

[Type text]



განათლების ხარისხის განვითარების ეროვნული ცენტრი
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

**Accreditation Expert on Higher Education Programme
BACHELOR IN ARCHITECTURE
GTU**

Date(s) of Evaluation: September 4, 2017
2017

Report Submission Date: November 21, 2017

Tbilisi
2017

HEI's Information Profile

Name of Institution Indicating its Organizational Legal Form	GEORGIAN TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY LEPL
HEI's Identification Code	211349192
Type of Institution	University

Higher Education Programme Information Profile

Name of the Programme	Bachelor in Architecture
Level of Education	Bachelor
Qualification Granted Indicating Qualification Code	Bachelor in Architecture 1101
Language of Instruction	English
Number of Credits	240
Programme Status (Authorized/ Accredited/New)	New

Expert Panel Members

Chair (Name, Surname, University/organization/Country)	NEUCKERMANS Herman KU Leuven, Belgium
Member (Name, Surname, University/organization/Country)	KADAR Balint Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Hungary
Member (Name, Surname, University/organization/Country)	IASHVILI Nana Tbilisi State Academy of Arts, Georgia
Member (Name, Surname, University/organization/Country)	KUPATADZE Ia Ilia State University Tbilisi, Georgia
Member (Name, Surname, University/organization/Country)	ZHVANIA Irakli Geographic Tbilisi, Georgia
	KURDIANI Giorgi Tbilisi State Academy of Arts, Georgia

▪ **General information on the education programme**

Georgian Technical University (GTU) was granted the university status in 1990 and has its origins in the Polytechnic Institute (1917) and as a Polytechnic Faculty of TSU which, was then transformed into an independent Georgian Polytechnic Institute in 1928 (website University-history). Currently, GTU prepares graduates/specialists in the fields of engineering, chemistry and scientific industry.

Today the University is offering 86 Bachelor's, 58 Master's and 49 Ph.D. programmes, covering Engineering, Technology, Architecture, Design, Humanities, Law, Business and Social Sciences. GTU is one of the largest educational and scientific institutions in the Southern Caucasian region with a total number of more than 20,000 students. GTU offers first cycle 4 years professional and undergraduate (Bachelor's degree) programmes; the second cycle takes two years and includes Master's programmes; the third, three-year long cycle is the Doctorate.

GTU has 12 Faculties with 29 departments, including an International Design School. The Faculty of Architecture, Urban Planning and Design counts 700 students in total (on BA, MA, PhD, higher education programmes); it enrolls 150 new students each year and enjoys the expertise of 133 professors and teachers, for running a Bachelor programme in architecture, in Georgian (Information on selected Academic Staff: Total – 121 (among them Full Professors - 15; Associate Professors - 17; Assistant Professors - 9; Invited: Full Professors -16; Associate Professors - 17; Assistant Professors - 13; Senior teachers - 14; Teachers -17).

According to the sources provided by the Georgian Technical University (University website in Georgian, students / Abiturs - Provision-approved by Georgian Technical University, Faculty of Architecture, Urban Planning and Design, Protocol No. 17 of 12 April 2013; modified-Georgian Technical University, Architecture, Urban Planning and Design faculty, Protocol of meeting No. 18 of 02 February 2017, Legal entity of public law - Georgian Technical University Architecture, Urban Planning and design, faculty of Graphics and Drawing, p. 4.), academic programs on the Faculty include the different aspects of architectural education, which according to these sources provide the students with ability to create architectural design, that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements on the bases of knowledge of the history and theories of architecture, technologies, technical and human sciences and fine arts, as an influence on the quality of architectural design. There are two departments at the Faculty of Architecture, Urban Planning and Design: Department of the Basics of Architecture and Theory and the Department of Architecture and Urban Design ("Urbanistics").

The new Bachelor in Architecture programme in English will not be located in this faculty. It will be based in the International Design School, where all teaching is done in English.

The new programme is a 4 years Bachelor in Architecture, counting 240 ECTS. The faculty intends to complement this with a 2 years Master programme in Architecture later. The model of education/profession in Architecture GTU and the Georgian Union of Architects is thinking of (not yet approved by Georgian parliament) comprises of a 4-year BA programme + 2 years Master's + 1-

year internship after or during MA studies¹. The programme aims at preparing the graduates for "successful and ethical practical activities in the field of architecture". As by now, the graduates of this new programme will not be granted the title of architect. They are meant either to assist a chartered architect, or move to Master's level study. It is important to mention here that the EU legislation EU/55/2013 about the mutual recognition of qualifications between EU-member states requires either 4 years + 2 years internship, or 5-year full time study of architecture as main subject, as a prerequisite for access to the profession. UIA, UNESCO, ACE and EAAE model requirement regarding programmes in architecture is 5 years of studies + 2 years of internship under (partial) control of the schools.

GTU expects 50 to 60 students for this new programme² (see note below). Number of applicants wishing to study architecture sums up to 300 candidates and as said 150 are admitted yearly.

In order to acquire grants for funding their studies, students should have passed first the Unified National Entrance Examinations. The enrollment of the foreign nationals and the people without citizenship is regulated by the legislation from the Georgian Ministry of Education and Science. Secondly, they have to pass the legal entrance examination of the faculty, comprising 4 subjects: 1. General skills 2. Georgian language, 3. Foreign language 4. Elective subject (One out the 3 following subjects: A. Mathematics B. Literature G. Applied art). Source: GTU WEBSITE: <http://gtu.ge/Arch/Pdf/publications/turil.pdf>. Students also have a test in graphic skills and drawing, which is a test of the candidates' creative capabilities and their spatial thinking abilities. Together with the results of the examination of the three exams and one optional examination from the Unified National Examination this produces the list of entrants who have the right to continue their studies at GTU architecture, urban and design faculty.

Brief overview of the accreditation site-visit

The committee visited GTU on Monday Sept 04, 2017 in the afternoon and met a group of enthusiastic and committed members of GTU.

In the first meeting with the leadership of GTU, including the Rector, the committee learned about the future plans of GTU, the admission rules, the financing and the allocation of the new programme within the International Design School. The question of proficiency in English was discussed, as well as the expected number of students. One of the professors present at the interview session, had been the Head of the Education Programme of the IUA (International Union of Architects).

This was followed by an interview with the Self Evaluating Team. They pointed out that the proposal has 62 subjects compared to 182 in the Georgian Bachelor of Architecture programme.. The evaluation system was discussed. The uniform weekly evaluation of all subjects, that also will be applied for the design studio, raised questions. The proposal was inspired by similar foreign institutions like Milan Polytechnic University Faculty of Architecture and Technical University in Prague.

¹ Has been added to the report considering feedback from GTU

² In the feedback on the Final Report Draft received from GTU, it was stated that GTU does not intend to admit 50-60 students to the programme. However, according to notes of several members of the panel, admission of 25 Georgian and international students as minimum is expected (interview session 1) and admission of 50 students (25 to 50 from the Georgian architecture programme + 25 new students) was mentioned during the second interview session; they also stated that number of students could increase up to 80

The meeting with students that followed was a meeting with students from related areas because a new programme has no students yet. They were satisfied with the facilities, the CAD-studio, and asked for more free components in the curriculum and better equipped workshops. Alumni from GTU also were interviewed and testified that they had learned how to learn. They also suggested more frequent changes in the programmes.

The visit of the premises in the International Design School took place on Tuesday, September 05, 2017. Once more the committee met very enthusiastic and committed staff. However, the committee was confronted there with several serious problems of infrastructure. Stairs are unsafe due to damaged steps and need repair, spaces are in bad condition, are not sufficient to host the expected number of 60 students (cumulatively), there are problems with ventilation, light, condition and worn-out furniture.

Also on Tuesday evening and after a time of reflection, the assessment committee reported its first impressions to the leadership of GTU.

Panel's Response to Feedback from GTU

On November 14, 2017, the Expert's panel received feedback from GTU on Final Report Draft submitted on November 1, 2017. There are factual errors and considerations of agreement and disagreement presented in the response of GTU

It is against the procedure of assessment, as set by NCEQE, that besides factual errors, GTU includes considerations of agreement and disagreement, in the feedback. .

