



**NATIONAL CENTER FOR  
EDUCATIONAL QUALITY  
ENHANCEMENT**

## **Accreditation Expert Group Report on Higher Education Programme**

For educational programmes implemented within the first and second levels of higher education and Georgian language preparation educational programme

**Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, Bachelor's Program**

**Caucasus International University, LLC**

Evaluation Date(s): February 23, 2026

Final Report Submission Date: April 10, 2026

Tbilisi

## Information about a Higher Education Institution <sup>1</sup>

Name of Institution Indicating its Organizational Legal Form	Caucasus International University, LLC
Identification Code of Institution	201951637
Type of the Institution	University

## Expert Panel Members

<b>Chair</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Hasan Çakır - Gazi University, Turkiye
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Magda Tsintsadze - LEPL Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Giorgi Iashvili - LTD Business and Technology University
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Nino Talikadze, LTD International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia
<b>Member</b> (Name, Surname, HEI/Organisation, Country)	Nino Gatchava, LTD Georgian Aviation University, Georgia

---

<sup>1</sup> 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)	კომპიუტერული მეცნიერებები და ხელოვნური ინტელექტი
Name of Higher Education Programme (in English)	Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence
Level of Higher Education/programme	Bachelor's degree
Qualification to be Awarded <sup>2</sup>	Bachelor of Computer Science
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 <sup>3</sup>	--
Language of Instruction	Georgian
Number of ECTS credits	240
Programme Status (Accredited/ Non-accredited/ Conditionally accredited/ Newly proposed/International accreditation) Indicating Relevant Decision (number, date)	New
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)	--
The quota for MD students requested by the HEI (In the case of Medical Doctor one-cycle educational programme)	--

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> In case of Integrated Bachelor's-Master's Teacher Training Educational Programme and Teacher Training Educational Programme

## II. Accreditation Report Executive Summary

### ▪ **General Information on Education Programme**

The Bachelor's Educational Program in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence at Caucasus International University is an academic higher education programme implemented by the Faculty of Business and Technology. The programme belongs to the broad field of Information and Communication Technologies and the detailed field of Software and Applications Development and Analysis. It is delivered as a full-time bachelor programme with Georgian as the language of instruction and leads to the academic degree of Bachelor of Computer Science.

The total workload of the programme is 240 ECTS credits, structured over four academic years (eight semesters). One academic year consists of two semesters of approximately nineteen weeks each, including the teaching period, examination sessions, and re-examinations. The ECTS credit system follows the Georgian higher education regulation where one credit corresponds to 25 hours of student workload, combining both contact hours and independent study. In order to obtain the degree, students must accumulate the full number of required credits and successfully complete all programme components.

The programme curriculum is composed of mandatory and elective course groups. The mandatory component includes 177 ECTS credits, distributed across university mandatory courses (21 ECTS), faculty mandatory courses (24 ECTS), and major field courses in computer science and artificial intelligence (132 ECTS). In addition to these compulsory subjects, the curriculum includes 63 ECTS credits of elective courses, including university electives (4 ECTS), faculty electives (4 ECTS), and field-specific electives (35 ECTS). The programme also allows students to take free elective courses totaling 20 ECTS, which may be selected from other undergraduate programmes within the university.

The curriculum contains a large number of courses covering fundamental mathematics and computing subjects such as calculus, linear algebra, discrete structures, programming, algorithms, databases, operating systems, and computer networks, followed by specialized courses in artificial intelligence, machine learning, neural networks, data science, cybersecurity, and software engineering. In addition to course-based instruction, the programme includes professional practice (10 ECTS) and a bachelor's project (6 ECTS) completed in the final stage of study. These components are intended to provide opportunities for applying theoretical knowledge in practical and research contexts.

Admission to the programme is open to applicants who hold a document confirming the completion of general secondary education or an equivalent qualification. Applicants are typically admitted through the national admission system regulated by Georgian legislation. Admission without Unified National Examinations may occur under special legal provisions, and student mobility or transfer from other higher education institutions is possible following the procedures established by national regulations and the university's internal rules.

The programme is implemented by academic staff from the Faculty of Business and Technology under the supervision of the programme head and involves professors and invited lecturers responsible for delivering courses, supervising projects, and participating in programme evaluation processes. The programme has 17 affiliated academic staff and 9 invited professors.

### ▪ **Overview of the Accreditation Site Visit**

The evaluation of the Bachelor's Educational Programme in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence was conducted by the expert panel formed by the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement (NCEQE). The online preparatory meeting of the expert team took place prior to the site visit on February 12, 2026. During the meeting, the panel members discussed their preliminary observations based on the self-evaluation report and the accompanying

documentation submitted by the institution. This meeting enabled the experts to clarify key aspects of the programme and identify issues requiring further discussion during the visit.

The site visit took place on February 23, 2026, at Caucasus International University campus. The expert panel consisted of both Georgian and international experts representing academic and professional expertise in the fields of computer science, artificial intelligence, and higher education quality assurance. During the visit, the panel conducted a series of meetings with the university and faculty administration, the quality assurance office, the programme director, academic and invited staff involved in the programme, as well as current students, graduates, and representatives of employers associated with the programme.

In addition to the interviews, the panel reviewed supporting documentation, including course syllabi, teaching and learning materials, and quality assurance procedures related to the programme. The experts were also provided with an overview of the learning environment and the technical resources available to students, including laboratories, computer facilities, and library resources that support teaching and research activities.

The site visit was organized according to the established accreditation procedures and schedule. The meetings were conducted in a constructive and professional atmosphere, allowing the panel members to gather additional information, clarify aspects of the programme implementation, and discuss the programme's development processes with different stakeholder groups. The discussions and additional documentation review provided the panel with additional insights into the structure, delivery, and quality assurance mechanisms of the educational programme.

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

- **Recommendations**

- Standard 1**

- Standard 1.3**

- Develop rubric-based performance descriptors aligned to each PLO, explicitly differentiating Introduction, Deepening, and Mastery levels.
- Provide an implementation plan document that facilitates transition from distribution-based monitoring to a criterion-referenced PLO attainment framework with clearly defined performance thresholds for each learning outcome.

- Standard 1.4**

- Ensure clearer structural integration of theoretical computer science foundations within the Computer Science qualification profile, in alignment with internationally recognized academic frameworks, either by introducing a dedicated course (for instance: Theory of Computation) or by systematically expanding existing algorithm-related courses to cover formal models of computation and advanced complexity analysis.

- Standard 2**

- Standard 2.3**

- Increase the proportion of analytical, design-based, and problem-solving tasks in final assessments of foundational and theoretical courses (Algorithms, AI, Software Engineering)

## ▪ **Suggestions**

### **Standard 1**

#### **Standard 1.1**

- Strengthen the societal contribution by adding a concise statement explicitly linking the programme to digital transformation, AI-driven economic development, cybersecurity resilience, and innovation ecosystems at national and regional levels
- Provide a formal mapping document showing alignment between programme objectives and the university's strategic development plan
- Strengthen the international orientation of the program with explicit international benchmarking and reference to ACM/IEEE computing curricula.
- Strengthen the documentary evidence of stakeholder engagement to strengthen the programme planning.

#### **Standard 1.3**

- Provide explicit PLO-level performance benchmarks beyond grade distribution to assess the student competency levels for learning outcomes.

#### **Standard 1.4**

- Strengthen the emphasis of AI curriculum in the official programme description.
- Strengthen the course readings by adding journal articles especially from the faculty members' research.
- Document formal curriculum benchmarking against international CS/AI standards

#### **Standard 1.5**

- Create rubrics to strengthen the assessment of the practical work in courses.
- Create explicit course-level outcome-to-assessment mapping tables to strengthen the transparency in course evaluations.
- Strengthen the process of regular updating of literature to reflect the latest international research

### **Standard 2**

#### **Standard 2.1**

- Introduce diagnostic testing or bridging modules (if necessary) for students lacking adequate mathematical or analytical preparation.

