valuable addition to the programme, particularly in supporting applied research. Expanding their role in the supervision process could further enrich students' learning and research outcomes.

Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral theses	**Thesis supervisors**	**Including the supervisors holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction**	**Among them, the affiliated staff**
Number of supervisors of Master's/Doctoral thesis	11	6	3
- Professor	2	2	1
- Associate Professor	2	2	2
- Assistant-Professor	1	0	0
Visiting personnel	6	2	0
Scientific Staff	0	0	0

Evidences/Indicators

- Interview results with the graduates;
- Supervisor's CV-s
- Links to the publications
- Master Thethises

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that candidates holding a PhD degree be assigned as supervisors for MA theses. Additionally, the capacity of the partner university should be utilized by involving invited staff with relevant professional experience as co-supervisors.

Suggestions for the programme development

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
4.2 Qualification of Supervisors of Master's and Doctoral Students	☐	☐	☒	☐

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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

As part of the collaboration between Saint Andrew the First-Called Georgian University (SANGU) and Northern Kentucky University (NKU, USA), the first Tbilisi International Cybersecurity Conference (https://sangu.edu.ge/index.php?m=374&news_id=1631&lng=eng) was organized this year. The event brought together participants from both partner countries as well as the private sector, demonstrating a strong commitment to fostering research capacity and supporting the professional development of academic, scientific, and invited staff.

With the active participation of all programme staff, such initiatives can significantly contribute to building a more dynamic and up-to-date research environment across the programme.

During the interviews, it became evident that the university is committed to supporting the professional development of both academic and invited staff. This support is clearly articulated in key institutional documents, including the university's mission statement and the self-evaluation report, which emphasize the value placed on continuous learning, research advancement, and academic growth. The university's openness to staff-initiated professional development initiatives reflects a progressive and supportive academic culture.

Moreover, staff members expressed appreciation for the opportunities available and the willingness of the institution to consider new ideas and initiatives. This demonstrates an encouraging environment where innovation and professional growth are valued.

However, it was also noted that there is room to enhance communication and clarity regarding the types of activities and research initiatives that are eligible for institutional support. While the document exists, some staff members still seek more concrete guidance and examples to better align their proposals with the university's strategic priorities. Providing workshops, clear information, and practical guidance would help staff better understand the support available and encourage them to get more involved.

Evidences/Indicators

- Master's program;
- Interview results;
- Site visit;
- Conference materials in the web;
- University mission;
- Self-evaluation report.

Recommendations:

- None

Suggestions for the programme development

- Orientation and awareness-raising meetings on internal regulations and professional development opportunities should be conducted on a regular basis.

Evaluation

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
4.3 Professional development of academic, scientific and invited staff	☒	☐	☐	☐

4.4. Material Resources

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

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The programme is supported by the necessary infrastructure, information resources relevant to the field of study, and technical equipment required for achieving the programme's learning outcomes.

Both educational buildings of SANGU are well-equipped with modern material-technical and software infrastructure. The university provides high-speed and reliable Internet access through dual providers with automatic load balancing, ensuring uninterrupted connectivity. Network safety is maintained through Kerio Control firewall and antivirus systems like Bitdefender.

Students and staff have access to five fully equipped computer laboratories with centralized management systems, virtual servers for scalable resource allocation, and 28 additional computers in the university library operating on Zero Client systems. All hardware is supported by licensed Microsoft and Google educational tools, including access to Office 365, Microsoft Azure, and JetBrains academic software packages, which are especially beneficial for cybersecurity-related learning and research.

The library is fully equipped with the required textbooks and practical materials, available both in hard copy and electronic formats. Additionally, students have access to resources from Northern Kentucky University, further enriching the academic support available for the programme.

In the second building, there is a dedicated examination hall for up to 200 students, equipped with high-resolution video surveillance and an electronic attendance system. The building also includes five computer labs, centrally managed via a computer control system.

Lecture rooms are equipped with modern technology, including large monitors, projectors, computers, smart boards, and more.