It is regrettable that GTU does not see the report as a tool or opportunity for improving their educational programme, based upon the screening/evaluation made by an external, international panel. The school should use the report as a means to obtain more means and support from the central administration of the university, to deliver education and perform better, instead of trying desperately to prove that they are right, and have what they need. Education in architecture can have and exists in diverse profiles - ranging from artistic to technical, and from theoretical to more operational approach. It is our conviction that the architect's education is too weak for facing the upcoming challenges of a global world where sustainability is one of the major issues. Therefore, universities have the duty to educate architects who will be competent and capable enough to cope with upcoming problems, without losing the artistic component of architecture. The proposed programme does not embrace this attitude and it is even more regrettable that s in the feedback provided by the HEI, this attitude is not fully endorsed.

The normal procedure of study programmes evaluation is that institutions write a SER, the panel studies it on beforehand (with other programme materials), and checks this on site. The fundamental problem with the feedback from GTU, is that the panel cannot check the information provided only now by GTU i.e. after the visit. Neither does the panel has the task to study additional documents and repeat the process of evaluation.

Furthermore, the way of answering with references to pages and paragraphs, instead of referring to the substandard at stake, made it difficult for the panel to adapt the draft report when needed. Nevertheless, after profound screening and filtering of the comments made by GTU to the draft report,

the panel reacted to only those errors, which were considered as factual.. Editions in the text of the report have been done by deleting/editing some sentences with factual errors (e.g. the report wrongly counted only 5 ECTS for History and Theory of architecture, which has been edited in the Final Report), and by using footnotes or text underline format, when adding some statements. The panel deemed several points from GTU feedback as not factual errors and comments the following:

- Documents provided additionally on financing (in component 4.5): The table with expenditures on teachers' salaries provided by GTU in their feedback now, still does not allow to assess what is minimum number of students needed in order to achieve break-even. Whether GTU expects break-even or not is the business of GTU, but it is the right of the panel to assess if this proposal is financially sustainable. And this cannot be done by evaluating only personnel costs (provided by GTU now). Consequently, nothing has been changed in the report in this regard.
- Panel's response to comment 12 in the feedback(substandard 1.1): The distribution of ECTS in this proposal determines the profile of this Bachelor programme. It is internationally agreed (see for example "Chania statement 2001" from the European Association for Architectural Education), that schools should strengthen their profile as an answer to the unifying BA-MA structure imposed by Bologna. A school can strengthen its profile by making full use of the in-house competences. From a Technical University one can expect a 'technical, technological, constructive' profile (that does not mean *only* technical or *only* rational approach). For such a profile the number of ECTS devoted to this area is low: for example, RWTH Aachen had in 2006 more than 70 % technical components. GTU comes up with 45 ECTS out of 240 devoted to technological/engineering subjects. There are of course schools with a much more artistic color (with 20% technical subjects), but trying to build this in a technical University is a waste of opportunities and not the best strategy. This is an advice showing which way to go in a society that will be ruled more and more by economy, by energy, by sustainability. The SER starts by saying that GTU is willing to educate assistant architects, working with and not as an architect, it means as a 'better draftsman'.
- Panel's response to comment 13 (substandard 1.2): the panel was not aware of the fact that the translation of credits in work hours in studio is different for the auditorium hours for design studios, compared to the load of other courses. In the feedback GTU argues that 315 hours are studio auditorium hours, which means that 495 hours (810 – 315) are worked at home. However, this was nowhere mentioned in the SER. The panel indeed multiplied 30 credits by 27 hours as written without restriction, which is also valid for studio workload in the SER. As a result, this does not change anything to the real workload and weekly time use for students.
- Panel's response to comment No 17 on Spaces available for the new programme (component 4.1): the report described rooms that were presented to the panel during the visit. General conditions of these rooms were (be)low standard and the school/faculty should ask for more means to the central GTU leadership to improve these conditions. During the visit, the panel

has not seen the rooms mentioned in the feedback from GTU. Thus, the presence nor the state of these can be assessed.

Judgments have not been changed because none of the factual errors were the only reasons for the final evaluation. The panel has responses to all answers, and sends it separately to NCEQE, but refuses to answer these in the report, because this is against the rules of the procedure and can create a precedent for future evaluations. At least the institution merits a reprimand because they violated the rule on to point out factual errors only in the feedback.

Summary of education programme's compliance with the standards

The programme was evaluated according the five Accreditation Standards for Higher Education Programmes established by the National Centre for Education Quality Enhancement (NCEQE).

1. Educational programme objectives, learning outcomes and their compliance with the programme.

Objectives are clearly stated in the SER. The programme complies with national regulations. Stakeholders were involved as learned from the interviews on site. The graduates of this programme can either work in practice *with* an architect or can further their studies into a Master's degree. Being a programme within a technical university one would expect to find a strong emphasis on engineering and/or technological aspects of architecture. Especially since that is moreover also in the mission statement of GTU. But there appears to be a strong emphasis on graphic skills, manual and computerized, even to the extent that courses on structures, construction, building physics and other engineering subjects are underrepresented in the proposal. There is too much emphasis on teaching the tools at the expense of contents. Such a profile is not the best choice to build a Master's programme upon.

Does not comply with requirements

2. Teaching methodology and organization, adequate evaluation of programme mastering.

The CVs of Professors, do not demonstrate their aptitude to implement this international program. It is unclear how IDS will offer a quality training in English. Most of the professors do not have (a certificate of) English language proficiency. They do not participate in the international conferences. They even have only publications in the university published journal(s) in Georgian. There are professors working in different universities, on a large scale and teaching many subjects, what leads to questions about the quality of teaching.

If the number of planned students (60-70 pers.) is enrolled in the program, it becomes necessary to divide them into groups. Nothing is mentioned about this in the program. The current number of professors can't provide the BA program, because of the interactive and thus, labor intensive nature of design studio tutoring. That is why IDS needs more academic (wo-)manpower, more design tutors, more teachers for drawing and graphics, etc.

Level of proficiency in English of staff and students is a serious problem. Weekly assessment also is a problem: first, it is not the commonly accepted practice of teaching at university (compared to practices and insights elsewhere in Europe) and secondly, weekly assessment

is materially not feasible to carry out when the number of students grows to the expected numbers of 50/y. It also risks to disturb "the designerly way of thinking" (N. Cross) of the students.

Partially complies with the requirements.

3. Student achievements and individual work with them.

The precise way of tutoring design, for example frequency of personal one to one consultations, is not in the documents. Detailed and precise info is missing about the workload of staff. Research is not an issue in the Bachelor education, although it is important for the teachers. Information about research activity is missing.

Partially Complies with the requirements.

4. Providing teaching resources.

The premises in the International Design School are below standards. Stairs are dangerously damaged. Adequate spaces in number, in size, are not available for the expected number of students. General condition, ventilation and lighting has to be upgraded. Furniture is completely worn out. All premises need to be upgraded. GTU says it has the financial means, but detailed info about sustainable financing is missing.

Does not comply with requirements

5. Teaching quality enhancement opportunities

Quality assurance system is a university wide system in GTU, with a Quality Agency on university level as well as on Faculty level. The quality assurance circle is operational all over GTU.

Complies with the requirements

Summary of Recommendations

- GTU should raise the prerequisite of admission of English language to level B2. If that is not feasible immediately, GTU has to offer (academic) English course(s) right at the beginning of the first semester or better, before the start of the first academic year. This will be beneficial for contacts between students and staff. Organise an interview with the candidate students, eventually via electronic means.
- Include the detailed information related to the admission of foreign students in a step by step form on the website under a special heading that can easily be accessed and properly understood and make sure that the applicants know about the expected language proficiency and that problems in this respect are detected and remedied.
- Also at the level of the National Admission Exams the level of English proficiency should be raised.
- Raise level of proficiency of English of staff, set requirements and test it. Offer within GTU opportunities for staff to improve academic English fluency.