### **Standard 2.2**

- Introduce clearer integration of research-oriented tasks within core CS and AI courses
- Increase undergraduate participation in funded research initiatives

### **Standard 2.3**

- Introduce structured algorithmic case-analysis tasks requiring complexity comparison and justification.
- In AI and Algorithms, incorporate at least one exam task requiring: heuristic admissibility proof, complexity comparison between strategies, design of an optimized solution.
- In Software Engineering, consider increasing the weight of project evaluation relative to theoretical tests

## **Standard 5**

### **Standard 5.1**

- It is desirable to further improve feedback cycles so that all stakeholders are equally informed about how their recommendations have been addressed.

### **▪ Brief Overview of the Best Practices (if applicable)<sup>4</sup>**

N/A

### **▪ Information on Sharing or Not Sharing the Argumentative Position of the HEI**

Recommendations by the expert group were reviewed and responded by the higher education institution. Below is a summary of programme's argumentative points. *The higher education institution's response to the recommendation 1 and recommendation 2 for sub-standard 1.3. can be summarized as* the Bachelor's Programme in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence has established a learning outcomes assessment system that combines distribution-based monitoring with criterion-referenced, programme learning outcome-focused evaluation. Each learning outcome is supported by defined assessment indicators and three performance levels, confirming the use of rubric-based assessment. A second assessment stage analyzes learning outcome achievement within specific courses, enabling competency-based evaluation rather than simple grade distribution tracking. While the experts' recommendation is viewed as reasonable and constructive, the programme maintains that its current assessment mechanism already fully meets the requirements of sub-standard 1.3 set by the accreditation standards. *The institution's response to recommendation for substandard 1.4 can be summarized as* the programme builds a strong theoretical base through courses in

---

<sup>4</sup> A practice that is exceptionally effective and that can serve as a benchmark or example for other educational programme/programmes.

mathematics, Discrete Structures, and Algorithms and Data Structures, covering formal models of computation, discrete mathematics, logic, graphs, and algorithm analysis. Students develop skills in evaluating algorithm correctness, complexity, and performance at the bachelor's level. While experts note topics such as automata theory, computability, and advanced complexity analysis, these are partially included in relevant courses. Programme developers deliberately followed ICT sector benchmarks to clearly separate bachelor's and master's-level content, aiming to avoid overlap; experts acknowledge the need for clearer structural integration, not the absence of these topics. And finally, *the institution's response to recommendation for sub-standard 2.3 can be summarized as* across the three courses—Algorithms and Data Structures, Software Engineering, and Artificial Intelligence—interim assessments already include the types of analytical, design-oriented, and problem-solving tasks highlighted by experts. In Algorithms and Data Structures, students design and analyze algorithms and data structures. Software Engineering emphasizes system design, UI development, architecture, security, and modern development tools. Artificial Intelligence focuses on recognition tasks, data processing, model selection, and result evaluation. While final assessments also include such tasks alongside theoretical testing, the experts' suggestion to increase their weight may be reasonable. However, maintaining the current assessment structure is unlikely to negatively affect learning outcomes, given the strong practical emphasis in interim assessments.

Based on the information provided by the higher education institution and information obtained during the site visit, the expert group discussed the argumentative points of the institution and decided not to change the recommendations provided in this report in the light of following explanations.

For sub-standard 1.3, while the HEI asserts that rubric-based assessments and three-tier performance criteria are in place, it fails to present clear evidence that these descriptors are consistently aligned with each programme learning outcome or that they effectively distinguish among the Introduction, Deepening, and Mastery levels. The institution's position depends largely on broad statements rather than showcasing a coherent, criterion-referenced framework with explicitly defined performance benchmarks. Furthermore, the current evaluation method in the programme is an institution wide practice therefore the expectation is not to change it rather provide a transition plan. The recommendation specifically requests an implementation plan to shift from distribution-based monitoring to a criterion-referenced approach and no such plan was provided at time of application or site visit.

Regarding to the sub-standard 1.4, it seems that the response suggests a limited interpretation of the Theory of Computation as a core area of computer science. Rather than presenting it as a clearly defined theoretical domain, it describes the area through selected topics from discrete mathematics, an introductory reference to automata, and basic aspects of algorithmic complexity distributed over different courses. In internationally recognized academic frameworks, Theory of Computation is typically understood as a structured field encompassing formal languages, systematic automata theory, computability concepts such as decidability and reductions, and complexity theory. As a result, it is difficult to conclude that students gain the expected foundational understanding. Framing the recommendation as optional also limits the engagement with this identified curricular issue.

Finally, for sub-standard 2.3, the response highlights the existence of analytical and problem-solving tasks within interim assessments but does not fully engage with the main concern of the recommendation, which focuses on their role and weighting in final assessments. Although practical assignments are described in detail, their relevance remains unclear without a direct connection to summative assessment design. Increasing analytical and design-based components in final assessments would be reasonable, it suggests room for improvement. The institution's assertion that the use of current approach does not affect learning outcomes would benefit from clearer supporting evidence, especially given the established importance of summative assessments in confirming student achievement.

- **Quantitative Data Analysis of the educational programme in accordance with the requirements of the accreditation standards, for example:**
  - **Staff and Supervisors** - The implementation of the Bachelor's Educational Programme in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence involves a combination of affiliated academic staff and invited lecturers. The programme includes 10 professors, 16 associate professors, and 1 assistant professor, bringing the total number of academic personnel involved in teaching to 27 individuals. Most of the academic staff involved in the programme hold **doctoral degrees in relevant disciplinary fields**, and the distribution of courses among faculty members reflects their academic specialization and professional experience.
  - **Scientific/Research Indicators** - The academic staff involved in the programme demonstrate research activity across several indicators during the last five years. These indicators include publications in peer-reviewed international journals, participation in local and international scientific conferences, and involvement in research and development activities related to computer science and information technologies. Total of 140 publications are reported for the last 5 years. Faculty members contribute to research dissemination through conference presentations and publications.
  - **Academic Staff Turnover Rate** - For the last 5 years, the department did not hire any new faculty member or no faculty member has been retired. Therefore staff turnover rate is not available.
  - **Data on the Individuals Enrolled:** Since this is a new program such data is not available.
  - **Analysis of other quantitative data** provided in the self-assessment and annexes.
- **In case of re-accreditation, a brief overview of significant achievements and/or progress (if applicable) during the accreditation period, as well as a review of the fulfillment of the recommendations received during the previous evaluation process.**

### III. Summary Table of Compliance of the programmes with the standards

	Standard	Evaluation
<b>1.</b>	<b>1.1. Educational Programme Objectives, Learning Outcomes and their Compliance with the Programme</b>	<b>Substantially Complies</b>
1.1	<a href="#">Programme Objectives</a>	Complies
1.2	<a href="#">Programme Learning Outcomes</a>	Complies
1.3	<a href="#">Evaluation Mechanism of the Programme Learning Outcomes</a>	Substantially
1.4	<a href="#">Structure and Content of Educational Programme</a>	Substantially
1.5	<a href="#">Academic Course/Subject</a>	Complies
<b>2.</b>	<b>Methodology and Organization of Teaching, Adequacy of Evaluation of Programme Mastering</b>	<b>Complies</b>
2.1	<a href="#">Programme Admission Preconditions</a>	Complies
2.2	<a href="#">The Development of Practical, Scientific/Research/ Creative/ Performance and Transferable Skills</a>	Complies
2.3	<a href="#">Teaching and Learning Methods</a>	Substantially
2.4	<a href="#">Student Evaluation</a>	Complies
<b>3.</b>	<b>Student Achievements and Individual Work with Them</b>	<b>Complies</b>
3.1	<a href="#">Student Consulting and Support Services</a>	Complies
3.2	<a href="#">Master's Student Supervision</a>	N/A
<b>4</b>	<b>Providing Teaching Resources</b>	<b>Complies</b>
4.1	<a href="#">Human Resources</a>	Complies
4.2	<a href="#">Qualification of Supervisors of Master's Student</a>	N/A
4.3	<a href="#">Professional Development of Academic, Scientific and Invited Staff</a>	Complies
4.4	<a href="#">Material Resources</a>	Complies
4.5	<a href="#">Programme/Faculty/School Budget and Programme Financial Sustainability</a>	Complies
<b>5</b>	<b>Teaching Quality Enhancement Opportunities</b>	<b>Complies</b>
5.1	<a href="#">Internal Quality Evaluation</a>	Complies
5.2	<a href="#">External Quality Evaluation</a>	Complies
5.3	<a href="#">Programme Monitoring and Periodic Review</a>	Complies