Furthermore, the university is accessible and inclusive, offering infrastructure for students with disabilities and robust fire safety and emergency systems. Facilities such as a modern exam hall with surveillance and electronic attendance systems, along with smart classrooms, enhance the overall academic environment and directly support the achievement of programme learning outcomes.

Evidences/Indicators

- Campus Visit;
- Labs and virtual infrastructure;
- Self-evaluation report;
- Interviews results;
- Access to the leading field related databases and materials provided by the Northern Kentucky University (NKU, USA).

Recommendations:

Suggestions for the programme development

Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
4.4 Material Resources	☒	☐	☐	☐

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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The budget document demonstrates a high degree of detail and transparency in the categorization and description of expenses. It systematically lists all major and minor cost components, providing a comprehensive overview of the program's financial structure without referencing specific monetary amounts.

The budget document provides a transparent and structured overview of the program's financial support mechanisms. It explicitly outlines the university's (USU's) commitment to supporting the program through its budget, ensuring that the allocation of financial resources is economically feasible and aligned with institutional priorities.

Importantly, the budget includes dedicated allocations for scientific research activities, research grants, and research projects. These provisions are reflected in various budget lines, such as university grants, co-financing for research grants, funding for scientific centers, expenses for organizing scientific conferences and seminars, acquisition of research equipment and materials, and support for academic publishing. This demonstrates the institution's commitment to fostering research and supporting both ongoing and new research initiatives.

This document Includes remuneration for both salaried and non-salaried staff, covering academic, administrative, and invited personnel, as well as supervisors, reviewers, and assistants.

Key Characteristics of program's budget document are:

Goods and Services: Encompasses payments for external services, office and utility expenses, communication and internet, maintenance, and representative costs such as events and receptions.

A**cademic and Research Support:** Covers expenses for educational materials, translation services, university grants, practical courses, professional development, scientific equipment, publishing, and organizing conferences and seminars.

Travel and Mobility: Allocates resources for both domestic and international travel, supporting academic collaboration and mobility.

C**ontingency and Miscellaneous:** Provides for unforeseen expenses, student self-government funds, and costs related to program accreditation and authorization.

Non-Financial Assets: References the acquisition and maintenance of property, equipment, office and laboratory inventory, and software.

Each expense is categorized and, where relevant, sub-categorized (e.g., by personnel type or activity), ensuring clarity and facilitating effective financial monitoring and reporting.

Overall, the budget document is highly detailed, covering all aspects of program operations, personnel, academic activities, infrastructure, and support services. This level of detail supports transparency, accountability, and informed decision-making in financial management.

The budget details the sources of financial support for the program, distinguishing between periodic (recurring) and one-time funding streams. These sources include state budget grants, university grants, tuition fees, income from economic activities, and other relevant categories. This approach ensures financial sustainability and flexibility in program implementation.

Overall, the budget is comprehensive, covering all major components necessary for the effective operation, academic development, and research advancement of the program. The level of detail and the inclusion of specific financial support mechanisms underscore the program's economic viability and the university's strategic investment in its success. Additionally, as mentioned during the interview, there is a possibility—should the need arise—for funds to be reallocated from the school's budget to support essential program requirements. This provides an additional layer of flexibility and ensures that the program can respond effectively to unforeseen financial needs.

Evidences/Indicators

- Programme;
- Self-assessment document;
- Program's budget document;
- School's budget document;
- Interview results.

Recommendations:

- None

Suggestions for the programme development

- None

Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
4.5. Programme/ Faculty/School Budget and Programme Financial Sustainability	☒	☐	☐	☐

Compliance with the programme standard

4. Providing Teaching Resources	Complies with requirements	☐
	Substantially complies with requirements	☒
	Partly complies with requirements	☐
	Does not comply with requirements	☐

5. Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities

In order to enhance teaching quality, programme utilises 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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The quality assurance of educational programs at SANGU is conducted through a collaborative and systematic process. The primary objective of these internal quality assessment mechanisms is to cultivate a pervasive culture of quality within the institution. The internal evaluation of program implementation actively involves educational program staff in conjunction with the Quality Assurance and Strategic Development Service. This partnership encompasses comprehensive activities including the assessment of program delivery, evaluation of learning outcomes, planning and execution of evaluation procedures, development of assessment instruments, and the administration of evaluations. Personnel engaged in this process ensure that the data collected through appropriate tools are effectively utilized to inform continuous program improvement. These outcomes provide valuable opportunities for staff to refine pedagogical approaches and enhance the overall quality of educational offerings. According to the document, quality assessment serves as a tool for conducting research, performing analyses, and formulating recommendations grounded in appropriate research methodologies. Furthermore, it supports the ongoing development and enhancement of the university's activities.