- Expansion and upgrading of the premises for this new programme is absolutely necessary. More classrooms and studios will be needed. Expansion of library within the school. Workshop and classrooms have to be ventilated. Stairs need upgrading because they are dangerously damaged. Furniture is worn out. Lighting conditions have to be improved. More and decent classrooms and studios need to be provided.
- GTU has to come up with a well-balanced programme, reflecting the profile in the mission statement of GTU. Reduce the weight of the graphics part in number of credits and redistribute these over more credits devoted to structures, construction, building physics, energy; these subjects are underrepresented in the proposal.
- The curriculum of design projects, choice of subjects/assignments and sequence of assignments, should be conceived so, that along the four years, students can develop all required design skills and competences graduate needs; therefore, expose students to different building programmes, technologies, structural systems, building materials, different contexts, old and new, different scales. Tutoring has to evolve along the years from 'tight' follow-up in the beginning to more independent work in the last year of studies. Working in group, especially in multidisciplinary teams is needed in order to prepare graduates for the practice of today and tomorrow.
- GTU has to reconsider the dichotomy between graduates working with and graduates going to further their studies on Master's level and adapt subsequently the proposal. If GTU has the intention to build a Master's degree on top of this Bachelor degree, then it will have to remodel the entire 5 or 6 years curriculum, especially given the content gaps in the proposal.
- Evaluation should be testing competences to be achieved through each course. It is also necessary to outline evaluation and assessment criteria in syllabi in line with the learning outcomes that each course attempts to develop. So for example is the assessment of design different from the assessment of other components, especially the criteria (creativity, innovation, ...) will be different. A description of design assessment criteria still needs further specific elaboration for each design assignment. The Quality Assurance Department of the University should be helpful in elaborating this.
- The evaluation method for each program component has to be specified and communicated to the students before the start of that component. The assessment of design is different from the assessment of other components especially the criteria will be different
- Weekly assessment is definitely a weak point of the program, because it increases the workload for teachers and consequently will have a negative impact on the quality of teaching. Weekly assessment is not an university way of teaching and studying. Students have to grow in becoming independent individuals, capable of organizing and managing their time and efforts. Also, given the expected number of students, 50/y cumulatively, this is simply not feasible.
- Reconsider the interpretation of what is academic research. Especially when it comes to research by design. The proposal uses research in a non-internationally agreed meaning; indeed defining a program for a design is the first stage in design and is not research as understood in academia.

Staff has to develop research activities within GTU and publish in international peer reviewed journals.

- If not yet done, GTU should, via its Quality Agency, organize teaching courses for (especially beginning) teachers, introducing them with new learning and teaching resources, offering training sessions, exposing them to examples of best practices...Eventually offer individual consultancy to teachers about how to remedy weaknesses in teaching.
- GTU has to set rules if, and if yes to what extend a staff member are allowed to cumulate different academic and other jobs, especially when that sums up to more than a 100 % employment.
- Give detailed budget (the real figures) for this new programme. Have a board with equal representation deciding about the allocation of resources within GTU.

Summary of Suggestions

- It is important that the description of programme aims, objectives, and learning outcomes are consistent along all programme related materials (internal and external), not only for matters of external communication, but also for internal use since they determine programme structure, content, teaching approaches and individual course learning outcomes. The SER should focus much more on the specificities of the proposed programme, than on general schemes which are copy-pasted from the GTU documents.
- International Design School (IDS) already has the international English language programme for the design programme. The IDS programme includes free choice of languages (Italian, Russian, German, French). The panel suggests the school to repeat the same practice for the proposed Architecture programme.
- Advertise the program structure and syllabi on the website into the admission section in order to make students more attracted to the program.
- Put an emphasis on the professional development of teachers in form of international mobility, implementing new contemporary teaching methods, attract lecturers from abroad and involve industrial partners for implementing the programme
- Expand the list of electives with general subjects that can be profitable for students in architecture, IT technologies, computer programming, academic writing, Psychology, Archeology.
- More rational elaboration should be given to the inclusion of elective subjects and to the implementation of clear logic of the elective subjects according to modules, for example, the History of Architecture of Georgia, or even the History of the Architecture of Caucasus ..
- Check and correct the information on official website of University (<http://gtu.ge>), because based on information there, one professor is the Dean of the faculty of Architecture, Urbanism and Design, also the same person is the Head of the programme "Architecture" of IDS. It is confusing not only for the experts, but also for students.
- Assess learning process as well as the outcomes
- Implement system of monitoring students' academic performance during the semester.
- Attract lecturers from abroad and involve industrial partners for implementing the programme.
- Put an emphasis on the professional development of teachers by offering them international mobility, by suggesting them new contemporary teaching methods.

Summary of best practices (If Applicable)

In case of accredited programme, summary of significant accomplishments and/or progress (If Applicable)

Compliance of the Programme with Accreditation Standards

1. Educational programme objectives, learning outcomes and their compliance with the programme

1.1 Programme objectives are clearly defined and achievable; they are consistent with the mission of the HEI and take into consideration labour market demands

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

The BA in Architecture programme will be funded, implemented by and located in the International Design School. Several students of Georgian-language programmes at the 'Faculty of Architecture, Urban Planning and Design' expressed the desire to continue studies in Architecture in English language. The purpose of the program is also to prepare specialists with relevant competences in compliance with international requirements, who will be capable of being further trained under the guidance of the architect, having appropriate authority for practical professional activities.

The ambition of this programme is to prepare graduates who have the skills and the knowledge needed for a successful and ethical practice of architecture, in compliance with international requirements/demands, as well as in accordance with the mission of the university. GTU wants to develop engineering, technology and culture (SER, p. 3 and PD, p. 1). In theory GTU is well placed to do so, because it runs already an architecture programme in Georgian and it is an engineering school. This programme will be the 6th architecture education programme in Georgia. GTU is willing to start with a 4-year Bachelor in architecture now and has the intention also to come up with a 2 year Master's programme of architecture soon.

According to the SER, the graduates of this new programme will be working under the supervision of the architect and not working as an independent architect, who is entitled of taking responsibility for his design/project. Graduates thus, are not obliged to continue their studies on the MA level, if they work under the supervision of the chief architect, and not as the authors of the project; but whether architects with BA degrees are supervised by professional, independent architects is hardly controlled in a country like Georgia, where the profession of an architect is not protected.

A distinction should be made between preparing graduates for the local market of Georgia and for the international scene. For Georgia only, the quality of what should be a university bachelor in a HEI is ruling the programme, because in Georgia only the title of an architect is protected, not the profession of an architect. Looking in detail, the programme leads to a professional degree with a strong emphasis on graphical and representational tools an architect is using.

The Dean of the school said they focus on visual aspects of architectural education and "possible English language problems will not be an obstacle, since the main communication is through design". Minimizing the importance of the ability to communicate ideas in English in an English taught programme, inhibits to build up a strong theoretical foundation of the architectural profession and this is definitely, not a good strategy. Especially the aim – also to prepare graduates to become theoreticians of architecture and players on the international scene, presupposes fluency in English.

What is meant by 'international scene' was clarified during the visit. It appears to be the neighboring countries or the region around Georgia. Also, students who do not master the teaching language often impute their ignorance in exams to a language problem.

Europe has not such a unified system, but the EU regulation is definitely, used by many countries and this is discussed in ENQA (European Network of Quality Agencies). Central in this legislation is the EU directive (European law that has to be implemented in all member states), The PQD (Professional Qualifications Directive) from 2005 was amended in 2013 the PQD into 2013/55/EU <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013L0055&from=EN>. The EU requires 4 years plus 2 internship or 5 years of study; UIA, UNESCO claim 5 years minimum, EAAE argues in favor of 5 years plus 2 years of internship. At the core of this legislation is for architecture the list of 11 points, that is dating from The Architect's Directive 1985. In the broader international scene several countries have their own accreditation system (China, Romania, Estonia and many others). Those who do not have accreditation in their home land, and even when they have one, they frequently look for (costly) "international" accreditation by RIBA (the UK) or NAAB (the USA).