## **Guidelines and Standards (See link)**

[Accreditation Standards for Higher Education Programmes](#)

[Guideline for Assessment of Accreditation Standards of Higher Education Programmes](#)

[Suggestions on the evaluation of the methodology for determining the threshold number of student quotas on a higher education institution educational programme of a certified medical doctor](#)

[Assessment criteria](#)

### **Definitions:**

**Recommendations** - should be considered by the HEI in order to comply the programme with the requirements of the standard

**Suggestions** - non-binding suggestions for the programme development

## IV. 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

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.

The programme objectives are formally articulated and aligned with defined learning outcomes covering knowledge, skills, responsibility, and autonomy. They are realistic for a Bachelor-level programme and operationalized through a structured curriculum and measurable PLO framework.

They appropriately reflect the specificity of the field of Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence by emphasizing computational thinking, algorithmic problem-solving, software development, and data-driven decision-making, which are core disciplinary characteristics of the domain. They are aligned with the Bachelor level of higher education, focusing on the development of fundamental theoretical knowledge, applied technical skills, and initial research competencies expected at the bachelor's level. The objectives consider the structure of the educational programme, which has mandatory field courses, electives, practice, and a bachelor's project.

The programme objectives clearly articulate the development of core disciplinary knowledge in computer science, including algorithms, data structures, software engineering, database systems, and artificial intelligence foundations, ensuring graduates acquire a solid theoretical and technical base consistent with the bachelor qualification level. In addition to knowledge acquisition, the objectives emphasize the development of applied technical skills such as programming, system design, model development, problem-solving, and the practical use of AI tools and modern software technologies. The programme further addresses transversal competences, including analytical and critical thinking, teamwork, communication skills, ethical responsibility, and the ability to operate in professional and multicultural environments. Finally, the objectives incorporate elements of responsibility and autonomy,

While the objectives reflect preparation of AI and CS professionals, the societal and developmental contribution is implied rather than explicitly articulated. A statement that explicitly links program objectives to societal contribution would be beneficial.

The report and accompanying documentation suggest alignment with the Faculty of Business and Technology and the institutional mission. The programme objectives are consistent with the mission and strategic directions of the university, particularly in relation to fostering high-

quality education, strengthening research capacity, and promoting internationalization. They align with the faculty's emphasis on developing competitive professionals equipped with both theoretical foundations and practical competencies relevant to technological innovation and labor market needs. Furthermore, the objectives reflect the institutional strategy of integrating modern teaching methods, enhancing research productivity, and supporting sustainable development and international cooperation. However, the explicit cross-reference between programme objectives and the HEI strategic plan would be beneficial.

The curriculum content (ML, Neural Networks, NLP, Cybersecurity, Back-End Development, Project Management) reflects current global ICT and AI labor market trends. The market research analysis and needs analysis was completed by meeting with the potential employers to get their opinions. Development of the curriculum content is backed up by labor market needs analysis as well.

The inclusion of English language courses, English for Computer Science, AI-focused modern content, and globally relevant technologies indicates implicit international orientation. Nevertheless, explicit reference to international benchmarking, mobility, joint projects, or alignment with international accreditation/standards (e.g., ACM/IEEE Computing Curricula) is not clearly articulated.

The PLO evaluation mechanism indicates involvement of academic staff and programme supervisor in monitoring and evaluation. However, documented evidence of stakeholder participation (minutes, consultation records with employers, alumni input) is not explicitly visible in the provided documentation. However, during the site visit interviews it was concluded that the external stakeholders were involved by providing their opinions to prepare programme objectives and their opinions were collected about the developed programme objectives.

#### **Evidences/Indicators**

- Self evaluation report
- Programme Objectives
- Strategic plan of the faculty and the university
- Interview results

#### **Recommendations:**

- None

#### **Suggestions for the Programme Development**

- Strengthen the societal contribution by adding a concise statement explicitly linking the programme to digital transformation, AI-driven economic development, cybersecurity resilience, and innovation ecosystems at national and regional levels
- Provide a formal mapping document showing alignment between programme objectives and the university's strategic development plan
- Strengthen the international orientation of the program with explicit international benchmarking and reference to ACM/IEEE computing curricula.

- Strengthen the documentary evidence of stakeholder engagement to strengthen the programme planning.

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">1.1 Programme Objectives</a>	Complies with the requirements

### 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

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.

The PLOs comprehensively cover knowledge (core CS domains and AI), skills (software development, ML/NN problem-solving, analysis), and responsibility/autonomy (ethics, teamwork, self-development). They logically operationalize the programme's academic and professional aims and reflect balanced competence development.

It is observed that the programme learning outcomes are formulated using action-oriented verbs such as "analyzes," "applies," "designs," "implements," and "evaluates," which make them observable and assessable through concrete assessment methods. Their scope and complexity correspond to the Bachelor level, ensuring that the expected competencies can realistically be achieved within the 240 ECTS structure, including coursework, internship, and the bachelor's project. The outcomes are attainable through the combination of theoretical instruction, practical laboratory work, project-based assignments, and supervised practice, which was viewed as sufficient to provide learning opportunities. Overall, the defined learning outcomes are realistic in relation to the programme duration, student workload, and available academic and material resources.

Presented programme learning outcomes are aligned with the Bachelor-level qualification by focusing on the acquisition of fundamental theoretical knowledge, applied technical skills, and the development of analytical and problem-solving abilities appropriate to first-cycle higher education. They emphasize the ability to apply established principles and methods in computer science and artificial intelligence. The outcomes also incorporate responsibility, autonomy, teamwork, and ethical awareness, which are characteristic of Bachelor-level descriptors. Overall the expert team sees that the defined learning outcomes are coherent with the level of qualification and appropriately reflect the competencies expected from graduates awarded the Bachelor of Computer Science degree.

Moreover, the documentation demonstrates structural alignment with knowledge–skills–responsibility/autonomy categories typical of NQF descriptors. However, an explicit reference to the Georgian NQF level descriptor or sectoral benchmark document is not clearly indicated in the supplied documents.

As for the vertical and employment alignment of the PLOs, the programme learning outcomes are aligned with current employment demands by emphasizing practical competencies such as programming, software development, data analysis, artificial intelligence applications, teamwork, and problem–solving in real–world contexts. They prepare graduates to operate effectively in entry–level professional roles within the IT and AI sectors by integrating applied learning components such as internship and project–based work. The expert team agrees that based on the programme and the course list, the outcomes provide an acceptable theoretical foundation in core computer science disciplines, enabling graduates to meet the academic prerequisites for progression to Master’s–level studies.