In addition to this, the university maintains a separate regulatory framework pertaining to educational programs, entitled the Methodology of Planning and Development. This document delineates the roles and responsibilities of the internal quality service in relation to program planning and execution. However, the expert panel observed that the fragmented presentation of survey instruments, survey outcomes, internal evaluations, and quality assurance documentation complicates a holistic understanding and effective management of the university's internal quality system. Consequently, it is imperative for Sangu University to develop a comprehensive internal quality assurance policy document that integrates all quality-related activities, thereby minimizing overlaps and providing a clear, coherent roadmap for quality assurance processes.

The joint master's program in Cybersecurity between St. Andrew's First-Called Georgian University of the Patriarchate of Georgia (SANGU) and Northern Kentucky University (NKU) features a comprehensive and well-structured quality assurance (QA) system that aligns with both Georgian and American accreditation standards. This QA system integrates continuous monitoring through key assessments, regular data collection and analysis, and collaborative management between the two institutions to ensure program quality and compliance with international education frameworks. The collaboration is formalized by shared responsibility in curriculum design, faculty exchanges (including NKU professors visiting SANGU), joint student assessments, and opportunities for student mobility, which collectively enhance the program's academic rigor and relevance. Both universities maintain active communication

and coordination in QA activities, supported by documented processes for evaluation, reporting, and improvement cycles. However, to maximize the benefit of this partnership, it is desirable to further strengthen the active and ongoing collaboration specifically in joint quality assurance efforts, including harmonizing evaluation practices and sharing feedback more frequently and transparently. This would facilitate more agile responses to identified issues and foster a deeper integration of quality culture across both campuses. Overall, the partnership exemplifies a solid QA framework, yet emphasizing more dynamic, coordinated QA practices would contribute to sustaining and elevating program excellence.

An examination of the relevant documents and interviews revealed that the Rector has issued directives to establish working groups tasked with the evaluation of educational programs. These orders stipulate that each program should undergo an independent self-evaluation and that distinct field-specific councils should be constituted. Nevertheless, the documentation reviewed by the panel included protocols only for the working groups of the program. Notably, only one protocol indicated that the working group—comprising solely program staff and administrators—engaged with students and alumni. This suggests that students are not formally represented within the field-specific councils. The expert panel therefore emphasizes the necessity of actively involving students, graduates, and employers in the self-evaluation process. Despite some contested views, interviews confirmed that these stakeholder groups were not adequately represented in the preparation of the self-evaluation report. Their inclusion could have contributed to a more critical, reflective, and comprehensive assessment.

The expert panel also identified a significant area for improvement concerning the collaboration between the internal quality assurance office and the program implementation teams. Interview data revealed that, despite occasional differences in opinion, personnel involved in program delivery did not fully acknowledge the critical roles of the internal quality office. Simultaneously, the internal quality office appeared insufficiently informed about the deficiencies highlighted in the self-evaluation report. This indicates a pressing need for the university administration to establish clearer protocols and guidelines to facilitate effective communication and set explicit expectations between these units.

SANGU has established its quality assurance framework based on the well-recognized “Plan, Do, Check, Act” (PDCA) cycle. This framework supports rigorous quality evaluation mechanisms throughout both the planning and ongoing development phases of educational programs. Analysis of both documentary evidence and interview findings further indicates that the implementation of the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle remains problematic, particularly in the “Check” and “Act” phases. The Quality Assurance and Strategic Development Service has formulated a comprehensive methodology for program planning, design, and development. This methodology is aligned with applicable regulatory legislation, university policies, national standards for higher education institution authorization, accreditation criteria for higher education programs, and internationally recognized best practices. This challenge was acknowledged by representatives from both the central administration and the internal quality office. To address this, the expert panel recommends that Sangu University strengthen its internal quality assurance service by allocating additional

human resources, thereby enhancing the capacity to execute the PDCA cycle effectively and efficiently.