A school has the freedom to choose and define its specific profile by putting more emphasis on some of the eleven points mentioned above. However, one could reasonably expect a technical university to cherish the technical aspects of an education/profession especially in a world with raising energetic and sustainability awareness and demands. From a technical university like GTU one would expect the choice for a (rather) technical profile, because that is the competence it has "in house". This is matching the mission statement of GTU which states: "the University is a cradle for the development of engineering, technology and culture driven by ideals of democracy and humanism" (SER, 1.1). In that perspective courses on structures, construction and building technology, building physics and other engineering subjects are underrepresented in the proposal. Take as an example, Building Physics, a course that is fundamental for energy and climate issues in the future - allocating 5 credits for educating architects in heat, moisture, noise and, in day- and artificial light cannot be coined with a technical university approach. This is completely insufficient to cope with upcoming challenges in the building industry and architecture. As the programme does not completely ignore these issues, the overall assessment of this substandard is rated as partially compliant.

Recommendations:

- The ambition of GTU also to prepare graduates to become theoreticians of architecture and players on the international scene, presupposes fluency in English.

<p>Strengthen the GTU profile of this programme with more credits for courses on structures, construction, building physics and other engineering subjects because they are underrepresented in the actual proposal.</p>
<p>Suggestions for programme development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is important that the description of Programme Aims, Objectives, and Learning Outcomes are consistent along all programme related published materials, as well those for internal use within GTU as for the third parties (external world). That is indeed important not only for matters of external communication, but also for internal use since they describe teachers, programme structure, content, teaching approaches and individual course learning outcomes.
<p>Best Practices (if applicable):</p>
<p>In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress</p>
<p>Evaluation</p> <p>X Partially complies with requirements</p>

1.2 The content of a programme component (a course, a module, etc.) ensures the achievement of the objectives and student learning outcomes of the component, considering the number of credit hours allocated for it and teaching methods utilized

This is 4-year curriculum of 240 ECTS. (The program components are described in SER, pp. 3-5 and in the Architecture Bachelor Program (ABP-English), pp. 8-11, as well as in Program curriculum of ABP, pp. 14-17. More specifically there is the following ECTS allocation in the programme, as described in 'Architecture Bachelor Program.English', p. 2: "Major courses – 220 ECTS (selective courses – 25 ECTS credits, design practice – 5 credits, a Bachelor's thesis – 15 credits) and free components – 20 credits". *Nobody knows what means 'selective courses' and the sum of courses between brackets is not 220 ECTS!* This is one example of the fuzzy way GTU is describing the programme. One semester consists of 30 credits and thus, a year consists of 60 credits. One credit equals to 27 hours, comprising students' in-class and independent workload. One year of the study program (2 semesters, 20-21 weeks) is scheduled as follows: 15 weeks of each semester are dedicated to the lectures and seminars, VII and XIV weeks to mid-term exams, XVIII, XIX, XX and XXI weeks are for the final and additional exams, if necessary. GTU operates in a semester system.

Within the first two semesters, through the course in the "History of Architecture» students get acquainted with the history of the global development of architecture from ancient times until the 19th century. A special attention is paid to the traditional architecture", This is a 5 ECTS course, and involves 2 hours lectures and 1 hour seminar per week, which is 30 hours of lectures and 15 seminars in a semester, presenting from Megalithic culture to the baroque Architecture in France and England till the 19th century (SER, p. 3). Unfortunately, the course does not include the study of Georgian architecture and art history, nor global regional art and architecture history.

The first academic year unfolds as follows: Art history – 5 credits; Architecture History – 5 credits; graphic skills (manual and computerized) – 30 credits; Design studio – 5 credits; Engineering – (Linear Algebra + Geodesics) – 10 credits; Philosophy – 5 credits. This is clearly an overkill of graphical skills and doing so it inhibits the insertion of more vital and content related subjects like the basics for underpinning the physics, mechanics and energy issues related to building.

In the second year, 50 out of 60 credits are compulsory main specialty courses and 10 credits are optional courses. The second academic year comprises: Art History and Architecture History-10 credits; GTU basic – 25 credits; GTU General – 5 credits; Architectural Profession-20 credits.

In the second semester of the third year, students have an opportunity to improve and deepen of their command of English language, namely professional terminology and verbal communication skills by selecting language courses of various difficulties; there is a test as precondition to enroll for these courses. It would however be better to introduce an elective course of English language, right from the first semester, which will facilitate students to better communicate with professors and audiences

The third academic year counts 45 credits compulsory courses and 15 credits for electives. It develops as follows: Art History and Architectural History- 0 credits; GTU basic – 0 credits;

GTU General –15 credits; Architectural Profession - 15 credits; Design Studios - 30 credits. Thirty credits for design in one year means student will have to spend 5 hours design work every afternoon, during all 30 weeks of both semesters!³ This seems unfeasibly overloaded and it definitely leaves almost no time to spend on theoretic courses. The documents do not mention workload measurement and monitoring for design studio work, although this - as a rule, tends to require much more work and time than programmed in schools of architecture. The third year thus, has a very unbalanced ratio between theoretical courses and studio design.

Fifteen credits are devoted to the final Bachelor's Degree thesis-project in the fourth year. The project has to be presented orally before an interdisciplinary Examination Commission, which is a well-established practice in many schools of architecture all over the world. In one year the student is passing only 5 credits in General University subjects. In the fourth year, 40 credits out of 60 credits are devoted to basic specialty subjects (including 15 credits for bachelor's work) and 20 credits - free components that students can choose from the list of free components. In that list some subjects of major/general interest today are missing, for example IT technologies, Academic Writing, Psychology, Archeology.

Curriculum of the design courses in particular, merits special attention. Time is precious, especially for students, and the assignments have to be designed in a way, so as to avoid overlaps in assessing learning outcomes, and to ensure that through the programme students can develop all required design skills and competences graduates need. The English description of the programme describes the design assignments in very general terms, which does not allow to read the logic and the 'whys' of the choices made. The panel would like to see a structured argumentation for/and exposing students to different programmes, different design stages, different technologies and building materials, structural solutions, different contexts, old and new etc.

Tutoring has to evolve along the years, from 'tight' follow-up to more independent work. Working in group, especially in multidisciplinary teams is needed, in order to prepare graduates for the practice of today and tomorrow. In this respect it is regrettable that GTU did not refer at all to its experience with its Bachelor of architecture in Georgian language, neither was it shown to the panel.

General university courses lift a programme to the real university level of education and they widen the horizon of students.

Evidences/indicators

- Study Process Management Instruction approved by the Resolution #198 of 22 January 2010

³ In reference with comment 13 in GTU feedback, the panel is counting 30 ECTS as 810 hours workload (30 x 27hrs), as GTU does. Even if the total "auditorium hours of design studio", what the panel reads as "time spent in the design studio at school" is 315 hrs, then the students still have a supplementary workload of 495 hours (810 – 315) at home. These are physical hours summing up to 27 hours design workload /week during 2 times 15 weeks for this 30 ECTS.

by the Academic Council of the Technical University.

- English Language Educational Program BA in Architecture approved by the Decree #2426 of the GTU Academic Council.
- Learning course programs (syllabi).
- Interview with Programme management, Teaching Staff
- SER, pp. 3, 4, 5.
- Specific goals to be achieved for each component are described in the Architecture Bachelor Program (ABP-English), ABP, pp. 12,13.

Recommendations:

- GTU has to design a well-balanced programme, reflecting the profile in the mission statement of GTU. GTU should check the feasibility of the workload during semesters, reduce weight of the graphics courses share in number of credits, and redistribute these to over more credits devoted to structures, construction, building physics, energy, theory and history of architecture.
- GTU has to come up with a synoptic way of representing the programme, which uses the categories used in the SER, without mistakes or notations that create confusion.
- The curriculum of design projects, choice of subjects/assignments and sequence of assignments, should be considered, so that along the four years, students can develop all required design skills and competences a graduate needs; therefore, it is necessary to expose students to different programmes, technologies, structural solutions, building materials, different contexts, old and new, and to different scales.