By reflecting the specific characteristics of the Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence field, the PLOs address labor market demands by integrating competencies related to modern programming languages, system development, data processing, and practical project implementation, which are essential in contemporary IT and AI sectors. Furthermore, the inclusion of soft skills such as teamwork, communication skills, and ethical responsibility responds to employer expectations for adaptable and professionally competent graduates. Therefore the PLOs are consistent with the specifics of the field and labor market needs, which is supported by the presented documentation.

During the site visit, the interview findings from the related parties indicated that the development of the programme learning outcomes followed a collaborative approach that involved key internal and external stakeholders, including academic staff, programme leadership, quality assurance representatives, students, graduates, and employers. It is evident that this participatory process ensured that the learning outcomes reflect both academic standards and labour market expectations, strengthening their relevance and practical applicability for the department. However, explicit documentation that presents this process needs to be strengthened.

The programme under evaluation uses a leveled mastery structure for learning outcomes. They are grouped within the cluster and demonstrate vertical consistency across levels by applying a structured three–level mastery model: Level 1 (introduction and foundational understanding), Level 2 (reinforcement and applied development), and Level 3 (advanced integration and independent application). These mastery levels are distributed progressively across the curriculum, beginning with fundamental courses in early semesters, continuing with intermediate applied courses, and culminating in advanced specialization, internship, and bachelor’s project components. This staged development ensures increasing complexity, autonomy, and cognitive depth in accordance with first–cycle qualification descriptors.

For example, a learning outcome such as “the ability to design and implement software solutions” is introduced at Level 1 in introductory programming courses where students apply predefined algorithms and basic coding principles. At Level 2, in courses such as Software Engineering or Database Systems, students design structured systems, apply development methodologies, and work collaboratively on more complex projects. At Level 3, during the bachelor’s project, students independently design, implement, test, and evaluate comprehensive software or AI–based solutions in real or simulated professional contexts. This progression reflects coherent vertical alignment and increasing mastery across the programme cluster.

The PLOs are formally documented and integrated into course mapping and evaluation mechanisms. The site visit interviews confirmed that the individuals involved in the implementation of the programme actively communicate the learning outcomes to relevant stakeholders, such as involved faculty members and the potential employers. Academic staff present course–level and programme–level learning outcomes through syllabi, orientation

meetings, consultation hours, and classroom explanations, while administrative units provide supporting information through official communication channels. Interview results indicate that students and other stakeholders are aware of the intended learning outcomes and understand how they relate to course content and assessment. This systematic dissemination contributes to alignment between teaching, assessment, and stakeholder expectations, strengthening the overall quality assurance framework of the programme.

### Evidences/Indicators

- Self evaluation report
- Programme Learning Outcomes
- Educational programme description document
- Evaluation mechanism of the programme
- Interview results

### Recommendations:

- None

### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">1.2 Programme Learning Outcomes</a>	Complies with the requirements

### 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**

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.

The programme has established a structured mechanism for evaluating Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs). The evaluation framework includes both direct and indirect assessment methods. Direct methods consist of analysis of examination results, practical assignments,

project evaluations, Bachelor's Project assessment, and Practice outcomes. Indirect methods include planned surveys of students, alumni, and employers, as well as curriculum analysis. The evaluation cycle is implemented within semester-based quality assurance monitoring procedures and supported by institutional regulations.

The programme defines a two-stage direct assessment mechanism, including (i) statistical grade distribution analysis and (ii) course-based reinforcement analysis. This demonstrates the existence of a formalized and periodic monitoring system. Quantitative benchmarks and deviation thresholds are defined, reflecting a data-oriented monitoring culture.

However, the current model relies substantially on Gaussian distribution-based grade analysis as an indicator of outcome attainment. While statistical distribution analysis can serve as a useful tool for identifying grading anomalies or deviations, it does not directly measure whether students have achieved specific Programme Learning Outcomes at a defined competency level. The mechanism primarily evaluates relative grade dispersion rather than explicit, criterion-referenced attainment thresholds tied to individual PLOs.

Furthermore, although courses designated at the "Reinforcement/Mastery" level are selected for direct observation, the mapping framework does not consistently provide rubric-based descriptors clearly distinguishing between Introduction, Deepening, and Mastery levels. This limits the precision and transparency of vertical progression measurement and weakens the direct linkage between performance evidence and specific PLO indicators.

During the site-visit interviews, Quality assurance representatives acknowledged the methodological limitations of the Gaussian-based evaluation and confirmed that they are planning to revise the current assessment framework. The programme team expressed their intention to introduce a more explicit criterion-referenced approach to PLO attainment measurement. This indicates institutional awareness of the issue and a proactive commitment to strengthening outcome-based assessment practices.

The Quality Assurance Office provides structured procedures for monitoring, introduces assessment criteria in advance, and conducts evaluation cycles with feedback to academic staff. Interviews confirm that faculty members are informed about PLO evaluation procedures and participate in monitoring discussions. Institutional support for outcome assessment is therefore in place.

### **Evidences/Indicators**

- Self evaluation report
- Programme Learning Outcomes
- Educational programme description document
- Evaluation mechanism of the programme
- Site visit interview results

### **Recommendations:**

- Develop rubric-based performance descriptors aligned to each PLO, explicitly differentiating Introduction, Deepening, and Mastery levels.
- Provide an implementation plan document that facilitates transition from distribution-based monitoring to a criterion-referenced PLO attainment framework with clearly defined performance thresholds for each learning outcome.

## Suggestions for the Programme Development

- Provide explicit PLO-level performance benchmarks beyond grade distribution to assess the student competency levels for learning outcomes.

### **Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">1.3 Evaluation Mechanism of the Programme Learning Outcomes</a>	Substantially complies with the requirements

### **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**

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.

The programme is designed in accordance with the HEI's established methodology for planning, designing, and developing educational programmes. The documentation reflects systematic design elements, including curriculum mapping, defined PLO reinforcement levels (Introduction–Deepening–Reinforcement), structured sequencing of courses, and alignment with the National Qualifications Framework. These elements indicate adherence to institutional programme development procedures.

The curriculum includes foundational mathematics (Calculus, Linear Algebra, Probability and Statistics), programming, discrete structures, algorithms, systems, databases, software engineering, and artificial intelligence components, which are generally appropriate for a Bachelor-level qualification. The programme demonstrates a logical academic progression from introductory programming and mathematical foundations in early semesters to advanced courses such as Machine Learning, Neural Networks, Software Engineering, and Natural Language Processing in later semesters. Prerequisites are clearly defined, supporting vertical academic coherence and gradual development of competencies.

The ECTS-based structure is clearly articulated. All reviewed syllabi specify credit allocation, contact hours, independent workload, and assessment weightings. The 100-point grading scale and minimum threshold requirements align with Georgian higher education regulations. The workload distribution appears feasible and consistent with the first-cycle qualification level.

Although the programme is classified as Computer Science, Artificial Intelligence constitutes a core thematic pillar within the curriculum. The presence of courses such as Machine Learning, Neural Networks, Data Science, NLP, and Cybersecurity Management differentiates the programme from a traditional Computer Science curriculum and reflects responsiveness to contemporary technological developments. However, the added value and strategic positioning of AI within the programme description could be articulated more explicitly in the official programme narrative to clarify its distinctive academic profile.

The structure integrates compulsory core courses, elective components, a 10-credit internship, and a 6-credit Bachelor's Project, ensuring applied and integrative learning. Practical components, laboratory work, project-based assignments, and professional practice contribute to the development of analytical thinking, software development competence, AI application skills, and professional responsibility.

However, while the programme includes Discrete Structures and Algorithms, a distinct and sufficiently developed theoretical computer science component (e.g., formal models of computation, automata theory, computability, and advanced algorithmic complexity analysis) is not clearly identifiable within the current curriculum structure. Given the designation of the qualification as Bachelor of Computer Science, the theoretical foundation could be strengthened to enhance alignment with internationally recognized Computer Science frameworks (e.g., ACM/IEEE guidelines) and to support deeper formal reasoning competencies.