To facilitate the preparation of the self-assessment report, a working group comprising representatives from both academic and administrative staff was established. While the process was marked by openness and collaboration, it is desirable to further strengthen this cooperative approach by actively involving a broader range of participants, including invited personnel and students, to enhance the effectiveness and inclusiveness of the self-assessment process.

The instruction for master's thesis completion, defense, and assessment provides detailed specifications for all thesis components (title page, abstract, table of contents, introduction, main body, conclusion, bibliography, appendices), giving students clear guidance. The instruction also precisely outlines text formatting requirements, including font specifications, line spacing, and other technical details. Additionally, it defines presentation scope, reviewer responsibilities, examination committee composition, and assessment criteria. The assessment criteria and grade distribution are thoroughly presented, ensuring fair and objective evaluation. According to the evidence provided, these must be submitted for plagiarism checking on the Monday of the 13th week, ensuring timely verification.

However, the document does not specify what percentage is considered an acceptable threshold for similarity (as opposed to plagiarism). This is essential so that students and staff know when a thesis is considered problematic. A specific percentage should be defined (e.g., 20%) above which the thesis requires re-examination or revision.

The document does not indicate whether students have the right and opportunity to independently check their thesis for plagiarism before submission. Therefore, information should be added regarding whether students can access the plagiarism detection system, how many times, and within what timeframes. Additionally, it is not specified where and how students can obtain information about plagiarism prevention (instructions, websites, training sessions, etc.). The interviews also confirmed this need.

According to Article 5, Section 2, Subsection "d" of the "Regulations for Plagiarism Detection, Prevention, and Response," the library director monitors theses uploaded to the plagiarism system and evaluates plagiarism indicators identified in the work based on the system's analysis. However, interviews revealed that a specialist must directly determine whether plagiarism exists in the thesis. Furthermore, regarding specific indicators, it was stated during interviews that percentage thresholds are not established considering the specificity of different academic fields.

Despite the library director's involvement in this process, this arrangement does not ensure quality implementation of plagiarism detection procedures. Given the interview findings and the need to consider field-specific requirements, it is essential that school administration and quality assurance services be designated as responsible parties in this process. Currently, the regulations do not clearly specify who conducts plagiarism checks, within what timeframes,

or how results are communicated. In this context, it is crucial to define responsible personnel (such as school administration and quality assurance services) and establish checking deadlines (for example, 5 working days from submission).

According to Article 6, Paragraph 4 of the regulations on plagiarism detection, prevention, and response procedures, when plagiarism is identified in a master's thesis, the work is forwarded to the student's academic supervisor, program director, and dean, while the student is granted 14 days to submit a revised thesis. In cases of repeated plagiarism detection, an ethics committee is formed to review the matter and issue recommendations regarding defense or assessment with a "zero grade." This regulatory framework directly correlates with the Ministry of Education and Science's January 5, 2007 Order N3 regarding credit calculation procedures for higher education programs. Specifically, Article 4, Paragraph 19 stipulates that if a master's student receives the assessment outlined in sub-paragraph "b.b" of Paragraph 9 or sub-paragraph "z" of Paragraph 17 for the scientific-research component of the master's program, they forfeit the right to resubmit the same scientific-research component. Consequently, when plagiarism is detected in a thesis, a zero grade is assigned, effectively terminating the student's opportunity for resubmission.

Given this legal framework, the expert group concludes that the "Master's Thesis Completion and Assessment Procedures" must align with the requirements established by the Ministry of Education and Science's 2007 Order. However, this alignment necessitates critical terminological and procedural refinements. First, the term "plagiarism" should be replaced with "similarity" to ensure accurate identification of problematic content. Second, establishing specific percentage thresholds for similarity detection is essential to distinguish between acceptable academic overlap and genuine academic misconduct. Without such clearly defined parameters, any minimal percentage similarity could potentially create unnecessary complications, thereby undermining the fairness and effectiveness of the assessment process.