Suggestions for programme development:

- International Design School (IDS) already has the international English language programme for the design programme. The IDS programme includes free choice of languages (Italian, Russian, German, French). We suggest the school to repeat the same practice for the proposed Architecture programme.
- The precondition of admission in terms of knowledge of English should be level B2 according to CEFR. Also at the level of the National Admission Exams the level should be raised. It is desirable to add as an elective subject - Language (English), right from the first semester; that will facilitate students to communicate with professors and audiences.
- GTU should expand the list of electives with general subjects that can be profitable for students in architecture, for example: IT technologies, computer programming, academic writing, Psychology, Archeology.
- It is necessary to check and correct information on official website of University (<http://gtu.ge>), as based on information given on the website, one and the same person is the Dean of the faculty of Architecture, Urbanism and Design and the Head of the programme of "Architecture" at IDS. This information is confusing not only for experts, but also for students.

Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
<p>Evaluation</p> <p>X Does not comply with requirements</p>

1.3 Programme components ensure the achievement of programme objectives and student learning outcomes of the appropriate level of qualification in the National Qualifications Framework

Although the SER is stating that the programme fulfills all requirements set by the Higher Education Qualifications Framework, a close and critical analysis of the proposal is contradicting these statements and reveals major weaknesses. Firstly, there is the serious unbalance of subjects, and secondly, there are serious gaps in the proposal as argued in substandard 2.1.

Moreover, the profile of the education as reflected in the programme is not up-to-date with the actual world and problems of the built environment: problems of energy, sustainability are touched upon, but not with the depth expected from a university graduate from GTU within the allocated time slot.

The learning outcomes of the BA in Architecture (English Language) are described by six general and sectorial competences (SER, p.5), but their realization is not evidenced in the detailed description of the programme.

The panel acknowledges that with the proposal the competences (Knowledge and understanding, Ability to use knowledge in practice, Skills in drawing conclusions, Communication skill, Ability to learn) will probably be achieved to a certain extent (the programme is not without merit), but it cannot be read in documents where and to what level this will be realized and in which programme component. On the other hand, the panel believes that values, especially those related to the preservation of cultural values and the values promoted by the International Union of Architects (IUA) will be transferred upon students via history courses and specific design assignments. If fact, these values have to pervade the spirit of the school as expressed in its attitude towards how to cope with tradition and cultural values. The panel believes that this will be the case, because it is explicitly written in the SER, which means that the awareness of the cultural value of the built environment is already present as one of the learning outcomes in the programme.

Evidences/indicators

- Decree #120/N of 10 December 2010 of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia on the Approval of the National Quality Framework.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Language Educational Program BA in Architecture approved by the Decree #2426 of the GTU Academic Council. • Learning course programs (syllabuses). • SER, pp. 5, 6, 7.
<p>Recommendations</p> <p>GTU should redistribute the programme components so as to obtain a polytechnic profile in architecture, with more emphasis on technology and engineering principles of building, without falling in the trap of considering architecture as a pure problem of construction.</p>
<p>Suggestions for programme development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review programme syllabi, rationalize learning outcomes and express them where necessary, in a way that their achievement is measurable and identifiable within the framework of the study programme. • Expand the "Map of Competences" to incorporate links between subjects and specific program-level learning outcomes
<p>Best Practices (if applicable):</p>
<p>In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress</p>
<p>Evaluation</p> <p>X Does not comply with requirements</p>

1.4 Programme learning outcomes ensure the competitiveness of its graduates on educational (at the next level of education) and labor markets.

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

Architectural organizations, private and public ones (a selection is listed in the SER, p. 8) are interested in graduates having architectural education, who are fluent in English. The proposed programme fits into the strategic "ten-point plan" of the Government of Georgia for development, modernization and employment of the country. This strategic plan is targeted to broader construction market, increase number of new buildings and rehabilitated ones, and envisages improvement of the investment environment, urban and regional development and other important priorities. This English taught programme is important in the context of the EU-Georgia Association Agreement and the enforcement of the visa liberalization with the EU and a sharp increase in international interaction. As said before EU-directive and UIA, UNESCO an EAAE advocate 5 years of education plus 2 years of apprenticeship in order to be a fully educated architect. If GTU has the intention to build a Master's degree on top of this Bachelor degree, then it will have to remodel the entire 5 or 6 years curriculum, especially given the gaps in the proposal. What is missing at the very basis is a fundamental approach to architecture where principles are taught and

understood. For example, not only knowing *what* is a vapor barrier and *where* to put it, but *why* it has to be there.

The graduates of this programme (completing of which serves as the first step for becoming an architect), can of course do useful work in practice with the computer literacy skills, which the programme provides. That makes the assessment regarding competitiveness rather difficult if not impossible. As stated in the SER, graduates will have the skills to work *with* an architect, not *as* an architect. The programme, as it is proposed now, will in fact produce better skilled/informed draftsman. That contradicts somehow the mission statement in *Architecture, Bachelor Program, English, p. 1*: "*The Bachelor of Architecture curriculum is designed to provide the student with a comprehensive educational experience, gaining knowledge and skills in preparation for the successful and ethical practice of architecture. The aim of the English Bachelor education program "Architecture" is to prepare competitive specialists.*" Also in international context these graduates are by no way not ready and capable to act as self-employed architects. On the other hand, the graduates who envisage to further their studies on Master's level are not well-prepared to do so, because of the lack of fundamentals and focus on principles in this Bachelor programme.

It is thus important to specify sharply the profile of the program: whether it is creativity oriented or whether it has a stronger focus on technological engineering. The main components of the program, as presented are aimed at the introduction of graphic disciplines, which is why it tends to be the level of professional education.

Evidences/indicators

- Programme description
- Programme Syllabi
- Interview with programme management team
- Interview with teaching staff (Invited teachers)
- Interview with Employers
- SER, p. 7,8.

Recommendations:

GTU has to reconsider the dichotomy between graduates working and graduates going to further their studies on Master's level, and adapt subsequently the proposal. If GTU has the intention to build a Master's degree on top of this Bachelor degree, then it will have to remodel the entire 5 or 6 years curriculum, especially given the content gaps in the proposal.

Suggestions for programme development:

Best Practices (if applicable):

In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress

Evaluation
X Does not comply with requirements

1.5. The mechanism of stakeholders' (employers, academic staff, students, graduates) participation in the establishment of programme learning outcomes and programme development, is established and implemented
Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements During the visits it became clear that along with the academic staff of the International School of Design, the general university leadership and other engineering departments have been actively involved in the development of this program, as well as private and state organizations, potential employers, the Union of Architects of Georgia and specialists with hands-on experience.
Evidences/indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University regulations • QA documents • Interviews with University administration, SER team, Employers, Invited-teaching staff
Recommendations:
Suggestions for programme development:
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation X Complies with requirements

Programme's Compliance with Standard

Standard	Complies with Requirements	Partially Complies with Requirements	Does not Comply with Requirements
Educational programme objectives, learning outcomes and their compliance with the programme			X

2. Teaching methodology and organization, adequate evaluation of programme mastering

2.1. Programme admission preconditions are transparent and ensure the admission of students of relevant knowledge, skills and values necessary to master programme learning outcomes.

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

During the visit it became clear that admission criteria are transparent and well understandable by applicants. Additional information, if necessary, can be obtained via e-mail. Enrolment in the GTU will be implemented according to rules established by Georgian legislation. Prerequisites for enrolling in the program are transparent: enrolment of persons, who possess the necessary knowledge, skills and values will be ensured. That means in fact that there should be an (e-)interview with the candidates. Information about enrolment in the program will be available to students and other interested individuals. Information for interested students will also be available on the website of the Faculty of Architecture, Urban and Design of the GTU.