The curriculum incorporates contemporary subject areas and modern tools, indicating alignment with current developments in the field. Course syllabi reference practical implementation, programming environments, and AI-related technologies. Nonetheless, mandatory reading lists in several core courses rely predominantly on lecture notes and locally produced materials, with limited explicit integration of recent peer-reviewed international research literature. Stronger visible linkage between faculty research activity and curriculum content would further enhance academic depth and research-informed teaching.

The programme development process reflects a collaborative approach involving academic and administrative stakeholders within the faculty. Interview results indicate that faculty members actively participate in curriculum design, revision discussions, and the refinement of programme learning outcomes, contributing disciplinary expertise to programme development. The involvement of internal stakeholders supports alignment between course content, institutional priorities, and field-specific advancements.

### **Evidences/Indicators**

- Self evaluation report
- Educational programme description document
- Course syllabi
- Affiliated faculty CVs
- Site visit interview results

### **Recommendations:**

- Ensure clearer structural integration of theoretical computer science foundations within the Computer Science qualification profile, in alignment with internationally recognized academic frameworks, either by introducing a dedicated course (for instance: Theory of Computation) or by systematically expanding existing algorithm-related courses to cover formal models of computation and advanced complexity analysis.

### **Suggestions for the Programme Development**

- Strengthen the emphasis of AI curriculum in the official programme description.
- Strengthen the course readings by adding journal articles especially from the faculty members' research.
- Document formal curriculum benchmarking against international CS/AI standards

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">1.4. Structure and Content of Educational Programme</a>	Substantially complies with the requirements

### 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

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.

The syllabi of core courses explicitly reflect programme-level competencies such as algorithmic reasoning, software development, AI/ML implementation, and teamwork. The curriculum map demonstrates structured reinforcement of PLOs across selected key courses. Alignment of the courses within the programme is systematic and clearly designed to support programme-level outcome attainment.

It appears that the course syllabi demonstrate a clear alignment between the stated course learning outcomes and the structure of weekly topics, which indicates coherence between intended competencies and instructional content. In technical courses such as Algorithms and Data Structures, Machine Learning, and Database Systems, the topics directly support the analytical, programming, and system-design skills articulated in the course outcomes. The presence of practical exercises and project-based tasks further reflects consistency between applied learning objectives and course implementation.

Courses follow the standard 5–6 ECTS model with clearly distributed lecture, practical, project, and independent work hours. The balance between contact hours and independent study (approximately 60–70% independent work) is appropriate for a Bachelor-level computing programme. The credit allocation appears proportionate to course complexity and expected competency development.

The syllabi indicate that course learning outcomes are assessed through multiple evaluation components, including midterm exams, final exams, laboratory assignments, project work, presentations, and practical tasks. In technical and applied courses, practical work constitutes a significant portion of the overall grade, suggesting that skill-based learning outcomes are actively evaluated rather than only theoretical knowledge. Assessment criteria are generally described in grading breakdowns; however, detailed analytic rubrics specifying performance levels for each learning outcome are not consistently visible across all reviewed syllabi. While practical components are clearly evaluated, the transparency of how each individual learning outcome is measured could be strengthened through standardized rubric-based assessment matrices. The introduction of explicit outcome-to-assessment mapping tables and detailed rubrics for project and laboratory work would improve traceability and consistency in demonstrating that every learning outcome is systematically assessed.

The compulsory literature listed in the syllabi generally aligns with the thematic focus and intended learning outcomes of each course, particularly in core areas such as programming, algorithms, databases, software engineering, and artificial intelligence. The selected textbooks and technical resources for the courses appear to support both theoretical understanding and applied skill development. In addition to textbooks, the inclusion of practical tools, software frameworks, and laboratory-based resources can further reinforce the connection between course-level competencies and overall programme objectives.

The syllabi include widely recognized foundational textbooks in areas such as algorithms, machine learning, software engineering, and databases, many of which are established international references in the field. In several courses, the main literature consists primarily of textbooks rather than recent peer-reviewed journal articles, and some editions referenced are not the most current available. While modern technological tools and frameworks are incorporated into practical components, the explicit inclusion of up-to-date scientific journal articles and recent conference proceedings (e.g., from IEEE, ACM, or leading AI venues) is limited in the reviewed materials. The reading lists therefore reflect strong theoretical grounding but provide less visible evidence of systematic integration of the latest literature. Expanding the compulsory or recommended literature to include recent high-impact research publications would enhance alignment with cutting-edge scientific developments in computer science and artificial intelligence.

### **Evidences/Indicators**

- Self evaluation report
- Course syllabi
- Affiliated faculty CVs
- Site visit interview results

### **Recommendations:**

- None

### **Suggestions for the Programme Development**

- Create rubrics to strengthen the assessment of the practical work in courses.
- Create explicit course-level outcome-to-assessment mapping tables to strengthen the transparency in course evaluations.
- Strengthen the process of regular updating of literature to reflect the latest international research

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">1.5. Academic Course/Subject</a>	Complies with the requirements

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

Prerequisites for admission to the programme, teaching-learning methods and student assessment consider the specificity of the study field, level requirements, student needs, and ensure the 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 programme has clearly defined, transparent and publicly accessible admission preconditions. Admission requirements are aligned with national regulations and the Bachelor's level qualification framework. Entry to the programme requires completion of general secondary education and participation in the national unified examination system. The programme is positioned appropriately at Bachelor level and does not impose unreasonable or unclear additional requirements.

The admission procedures appear transparent and accessible through institutional regulations and public information sources. Based on the SER and supporting documentation, the admission framework ensures that enrolled students possess general academic preparation suitable for beginning studies in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence.

However, given the academic rigor expected in a CS+AI programme, the panel notes that the programme does not specify additional subject-level expectations (e.g., mathematics readiness) beyond national examination standards. While legally compliant, clearer articulation of recommended background competencies (mathematics, logical reasoning, analytical skills) would further strengthen alignment with programme learning outcomes.

### Evidences/Indicators

- Programme description and published admission requirements
- Institutional admission regulations
- Information available on official university website
- Interviews with programme leadership and administrative staff

### Recommendations:

- None

### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- Introduce diagnostic testing or bridging modules (if necessary) for students lacking adequate mathematical or analytical preparation.

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">2.1 Programme Admission Preconditions</a>	Complies with the requirements

## 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 programme includes several components that support the development of practical and transferable skills, including laboratory-based courses, project assignments, Practice (internship), and the Bachelor's Project. The inclusion of a 10-credit Practice component and a 6-credit Bachelor's Project provides appropriate opportunities for applied learning and integration of theoretical knowledge within a professional context.

The practical component is designed in alignment with the programme learning outcomes and corresponds to the Bachelor-level qualification. The defined practice outcomes focus on the application of theoretical knowledge, use of field-specific tools, problem-solving, communication, and teamwork skills.

Course syllabi indicate the use of practical assignments, programming exercises, and project-based activities across several courses, particularly in areas such as Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Software Engineering. These elements are designed to support the development of technical and transferable competencies relevant to the field.

Within the framework of the Practice component and the Bachelor's Project, students are expected to be supervised by qualified academic staff assigned according to the topic and field specificity. The documentation outlines supervision and evaluation procedures; however, as the programme is new, the practical implementation of supervision arrangements, including potential involvement of external supervisors from host organizations, is not yet evidenced.

The programme is supported by cooperation agreements and memorandums with partner organizations, which are intended to serve as placement bases for student internships. The documentation confirms the existence of such agreements and their relevance to the field of study.

However, as the programme has not yet been fully implemented, it is not fully evidenced to what extent these agreements systematically specify detailed elements such as the number of students, clearly defined learning objectives, expected outcomes, and structured evaluation procedures for practice.