The document does not describe how students should proceed if they disagree with plagiarism check results or assessment. An appeals procedure and deadlines should be added here. Furthermore, the instruction does not contain precise page count requirements regarding thesis length. The recommended number of pages should be specified, or it should be indicated that length is determined according to program specifications.

The document does not detail how students should submit their thesis (e.g., physical copy, CD, electronic format), though this is often essential. Recommendation: specify submission format and deadlines.

What else should be reflected in the document?

· Thesis length recommendations (exact page count or by program);

· Master's thesis completion, submission, and defense deadlines (e.g., plagiarism check deadline on Monday of the 13th week);

· Plagiarism checking process (who conducts checks; student independent checking possibilities and conditions; result notification deadlines; appeals mechanism);

· Master's thesis assessment procedure (committee composition; public defense regulations and duration; thesis submission format: physical and electronic copies (e.g., bound thesis, CD, PDF, Word)) and others.

The document already contains significant and detailed information about master's thesis completion, defense, and assessment, which is very positive. However, additional details are necessary, particularly regarding technical and procedural aspects of plagiarism checking, to ensure the process is maximally transparent, fair, and comprehensible to students. With these changes, the document will become a comprehensive tool that ensures both academic integrity and quality master's theses with fair assessment.

Evidences/Indicators

- Internal quality assurance office internal assessment results;
- Survey results conducted by higher education institution;
- SER;
- The instruction for master's thesis completion, defense, and assessment;
- Program development protocols;
- The "Regulations for Plagiarism Detection, Prevention, and Response';
- The Ministry of Education and Science's January 5, 2007 Order N3 regarding credit calculation procedures for higher education programs;
- interview results.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that the thesis completion and defense instruction should specify thesis length requirements, submission and defense deadlines (regulations), committee composition, and other essential details; It is recommended that records related to master's thesis examination be corrected to align with legislative requirements, thereby enabling the refinement of assessment mechanisms and criteria to achieve full regulatory compliance.
- It is recommended to refine the plagiarism detection system by defining acceptable similarity percentage thresholds, specifying in what cases and within what timeframes a thesis may be revised and resubmitted within the same semester when these

thresholds are exceeded, as well as when modification within the established deadline is excluded and a revised version must be submitted in the following semester. Additionally, students should have self-checking access with clear procedures, appeals mechanisms, and plagiarism prevention resources.

Suggestions for the programme development

- It is suggested that SANGU formulate a comprehensive internal quality assurance policy document to strengthen its quality management framework; It is advised that SANGU augment its internal quality office with additional personnel to ensure the timely and effective completion of the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle.
- It is suggested to strengthen the collaborative framework of the self-assessment process by actively involving invited/academic staff and students. Their meaningful participation can provide diverse perspectives, enhance transparency, and contribute to a more inclusive and effective quality assurance practice.

Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
5.1 Internal quality evaluation	☐	x	☐	☐

5.2 External Quality Evaluation

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

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

External quality assessment involves the process whereby the Accreditation Council provides recommendations based on established accreditation standards. The university predominantly incorporates these recommendations into its program development initiatives.

Describe, analyse and evaluate the compliance of the education programme with the requirements of the component of the standard, based on the information collected through

the self-evaluation report (SER), the enclosed documents and site-visit. During the previous accreditation, several recommendations were issued. Among them, the following should be noted:

- The format, structure, and content of course syllabi should be brought into compliance with Georgian legislation;
- It is recommended that if international students are enrolled in the program, academic, research, and invited staff should consider their cultural and/or other needs in organizing teaching and assessment methods;
- It is recommended that the majority of subjects be conducted on-site;
- It is recommended that anti-plagiarism mechanisms be incorporated into the master's thesis instruction;
- It is recommended that the individual student's role during culminating group projects be clearly defined, along with assessment mechanisms to identify their individual contributions;
- Individual training plans for staff should be developed and implemented;
- It is recommended that both institutions work on sharing quality assurance assessment mechanisms and principles, which will promote similar course assessment procedures, assessment cycles, continuous monitoring of quality assurance processes, and compliance with relevant accreditation standards, among other things.