Individuals have the right to study at the Bachelor's degree program, if they have the state certificate or document certifying the full general education in accordance with the rules established by the legislation of Georgia. To acquire grants for funding their studies students should have obtained sufficient scores in the Unified National Entrance Examinations. The enrollment of the citizens of Georgia is regulated by the legislation from the Georgian Ministry of Education and Science and the legal requirements of the faculty, comprising passing exams in the following: 1. General skills; 2. Georgian language; 3. Foreign language; 4. Elective subject (one of the following: A. Mathematics; B. Literature; C. Applied art) GTU WEBSITE: <http://gtu.ge/Arch/Pdf/publications/turil.pdf> Additionally, applicants have to pass the test in graphics and drawing. According to the results of the test in graphics and drawing, the competency of the entrants is established, which together with the results of the examination of the three exams and one optional examination envisaged by the National Examination produces the list of entrants who have gained the right to continue their studies at GTU Architecture, Urban Planning and Design faculty. Foreign citizens and students can be admitted/enrolled in the university without passing the Unified National Examinations, in accordance with the legislation of Georgia (Law of Georgia on Higher Education, Article 52). The university has however the right to come up with additional entry requirements. It is the practice in the better universities worldwide who require portfolio and/or interview.

The program sets English language proficiency for applicants from Georgia as low as required by the Unified National Examinations. But this level is definitely too low to pursue bachelor studies in English. This was also admitted by the dean of the International Design School during interview.

There are absolutely no mechanisms to ensure English language proficiency for foreign students. There is no mentioning of even an interview in English or any kind of test to check the level of English language knowledge.

During interviews, students mentioned the problem of English language. Surprisingly, one of the alumni of the English program could not communicate with the panel in English because of lack of spoken English fluency.

Evidences/indicators

- Site visit interviews with stakeholders (SER group and program administration)
- Information on the website of the University
- interviews with students
- interviews with alumni

Recommendations:

- Upgrade the precondition of admission of English language to level B2. If that is not feasible immediately, GTU has to offer (academic) English course(s) right at the beginning or better, before the start of the first academic year. This will be beneficial for contacts between students and staff.
- Include the detailed information related to the admission of foreign students in the step by step form on the website under a special heading that can easily be accessed and properly understood.
- Organise an interview with the candidate students, eventually via electronic means.

Suggestions for programme development:

- Advertise the program structure and syllabi on the website into the admission section in order to make students more attracted to the program.
- Check capabilities of candidate foreign students for this Bachelor via interview.

Best Practices (if applicable):

In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress

Evaluation

X Partially complies with requirements

2.2 Teaching methods utilized in various components of the programme ensure the achievement of programme learning outcomes

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

Apart from a general list of teaching methods at GTU (SER, p.10 and Program description, pp. 5, 6, 7), teaching methods used for each particular course are described in syllabi in detail. Most widely used methods of teaching are: teamwork in the form of discussion, debates, presentations; implementation of IT technologies; presentations; review of literature; case studies; analysis and synthesis, oral teaching and writings; activity-oriented teaching, adequate evaluation of competences mastering, design tutoring and design presentations. More specifically related to design teaching: tutoring of design has to evolve along the years, from 'tight' follow-up in the first year to more independent work along with the progress in the curriculum. Also working in group, especially in multidisciplinary teams is needed, in order to prepare graduates for the practice of today and tomorrow.

If the number of planned students (50-60 pers.) is enrolled in the program, it will become necessary to divide them into groups. There is nothing about this written in the documents. The current number of professors is insufficient for running the BA program, especially because of the interactive and thus, labor intensive design studio. In this case, more teachers of practical subjects, of theoretical subjects, as well as assistants should become involved in the programme.

The panel did not read about initiatives by GTU to improve teaching and learning excellence by offering to the teachers support in teaching methods and practices, neither by stimulating/offering them opportunities for international mobility.

Evidences/indicators

- Interviews with the teaching staff, the Program Manager, Students
- Information stated in the syllabi
- SER, p.10 and Program description, pp. 5, 6, 7

Recommendations:

- Raise level of proficiency of English of staff
- Enroll more staff members
- Tutoring of design has to evolve along the years, from 'tight' follow-up to more independent work. Working in group, esp. in multidisciplinary teams is needed in order to prepare graduates for the practice of today and tomorrow.

Suggestions for programme development:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put an emphasis on the professional development of teachers by offering them international mobility, by suggesting them new contemporary teaching methods. • Attract lecturers from abroad and involve industrial partners for implementing the programme.
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation
X Partially complies with requirements

2.3 The sequence and admission preconditions of programme components are logical

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

"Structure and learning courses of the educational program are developed chronologically and in a logical order and are complex" (SER, p.10). The program curriculum meets legal requirements. The structure of the program is focused on part of the labour market demand namely working with an architect.

The tables shown on pages 8, 9, 10 of the Architecture Bachelor Program, English file, describe very well the sequence of the study components and their organization over the semesters and the years. Since the protection of cultural heritage is a national priority include (besides what has been suggested above in 1.1) elective courses on the History of Architecture of Georgia, or even the History of the Architecture of Caucasus ...

Evidences/indicators

- Programme description document
- Interviews with Program Director and the SER team
- Architecture Bachelor Program, English file, pp. 8, 9, 10.

Recommendations:

Suggestions for programme development:

- More rational elaboration should be given to the inclusion of elective subjects and to the implementation of clear logic of the elective subjects according to modules, for example, the History of Architecture of Georgia, or even the History of the Architecture of Caucasus etc.

Best Practices (if applicable):

In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation
X Complies with requirements

2.4 The evaluation methods of each programme component ensures the achievement of student learning outcomes of this component, which is proved by evaluation results

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

The grading system is implemented according to the ECTS-system and includes 100 points. All faculties of GTU use the same evaluation 100-point system as described in the PD (p.7). GTU has the following evaluation scheme:

- Weekly midterm assessment (maximum score - 30 points, 2 points x 15 weeks);
- I intermediate exam (maximum score - 20 points);
- II intermediate exam (maximum score - 20 points);
- Final/additional exam (maximum score - 30 points). The student has the right to pass the final examination, if s/he has collected at least 21 points in the interim exams. Minimum positive assessment of the final/additional exam is 7.5 points.

In case of failing to pass the exam (FX), the student has the right to pass an additional examination once at least 5 days after the expiration of the term. The description of the relevant methods, criteria and scales of assessment forms are given in the attached course syllabi" (SER, p. 10).

This procedure shows a very tight scheme of evaluation. It is in itself not bad, but the frequency of evaluation is definitely higher than in other countries. In some universities evaluation is done once a year of per semester after the courses are taught, others have intermediate assessment, some adhere the formula of permanent evaluation (which is possible/feasible) for architectural design, where teachers and students work on a one to one basis. In that scale of practices the system of GTU is an extreme case and rather unusual for a university, where students have to learn to comprehend and grasp large entities of study materials and to overview and synthesize a course as whole.

Weekly assessment is a serious problem: first, it is not a university way of teaching and secondly, it is materially not feasible when the number of students grows to the expected numbers of 50/y. What is even more alarming is that it will disturb "the designerly way of thinking" (*N. Cross, Designerly Ways of Knowing, Design Studies, vol 3, no 4, oct 1982, pp.221-227*) of the students, which requires a mind free of overregulation / constraints.

Evidences/indicators

- Course Syllabi
- SER, p.10

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with the Teaching staff and Students of this and other programmes of the university
Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review evaluation methods and criteria at least once a year. Evaluation method for each program component has to be specified and communicated to the students before the start of that component. Evaluation should be testing competencies to be achieved through the course and it is also necessary to outline evaluation and assessment criteria in syllabi in line with the learning outcomes that each course attempts to develop. For example, the assessment of design is different from the assessment of other components, especially the criteria should be different. A description of design assessment criteria still needs further specific elaboration for each design assignment. The Quality Assurance Department of the University should be helpful in elaborating this.
Suggestions for programme development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GTU should take into consideration students' feedback in reviewing and updating the evaluation criteria.
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation <p style="text-align: center;">X Partially complies with requirements</p>

2.5 Student evaluation criteria are transparent; students are informed about the achievement of learning outcomes, their gaps and ways for improvement

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

The student evaluation system corresponds to the requirement of the Order No. 3 of 5 January 2007 of the Minister of Education and Science of Georgia on Approval of Rules of Calculation of Credits of the Higher Education Program. Evaluation criteria are described in the program and in the syllabus of each course. Align the evaluation method with the competences that a programme component has to achieve. The evaluation method for each program component has to be specified and communicated to the students before the start of that component, keeping in mind that the

assessment of design is different from the assessment of other components, especially the criteria will be different.