Overall, the programme demonstrates an appropriate design of practical components aligned with learning outcomes and the level of education. Further evidence of implementation and formalization of practice-related arrangements is expected as the programme becomes operational.

### Evidences/Indicators

- Programme description
- Self Evaluation Report
- Interviews with programme leadership, administrative staff and employers

### Recommendations:

- None

### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- Introduce clearer integration of research-oriented tasks within core CS and AI courses
- Increase undergraduate participation in funded research initiatives

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">2.2. The Development of practical, scientific/research/creative/per forming and transferable skills</a>	Complies with the requirements

### 2.3. Teaching and Learning Methods

The programme is implemented by using 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**

The Bachelor's Programme in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence is delivered through diverse student-centered teaching and learning methods that are generally appropriate to the level of education, course content, and intended learning outcomes. The programme incorporates interactive lectures, practical and laboratory sessions, case-based discussions, problem-solving activities, team-based projects, action-oriented learning, and written assignments and presentations.

The curriculum demonstrates a clear applied orientation, particularly within field-specific courses, as well as in the Practice and Bachelor's Project components. Project-based learning and teamwork are integrated into several courses and contribute to the development of analytical, problem-solving, collaboration, and communication skills, consistent with the

expectations of a Bachelor-level qualification. Practical sessions are embedded across multiple semesters, and field courses progressively introduce students to programming, systems, data analysis, artificial intelligence, and software development topics.

Student assessment is conducted within a transparent 100-point grading system in accordance with national legislation. Course syllabi clearly define assessment components, their respective weightings, minimum competence thresholds, and criteria for midterm and final examinations, ensuring procedural clarity and predictability for students.

However, analysis of selected core syllabi indicates that in some foundational and theoretical courses, assessment mechanisms rely predominantly on recall-oriented written testing. For example, in the Algorithms and Data Structures course, a considerable proportion of the final assessment consists of short open-ended questions evaluated primarily on correctness, with limited emphasis on formal reasoning, proof construction, or deeper algorithmic analysis. Similarly, in Basics of Artificial Intelligence, although the syllabus includes advanced topics such as A\* search, Minimax, and probabilistic reasoning, the stated learning outcomes and assessment criteria remain largely descriptive and theory-focused. In Software Engineering, while project-based learning is included, the majority of grading weight is concentrated in midterm and final theoretical examinations.

Overall, while the teaching and learning methods are appropriate and varied, the balance between theoretical testing and higher-order analytical or design-oriented tasks could be strengthened to more fully support the development of advanced problem-solving competencies expected in a Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence programme.

### **Evidences/Indicators**

- Programme description
- Self Study Report
- Syllabuses

### **Recommendations:**

- Increase the proportion of analytical, design-based, and problem-solving tasks in final assessments of foundational and theoretical courses (Algorithms, AI, Software Engineering)

### **Suggestions for the Programme Development**

- Introduce structured algorithmic case-analysis tasks requiring complexity comparison and justification.
- In AI and Algorithms, incorporate at least one exam task requiring: heuristic admissibility proof, complexity comparison between strategies, design of an optimized solution.
- In Software Engineering, consider increasing the weight of project evaluation relative to theoretical tests

### **Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">2.3. Teaching and learning methods</a>	Substantially complies with the requirements

#### 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

According to the documentation submitted by Caucasus International University (CIU) and the findings of the accreditation site visit, the student evaluation system at the institution is in full compliance with existing legislative requirements. The university employs a 100-point grading model, where 100 is the maximum positive score and 51 is the minimum passing threshold. Positive grades are divided into five categories: A (91-100), B (81-90), C (71-80), D (61-70), and E (51-60). Negative evaluations are categorized as either FX (41-50), which indicates a failure but allows the student to take an additional exam within the same semester (at least five days after the announcement of the initial results), or F (0-40), which signifies a failure necessitating a retake of the course.

Depending on the specific nature of each academic course, the lecturer determines the components, content, and weighted distribution of the midterm evaluation. According to university regulations, the midterm evaluation accounts for a maximum of 60 points, where the midterm exam is typically conducted once per semester and valued at 20-30 points; however, the professor may decide on a different point distribution between weekly activities and the midterm exam based on the course's specifics. The minimum competence threshold for the midterm components is set at 25 points. The final examination is mandatory, carrying a maximum weight of 40 points, with a minimum competence threshold of 16 points. A course is deemed successfully completed only if the sum of the midterm evaluations and the final exam score equals at least 51 points.

The transparency of the educational and assessment process is guaranteed by CIU's internal regulatory documents and syllabi, which detail all procedures. Students have the opportunity to appeal their assessments through the specialized student platform (<https://goni.ciu.edu.ge/ge>). Furthermore, the university strictly monitors academic integrity through an approved policy for the detection of and response to plagiarism, which also includes guidelines for the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). The maximum allowable similarity coefficient in academic works is 24%, and in cases where plagiarism is confirmed, the work is nullified.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Bachelor's educational program and syllabi;
- Regulation on the Detection of and Response to Plagiarism;
- <https://goni.ciu.edu.ge/ge>
- Interview Results.

#### [Recommendations:](#)

- None

### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">2.4. Student evaluation</a>	Complies with the 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 student.

### 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

According to the expert panel's evaluation, based on submitted institutional documentation and interviews with students and alumni, it is confirmed that Caucasus International University (CIU) maintains effective mechanisms to support students in the administration of the academic process.

Specifically, the Faculty of Business and Technologies conducts informational meetings for students, where matters related to the educational process are discussed in detail. In addition to these meetings, university regulations provide for consultation sessions, information about which is also documented in course syllabi.

Based on the documentation provided and interviews with stakeholders, it was established that the university funds scientific research projects. Support is specifically directed toward projects submitted by academic staff in collaboration with students, which enables students to further develop their transferable skills.

The university operates a Student Self-Governance body, which is actively involved in both on-campus and external activities. Students and alumni note that they receive regular updates regarding exchange programs, job vacancies, and other activities via email. Regarding employment, students emphasize the significant support provided by both their lecturers and the faculty administration.

Regarding student awareness, interviews revealed that students are well-informed about academic integrity and plagiarism policies. Furthermore, they demonstrated an understanding of the scientific databases available at the university. It is also noteworthy that the university operates a "Business Incubator," which assists students in the preparation and development of various projects.

Finally, starting from the 2022-2023 academic year, the university implemented a funding program for students participating in exchange programs. Based on the results of a competitive selection process, students can receive two types of grants (full or partial), a benefit that is accessible to students across all faculties.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Personnel Regulation
- University Website
- Self-evaluation Report
- Interview Results

#### Recommendations:

- None

#### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

#### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">3.1 Student Consulting and Support Services</a>	Complies with the requirements

#### **3.2. Master's Student Supervision**

- A scientific supervisor provides proper support to master's student to perform the scientific-research component successfully.
- Within master's 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**

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.

Data related to the supervision of master's students	
Number of master theses supervisors	
Number of master's students	
Ratio - supervisors of master's theses/master's students	

### Evidences/Indicators

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

### Recommendations:

- Proposal (s), which should be considered by the HEI, the programme to meet the requirements of the standard

### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- Non-binding suggestions for programme development

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">3.2. Master's Students Supervision</a>	Select Appropriate

## 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 educational programme is implemented by academic and invited staff engaged in accordance with national legislation and the internal regulations of the CIU. The qualifications of the personnel correspond to the requirements of their positions and responsibilities within the programme. Academic staff members possess relevant academic degrees, teaching experience, and scientific publications, which demonstrate their competence in the relevant field.

The programme involves 37 academic staff members, including 10 professors, 17 associate professors, and 1 assistant professor, as well as 9 visiting lecturers who contribute to the implementation of the programme. Among the academic personnel, 17 staff members are affiliated with the institution, supporting the continuity and stability of programme delivery. A significant proportion of the academic staff hold doctoral degrees in the sectoral field, confirming their academic qualifications for teaching and research activities related to the programme.