Some of these issues still require attention today. For example, syllabi cover 7 weeks, with some having 7 topics distributed across 15 subtopics, while other courses lack such specific detail. There is no unified approach that would make syllabi more informative, transparent, and comprehensive, so that students understand what they will study in each course, what it will be based on, and to what depth. Additionally, the plagiarism issue remains problematic, particularly regarding the refinement of detection mechanisms, program learning outcomes and their assessment mechanisms (See 1.2, 1.3 Components), and others. It is essential that the program director and quality assurance service work more intensively and closely in this direction.

However, during the interviews, it became evident that there is readiness to work on these recommendations and refine other problematic issues. Quality assurance service representatives engaged in maximally constructive communication and expressed willingness to consider the findings.

Evidences/Indicators

- Master's Program;
- Minutes of the Educational Program Accreditation Council meeting of August 19, 2022;
- Decision of the Educational Program Accreditation Council of August 19, 2022;
- Interview results.

Recommendations:

Suggestions for the programme development

- It would be advisable to revisit the recommendations from the previous accreditation, analyze them, examine outstanding issues, and address problems with the aim of integrating them into the program or advancing its development.

Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
5.2. External Quality Evaluation	x	☐	☐	☐

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.

Summary and Analysis of the Education Programme's Compliance with the Requirements of the Component of the Standard

The university conducts monitoring and periodic evaluation of educational programs, the results of which are collected and analyzed after each academic year concludes, while the evaluation outcomes are reflected in the program content and the learning process. The monitoring and assessment of the Cybersecurity master's program implementation was carried out not only through traditional and tested methods, such as surveys and focus groups with students, lecturers, graduates, and employers, but also through direct involvement of the program's sectoral council. It becomes evident that work is needed on the program's learning outcomes and their assessment mechanisms (see components 1.2 and 1.3).

The procedures for developing and defending master's theses are problematic. The issue is that, on one hand, more information is needed regarding plagiarism matters, and on the other hand, it is essential that the issue of master's thesis composition be considered in greater detail and that the regulation be refined (see component 2.4 in detail).

Additionally, it was determined that greater support is required for academic and invited staff, so that the university ensures their awareness of contemporary teaching methods, enabling them to integrate teaching methodologies into the learning process considering the master's level (see substandard 2.3), strengthen and better ensure staff participation in scientific-research activities, and enhance the recruitment of lecturers with appropriate qualifications (see components 4.1 and 4.2. in detail). It is essential to strengthen measures by the quality assurance service in this direction.

Evidences/Indicators

- Magisters Program;
- Self-evaluation documents;
- Sillabi;
- Monitoring Mechanisms;
- Quality assurance mechanisms;
- Student survey;
- interview results.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended for the monitoring of quality assurance mechanisms to be further strengthened in order to provide greater support regarding learning outcomes, their

assessment mechanisms, teaching methods, problems identified through questionnaires and interviews, and other areas.

Suggestions for the programme development

Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
5.3. Programme monitoring and periodic review	☐	x	☐	☐

Compliance with the programme standards

5. Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities	Complies with requirements	☐
	Substantially complies with requirements	x
	Partially complies with requirements	☐
	Does not comply with requirements	☐

Attached documentation (if applicable):

Name of the Higher Education Institution:

St. Andrew's First-Called Georgian University of the Patriarchate of Georgia (SANGU) - Georgia

Northern Kentucky University (NKU) – USA

Name of Higher Education Programme, Level:

Cybersecurity

Compliance with the Programme Standards

Evaluation Standards	Complies with requirements	Substantially complies with requirements	Partially complies with requirements	Does not comply with requirements
1. Education Programme Objectives, Learning O utcomes and their Compliance with the Programme	☐	x	☐	☐
2. Teaching Methodology and Organisation, Adequacy Evaluation of Programme Mastering	☐	x	☐	☐
3. Student Achievements, Individual Work with them	x	☐	☐	☐
4. Providing Teaching Resources	☐	x	☐	☐
5. Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities	☐	x	☐	☐

Signatures:

Chair of Accreditation Expert Panel

Full name, signature

Accreditation Expert Panel Members

Full name, signature