GTU has a knowledge assessment system, that according to the SER (p.12) is transparent and includes feedback to the teachers and students. In the documents nothing is explicitly mentioned about assessing the process of learning, a practice that is very important for design education. The weekly assessment system is probably revealing this issue, provided the process is part of the evaluation. But as said before, the weekly formal assessment should be replaced by a more adult evaluation system that explicitly is taking into account also the student's progress in the design learning process.

Evidences/indicators

- Regulations regarding Student complaints,
- Regulations regarding providing feedback to students
- Interviews with Teaching staff, Students and Alumni
- University Study Process Management System
- Graded exams and assignments
- SER, p.12

Recommendations:

Suggestions for programme development:

- Assess process as well as the outcome. Implement system of monitoring students' academic performance during the semester.
- Provide efficient and detailed feedback on time focused on student performance, to monitor students' performance and ensure it can be improved during the course,

Best Practices (if applicable):

In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress

Evaluation

X Complies with requirements

Programme's Compliance with Standard

Standard	Complies with Requirements	Partially Complies with Requirements	Does not Comply with Requirements

Teaching methodology and organization, adequate evaluation of programme mastering		X	
---	--	---	--

3. Student achievements and individual work with them

3.1 Students receive appropriate consultations and support regarding the determination of their profile, planning of learning process and improvement of their academic achievement

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

- It is important to outline that students and or Alumni interviewed during the Expert Panel's visit, were not the target group subject for assessment by the panel of experts. This is mainly due to the fact that the program eligible for assessment is entirely new, and thus there are neither students nor alumni from this program yet. The students interviewed by the expert's panel were mainly from the faculties of industrial and graphic design, which are part of the same university. We interviewed the Master and PhD students from Georgian programs, studying with the professors responsible also for new program. The current evidence is mainly collected through interviews with students, alumni, staff and professors of the university. They were asked more general questions, rather than questions more particular to architecture.
- During the interviews, the students pointed out that they had the opportunity to do anonymous evaluation of teaching staff once in couple of months. If a problem arises either with studies or with a subject, there is a focal person that students may approach, who is responsible for addressing such issues. However, this statement of students has not been corroborated by other documents provided to the commission beforehand. The committee has not a single document about the monitoring by either teachers and staff.
- One of the alumni declared not having been aware of the fact that she enrolled in an English programme. That means that the communication from GTU was not what it has to be.
- Another alumnus was not prepared to speak English to the panel. Strange for an alumnus of an English programme. That also raises questions about the real achievements of such an English programme. GTU apparently failed in detecting this problem and remedy this.
- The panel did not hear about the existence of a student counseling system in GTU, nor was a service to improve academic achievements of students mentioned. Major European universities not only have the system of ombudsperson, but also course monitors/assistants for the beginners, whom students address for help in understanding the courses,

Evidences/indicators

Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make sure that the applicants know about the expected language proficiency and that problems in this respect are detected and remedied; • Create a service to counsel students and help students in understanding the courses when needed (if that service does not exist).
Suggestions for programme development:
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation X Partially complies with requirements

3.2 Academic staff workload scheme includes individual work with students
Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As confirmed by students themselves, they are closely working with their professors both individually, as well as in groups. They are free to choose from multiple topics in design studio, and a relevant professor supervises each topic. This is confirmed by statements in the SER and SWOT analysis (S), where it is mentioned that a student can choose topics (s) he is interested in within a program and a plan shall accordingly be established to assist him/her to match their interests. ○ Students reported that they receive strong encouragement from the staff to come up with own initiatives and own contribution in this process. At the end of every week students have a weekly assessment, which would have an impact on the overall grade at the end of the semester. This became evident via the description of the program, it also has been mentioned by staff and/or students during the visit. ○ Academic staff often participates in more than one program, sometimes in different universities. There are cases where a full-time administrative and/or academic staff member in one university, also works part-time in another university. This is an issue related of course to the level of remuneration of academic staff and regulations within GTU.
Evidences/indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interviews with students and/or Alumni ○ Interview with Academic Staff

<p>○ SER – Self Evaluation Report</p>
<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly assessment is definitely a weak point of the program, because it will lead to a not achievable workload for teachers and consequently will have a negative impact on the quality of teaching. Weekly assessment is not an university way of teaching and studying because students at university have to grow in becoming independent individuals, capable of organizing and managing their time and efforts. Also, given the expected number of students this is simply not feasible; • GTU has to set rules regulating to what extend staff members are allowed to cumulate different academic and other jobs, especially when that sums up to more than a 100 % employment.
<p>Suggestions for programme development:</p>
<p>Best Practices (if applicable):</p>
<p>In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress</p>
<p>Evaluation</p> <p>X Partially complies with requirements</p>

<p>3.3 The institution supports students' involvement in research projects and extra-curricular activities, and also offers them components developing practical skills</p>
<p>Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to the SER, and this was also confirmed by students, a lot of time is devoted to research during their study. They are encouraged to make a research that shall support their creative work. ○ It became however evident that what is called research here, is merely the normal analysis and search for information in the preparatory stage of any design: the so-called program definition phase. ○ Research defined as generation or unveiling of new knowledge is not present. It is misunderstood and therefore misused. It is however not the primary objective of a Bachelor's program, that is essential for a Master's programme. ○ Extra-curricular activities have not been reported to the panel.
<p>Evidences/indicators</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interviews with students and/or Alumni ○ Interview with Academic Staff ○ SER – Self Evaluation Report
<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Anyhow, reconsider the interpretation of what is academic research. Especially when it comes to research by design. The proposal uses research in a non-internationally agreed meaning. Defining a program for a design project is the first stage in design and is not the research that is referred to in academia.</p>
<p>Suggestions for programme development:</p> <p>In European universities, there are plenty of extra-curricular activities offered for students like theater, sports and sports competitions, cantuses, exhibitions. This could inspire GTU in case it is not yet implemented.</p>
<p>Best Practices (if applicable):</p>
<p>In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress</p>
<p>Evaluation</p> <p>X Partially complies with requirements</p>

<p>3.4 The institution aims to internationalise its teaching and scientific work as well as the employability of its graduates</p>
<p>Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The internationalisation of the program is supported by the fact that the entire program is entirely taught in English. University has a vast majority of teaching material available either in hard copy or in digital format – also in other foreign languages, including English. That was confirmed by international students from the parallel programs. ○ If talking about the proficiency of the English language, there could be a problem of mutual understanding between a professor and a student. As seen from interviews, not all students attending international programs within this university were fluent in English, expressing their opinion or communicating their ideas to/with a professor. As also confirmed by some students, there could be a problem, understanding the tasks given to them by the professor. According to them however, the teachers are very accommodating to the students' needs and in one way or another, always manage to impart the needed information to student. According to the SER, within the framework of this new program currently under assessment, first courses are taught in English during 3rd year 2nd semester, though theory is

taught during the first two years of their study. The recommendation for the program thus is either to raise the level of English already at the level of National Admission Exams, either to introduce English as an elective for students from the beginning of the program. In so far, as English is paramount for this program, it shall be fully integrated within this particular program and shall be in balance with the students' workload. As mentioned during the interviews, GTU has a course of English language, which is independent from everything else, and can be attended by any student. There is however no guarantee that every student from this program will attend it.

- Studying in an International program means that any student graduating from this program shall be accepted in the majority of foreign universities without exam in the English language. If any of these graduates from this new program will not have sufficient proficiency in English, that can create a problem for this program in the future.
- The panel has been evaluating the proposal for a new English taught programme. The international dimension of this programme can only be read from the research activities of the staff; But research, if there is any, has not been presented neither in the documents, neither in the interviews. The only possible reference to international visibility through research should be found in the publication lists of the teachers and these are not available in English. It appears that most of the publications are in local journals; that means no international profiles.