The involvement of visiting staff contributes additional professional expertise and practical perspectives, supporting the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The balance between affiliated academic staff and visiting lecturers generally supports the sustainable implementation of the programme and provides a combination of academic and professional experience within the teaching process.

CIU applies a workload scheme for academic, scientific, and invited staff, which is regularly updated and includes teaching, research, and consultation activities. The workload distribution takes into account the functions and responsibilities of academic and invited staff and provides allocated hours for student consultations. This structure contributes to the organization of the educational process and supports the implementation of teaching and supervision activities.

The number of academic and invited personnel involved in the programme appears to be adequate in relation to the number of students enrolled. The ratio between affiliated academic staff and visiting lecturers contributes to programme sustainability, while the university monitors quantitative indicators related to programme staffing, including staff composition and turnover, and uses this information in programme management processes.

The Head of the Programme possesses relevant academic qualifications and professional experience required for programme development and management. The programme head is involved in programme implementation, curriculum development, and student advising, and participates in activities related to programme improvement and quality assurance.

Administrative and support staff are available to assist with the organisation and administration of the programme. Their qualifications and responsibilities are consistent with their functions and support the effective implementation of the educational process.

Overall, the human resources involved in the programme are appropriate in terms of number, qualification, and workload distribution, supporting the effective and sustainable implementation of the educational programme. The programme complies with the requirements of this sub-standard.

Number of the staff involved in the programme (including academic, scientific, and invited staff)	Number of Programme Staff	Including the staff with sectoral expertise <sup>5</sup>	Including the staff holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction <sup>6</sup>	Among them, the affiliated staff
Total number of academic staff	37			17
- Professor	10	4	5	5
- Associate Professor	17	6	16	11
- Assistant-Professor	1		1	1
- Assistant				
Visiting Staff	9	3	9	—
Scientific Staff				—
Including International Staff				

### Evidences/Indicators

- Personnel qualification requirements and institutional regulations governing staff recruitment and engagement;
- Personal files of academic, scientific, and invited staff;
- Competition (contest) materials related to staff appointments;
- Information on scientific publications in peer-reviewed journals and other academic outputs;
- Academic, scientific, and invited staff workload schemes, including teaching, research, and consultation hours;
- Methodology for determining the number of academic, scientific, and visiting staff in the programme;
- Ratio of academic/scientific/invited staff to the number of students enrolled in the programme;
- Ratio of affiliated academic staff involved in programme implementation;
- Analysis of staff turnover indicators and their use for programme sustainability;
- Information on programme staff recorded in the Education Management Information System;
- Personal file and functions of the Head of the Programme;
- Number and job descriptions of administrative and support personnel;
- Results of interviews with programme staff and university representatives.

### Recommendations:

<sup>5</sup> Staff implementing the relevant components of the main field of study

<sup>6</sup> Staff with relevant doctoral degrees implementing the components of the main field of study

- None

### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">4.1 Human Resources</a>	Complies with the requirements

### **4.2 Qualification of Supervisors of Master's Students**

The Master's 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**

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.

Number of supervisors of Master's theses	Thesis supervisors	Including the supervisors holding PhD degree in the sectoral direction	Among them, the affiliated staff
Number of supervisors of Master's thesis			
- Professor			
- Associate Professor			
- Assistant-Professor			
Visiting personnel			—
Scientific Staff			—

### **Evidences/Indicators**

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

### **Recommendations:**

- Proposal (s), which should be considered by the HEI, the programme to meet the requirements of the standard

### **Suggestions for the Programme Development**

- Non-binding suggestions for programme development

### **Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

<b>Component</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
<a href="#"><u>4.2 Qualification of Supervisors of Master's Students</u></a>	Select Appropriate

### **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**

The university implements mechanisms for the evaluation and professional development of academic, scientific, and invited staff involved in the programme. Staff evaluation procedures include the assessment of teaching performance, research activity, and other academic contributions. The results of these evaluations, as well as staff satisfaction surveys, are considered in staff development processes and support mechanisms aimed at improving the quality of teaching and research activities.

CIU provides a range of opportunities to support the professional development of academic and scientific staff. Various professional development activities are organized regularly, including participation in scientific conferences, academic events, and training activities. Academic staff members are supported in attending international conferences, and the institution generally facilitates participation in such activities at least once per year.

The university has established financial and institutional mechanisms to encourage research and academic productivity. Incentives include financial rewards for publications in internationally indexed journals (including Scopus-indexed publications), internal research grants, and support for the publication of scientific works and academic books. Affiliated academic staff are particularly encouraged to participate in these activities through internal support schemes and performance-based incentives.

The faculty has also attracted significant funding for research activities. In total, approximately 800,000 GEL has been secured by the faculty for research initiatives, contributing to the university's overall research funding of approximately 3 million GEL. Academic staff are involved in externally funded research projects, including projects supported by the Shota

Rustaveli National Science Foundation, which further supports research activity and academic development within the programme.

In addition, the institution applies a performance-based evaluation system for academic staff, including an annual ranking process that may lead to financial incentives and recognition of research achievements. These mechanisms contribute to strengthening staff motivation and engagement in research and academic activities.

CIU also provides support for the use of modern teaching and learning methods, including e-learning and distance education tools when necessary. Training and institutional support mechanisms enable academic and invited staff to adapt their teaching practices to evolving educational needs.

Overall, the university provides conditions and support mechanisms that contribute to the professional development of academic and scientific staff involved in the programme. The programme complies with the requirements of this sub-standard.

### Evidences/Indicators

- Results of staff evaluation procedures and staff satisfaction surveys and their use in staff management and development;
- Interview results with academic and administrative staff;
- Events and activities aimed at the professional development of academic and scientific staff (trainings, conferences, academic exchanges, research missions);
- Institutional mechanisms supporting scientific and research activities (internal research grants, publication support, financial incentives);
- Data on staff participation in scientific projects, conferences, and research activities;
- Documents confirming international cooperation, research projects, and participation in international academic activities.

### Recommendations:

- None

### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

### Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#"><u>4.3 Professional development of academic, scientific and invited staff</u></a>	Complies with the requirements

#### 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 educational programme is supported by library, material, laboratory, informational, and digital resources that contribute to the achievement of programme objectives and learning outcomes. The university provides access to relevant teaching materials, laboratory facilities, and digital resources that support both theoretical and practical components of the programme.

The university library maintains the core literature indicated in the programme syllabi, as well as additional teaching and learning resources that support the educational process. The library collection includes approximately 30,000 books, providing students and academic staff with access to a broad range of academic literature. In addition, a dedicated reading hall is available, supporting students' independent study and research activities. Both printed and electronic materials are accessible, and the institution takes steps to update library resources in line with programme needs and developments in the field.

Students and staff also have access to modern scientific periodicals, digital resources, and international electronic library databases, which support engagement with contemporary research and scientific developments relevant to the field of study. These resources contribute to the development of analytical and research skills and support the achievement of programme learning outcomes.

The university provides computer laboratory infrastructure necessary for the implementation of practical components of the programme. Currently, the institution operates 10 such laboratories, each equipped with approximately 30 computers. Several of these laboratories are dedicated to IT-related programmes, while others serve the wider university community. During examination periods, the same laboratories are also used as part of the university examination centre. The institution has initiated the development of a separate examination centre, which will allow existing laboratories to be dedicated primarily to educational programmes, including those in the IT field.

Material, laboratory, informational, and digital resources are accessible to students and staff, and students are informed about the availability and use of these resources. The university also provides the necessary digital infrastructure to support teaching, learning, and assessment processes, including the use of electronic and distance learning tools when required.

Overall, the material, library, and digital resources available for the programme are appropriate to support the implementation of the educational process and the achievement of programme learning outcomes. The programme complies with the requirements of the sub-standard.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Library, material, informational, and digital resources and documentation confirming their acquisition or licensing;
- Ratio of technical devices and equipment to the number of students;
- Access to international electronic library databases and relevant certificates;
- Compliance of library holdings with the core literature indicated in programme syllabi;
- Indicators reflecting the use of international electronic library databases;
- Interview results with students, academic staff, and administrative personnel.

## Recommendations:

- None

## Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">4.4 Material Resources</a>	Complies with the requirements

## [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 university gives financial support to fully implement the educational program. This support helps increase the motivation of professors and students to take part in practical work and research activities. The program is funded by the university budget. The money from the university budget is used for several main purposes:

- to regularly update technical and material resources used in the programs
- to add new and relevant books to the library
- to support research activities
- to help students complete academic and research projects
- to organize student scientific conferences
- to publish and print professors' research, textbooks, and study materials

The university also supports professors financially so they can:

- participate in international conferences
- publish research articles in highly ranked international journals

The program budget presented in the documents is too small. In the program section, operating expenses only appear in: Cost of student participation in sessions, conferences and seminars, Program accreditation, Advertising and PR activities, Other costs of training (retraining of professors implementing the program). However, senior management emphasized their commitment to the programme's importance and their willingness to invest more if necessary. The HEI manages the budget effectively and are confident in their ability to support the BA programme, regardless of its financial viability.

In summary, the university budget supports teaching quality, research development, student academic work, and the professional growth of professors.

## Evidences/Indicators

- Budget of the Faculty of Business and Technology;
- Budget of the bachelor's educational program in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence.
- Meeting with the senior management of the university;
- Self-Evaluation Report.

## Recommendations:

- None

## Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">4.5. Programme/ Faculty/School Budget and Programme Financial Sustainability</a>	Complies 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 collaborate 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 process at Caucasus International University follows a continuous cycle called “plan–do–check–act.” This means the university plans activities, implements them, checks the results, and then improves them.

The process mainly focuses on developing, approving, and regularly evaluating educational programmes. The goal is to make sure that programmes meet both university and national

standards. The process starts with planning. The Quality Assurance Service (QAS) collects information from faculty members to ensure that course credits match the real workload of students. After the programme is created, it is reviewed by the QAS and then approved by the Academic Council.

The evaluation stage includes continuous monitoring. The university collects feedback from students, academic staff, and alumni through surveys. The QAS analyzes this data to improve programmes, teaching methods, and learning materials. Regular meetings are organized to improve teaching practices and update course syllabi.

The process is transparent and based on cooperation between academic staff and the QAS. However the institution should implement structured feedback cycles, ensuring that recommendations and/or suggestions are promptly shared with staff and faculty. It is important that evaluation results are properly discussed and used for improvement.

Overall, the quality assurance system is well organized and supports continuous improvement. The use of surveys and feedback from different groups makes the evaluation process more complete.

The university confirms that this process is fully implemented in practice. The self-evaluation report of educational program is developed as a collaborative process. It actively involves academic staff, faculty members, students, alumni, employers, ensuring that different perspectives are considered.

At the same time, the internal quality assurance office works closely with programme staff on a continuous basis to identify and eliminate weaknesses revealed during the self-evaluation process. This ensures ongoing improvement of programme quality.

In conclusion, the system is flexible and quality-oriented. It is strong enough to respond to both current needs and future challenges.

### **Evidences/Indicators**

- "Quality Assurance Mechanisms and Performance Management";
- University Quality Assurance Service Regulation;
- Quality Assurance Policy;
- Statute of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities;
- Rules governing the educational process;
- Professors and teachers, Students, graduates and employers Survey Special Forms (questionnaires for evaluating an educational programme, course, professor, syllabus, etc.);
- Professors and teachers, Students, graduates and employers Based on the survey results, changes made to educational programmes and reports prepared by the Quality Assurance Service in 2022-2023, 2023-2024, 2024-2025.
- Meeting with the senior management of the university;
- Self-Evaluation Report.

### **Recommendations:**

- None

### **Suggestions for the Programme Development**

- It is desirable to further improve feedback cycles so that all stakeholders are equally informed about how their recommendations have been addressed.

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">5.1 Internal quality evaluation</a>	Complies with the requirements

## 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

Caucasus International University ensures external quality assurance of its educational programmes through authorization and accreditation by the LEPL National Centre for Education Quality Enhancement and collegial assessments from Georgian and foreign experts. These mechanisms help improve programmes by incorporating external feedback. In the design of the educational program input from both Georgian and foreign experts was considered during development.

The university's approach to external quality assurance is effective, ensuring programmes meet national standards and benefit from diverse expert feedback. Involving both local and international experts adds value, though not all recommendations were fully applied. More thorough implementation of expert advice could further improve the programmes. Overall, the system supports ongoing development and quality improvement.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- External expert evaluations of the educational program.
- Meeting with the senior management of the university;
- Self-Evaluation Report.

#### Recommendations:

- None

#### Suggestions for the Programme Development

- None

## Evaluation

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">5.2. External Quality Evaluation</a>	Complies with the requirements

### 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 Bachelor's Program in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence at Caucasus International University is developed and evaluated with the participation of academic staff, invited lecturers, and employers.

The Quality Assurance Service (QAS) regularly conducts surveys among students, academic staff, alumni, and employers. Students regularly provide feedback on each course through questionnaires at the end of the semester. This feedback is used to improve the content and delivery of the courses. Based on this data, the programme is monitored and evaluated. If needed, changes are proposed.

The programme is updated according to the analysis of assessment results. In addition, the programme is periodically reviewed and compared with similar programmes offered by international universities. This helps ensure alignment with modern standards and allows the integration of best international practices. The QAS and programme heads check that the programme meets accreditation standards, analyze learning outcomes, and solve problems identified during the evaluation process. Financial support from the university budget helps update the programme, support research activities, and provide administrative assistance.

Academic and invited staff may undergo teaching evaluations at scheduled times. These evaluations use a standard classroom observation form. However, in practice, this form was not used for this specific programme.

The quality assurance system is broad and involves many stakeholders in both development and evaluation. Regular surveys and feedback help keep the programme aligned with academic standards and industry needs. Administrative and support staff assist in implementing the programme. In addition, the Dean of the Faculty evaluates academic and invited staff according to established criteria and formal procedures. So university uses different performance indicators and monitoring results to evaluate how effective the programme is. Based on this analysis, necessary changes are made to further develop and improve the programme.

Although the system is comprehensive, it could be improved by using a more structured feedback cycles. It would make the system stronger and more responsive.

#### Evidences/Indicators

- Bachelor's Educational Program in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence and syllabuses;
- Mechanisms for monitoring and analyzing students' learning outcomes;
- Mechanisms for assessing the programme's learning outcomes (PLO assessment);
- Reports on the assessment of the programme's learning outcomes;
- Questionnaires for professors, students, graduates, and employers;

- “Regulations on Electronic Learning”;
- Reports prepared by the Quality Assurance Service for the academic years 2022–2023, 2023–2024, and 2024–2025.
- Meeting with the senior management of the university;
- Self-Evaluation Report.

**Recommendations:**

- None

**Suggestions for the Programme Development**

- None

**Evaluation**

Please, evaluate the compliance of the programme with the component

Component	Evaluation
<a href="#">5.3. Programme monitoring and periodic review</a>	Complies with the requirements

Attached documentation (if applicable):


**Signatures:**

**Chair of Accreditation Expert Panel**

Hasan CAKIR 

**Accreditation Expert Panel Members**

Giorgi Iashvili 

Magda Tsintsadze 

Nino Gatchava 

Nino Talikadze 