Evidences/Indicators

- Interviews with students and/or Alumni
- Interview with Academic Staff
- SER – Self Evaluation Report
- Syllabuses of educational program
- program description

Recommendations:

The recommendation for the program is raising the grade for English already at the level B2 of National Admission Exams, or - as mentioned before - introduce English as an elective for students from the first semester of the program or even before enrolling.

Develop academic research and publish in international peer reviewed journals. Participate more in international research projects.

Suggestions for programme development:

Best Practices (if applicable):

In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress

Evaluation
X Partially complies with requirements

Programme's Compliance with Standard

Standard	Complies with Requirements	Partially Complies with Requirements	Does not Comply with Requirements
Student achievements and individual work with them		X	

4. Providing teaching resources

4.1 The infrastructure and technical equipment of the institution ensures the achievement of programme learning outcomes

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

Georgian Technical University has a significant infrastructure comprised of several buildings which are located on a walking distance to each other in the same area of the city. The university's main library is located in the administrative building. The library is spacious and has a collection of printed books, educational and scientific literature and is equipped with computers having access to digital and online materials. But it must be noted that computers are put in a long line next to each other on relatively narrow desks, which is not the best arrangement to study and research for longer time.

During the interviews was mentioned that GTU has a FabLab. But nothing was said about the possibility for students of this new programme to make use of it.

International Design School has a small library room with limited number of printed books. But it has an e-library with access to digital materials such as pdf books, magazines and online resources.

- IDS already runs five bachelor and one master's programs (GTU must correct information on the website saying Bachelor of Arts under Master's program).
- The Experts Panel visited a workshop and one studio space. During the visit to IDS, the committee saw only two classrooms for lectures, a space for the workshop and a tiny space for painting, which was called studio. The panel did not see 6 classrooms⁴. It is hard to

⁴ The floor plans presented by GTU in the feedback documentation show 2 classrooms, maybe 3, with goodwill 4, but by no way 6 classrooms.

<p>believe that this is sufficient for already existing six programs⁵. This additional program will bring more students (50 annually) to the school which has only two classrooms. <u>It is not excluded that IDS can get classrooms elsewhere, but this had to be documented in due time to be considered in the report.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stairs are unsafe due to damaged steps and need repair. In western world this would not be acceptable in a 'public' building. ○ Spaces are in bad condition, are not sufficient to host the expected number of 60 students (cumulatively) ○ There are problems with ventilation, lighting (levels of illumination), worn-out furniture and problems related to overall conditions of the premises in general.
<p>Evidences/indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visiting the main administrative building and the library ○ Visiting International Design School ○ Interviews with the administration of the university ○ Interviews with staff of the IDS ○ Visual Survey
<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GTU has to upgrade the premisses for hosting this new programme decently and safely • More classrooms and studios need to be ensured
<p>Suggestions for programme development:</p>
<p>Best Practices (if applicable):</p>
<p>In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress</p>
<p>Evaluation</p> <p>X Does not comply with requirements</p>

4.2 Programme staff has necessary competences required for the achievement of intended learning outcomes of the component they teach, which is proved by-in case of academic staff- scientific

⁵ IDS website lists six programs. If this is not correct GTU/IDS should correct this information on the website. The panel judges according to the information available.

papers written during the past 10 years (in arts field- creative projects) proving staff's competence in the relevant field; in case of invited staff -may be certified by practical experience

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

According to the SER, p.15, standard 4.2, 14 professors and 16 associate professors will be working in this new architectural programme. The documentation has been provided about 31 persons. Among them are professors employed at different faculties. In fact only 9 of them are professors, 9 associate professors and 2 invited professors.

- IDS has 1 professor (Head of QA) and 4 invited professors: none of these 4 have PhD degrees. The Dean of IDS and the Supervisor of programme are both also professors of the Architecture, Urban Planning and Design faculty.
- GTU must correct the information on website because the supervisor of programme is still shown as Dean of Architecture, Urban Planning and Design faculty.
- Based on the study of the documents provided by GTU it can be said that actually there are contracts made with five individuals for writing syllabus and teaching, on condition the program gets accreditation. Contracts with 16 professors (out of 31, i.e. almost half of them) are from different departments, and not from the International Design School, but they have submitted syllabi to teach. One has a contract with IDS for teaching English, but his syllabus is for 'animation studio'. Two contracts are signed by other professors than mentioned in the contract. The big majority of contracts are expired. Probably contracts are meant to be extended in case programme receives accreditation (but this is mentioned only in 5 cases)⁶.

International experience and qualifications of some staff members are not supported by their CVs. They do not have international publications, nor participation in conferences and the like (on an academic level).

The program does not include mechanisms to ensure English language proficiency for professors to teach the English language program. Evidence from the site proved that not all of them master the English language on an academic level.

Recommendations:

GTU has to set English language proficiency requirements for professors, who intend to teach English language courses.

⁶ This is hard for the panel to explain how these data match with the information provided by GTU in the feedback, stating that there are only 4 invited professors that only will be employed, if the programme gets accreditation.

Suggestions for programme development:
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation X Partially complies with requirements

4.3 Programme implementation is ensured by the administrative and support staff of an appropriate competence
Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements Georgian Technical University has a long history and traditions of providing education in mainly technical fields, but not only. The administration of the university encourages the implementation of the program. Administrative staff is interested in the program and assures the evaluation committee in their commitment. Administrative staff and Quality Assurance Service are highly motivated to run the program.
Evidences/indicators/indicators Interviews with the university administration interviews with the International Design School administration and staff.
Recommendations:
Suggestions for programme development:
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation

X Complies with requirements

4.4 Teaching materials are based on the core achievements in the field and ensure the achievement of intended learning outcomes

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

- Teaching activities are supported with literature and reading materials. Literature is listed in provided syllabi, it is up-to-date and sufficient in number for a Bachelor level.
- The university has well equipped main library. But the library within the faculty needs more printed literature although it has significant digital resources.

Evidences/indicators

- Visit to library in the main administrative building
- Visit to International Design School
- Syllabi for the provided courses and listed literature

Recommendations:

Suggestions for programme development:

Expand library within the school.

Best Practices (if applicable):

In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress

Evaluation

X Complies with requirements

4.5 Programme is financially sustainable

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No detailed information about finances for the program. According to the interviews with the university and the school financial resources are sustainable. The rector said he is deciding about the rules of finances allocation and budgeting⁷. ○ Tuition fees: 2250 GEL/y for Georgians, 4500 GEL/year for foreigners.
Evidences/indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interviews with the dean of the school and the program supervisor ○ Information on the school
Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give detailed budget (the real figures) for this new programme. • Have a board with equal representation deciding about the allocation of resources within GTU.
Suggestions for programme development:
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation <p style="text-align: center;">X Partially complies with requirements</p>

Programme's Compliance with Standard

Standard	Complies with Requirements	Partially Complies with Requirements	Does not Comply with Requirements
Providing teaching resources			X

5. Teaching quality enhancement opportunities

⁷ The figures provided by GTU in their feedback, describe costs of the programme only partially

5.1 There is a publicly available quality assurance system which is based on the "Plan-Do-Check-Act" cycle

Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements

During the interviews, the panel noticed that the academic community is aware of the quality enhancement processes and that a mechanism for quality monitoring is in place. The elements of the teaching and learning process are evaluated by the student's community every semester. Graduates assess their satisfaction regarding the studies and suggest areas to be improved. Lecturers evaluate their courses regarding workload and conformance with the NQF, etc. The QA office processes the results and forwards them to faculties and programme directors. Teachers are informed about their performance, all aspects (e.g. publications, conferences, teaching) taken into consideration, in an effort to assess and improve their qualifications and work.

Relevant regulation and guidelines are included in public documents such as University Regulations, Internal Regulations, and specific regulations regarding the Academic process, Academic positions etc. The Quality Assurance Service Regulation specifies the process for monitoring quality.

"The quality assurance system facilitates the development of university education, scientific research and creative activities. It evaluates, monitors and analyses academic and scientific research to ensure further development. The quality assurance system sets all elements that are an integral part of the planning, organization and monitoring processes.

The panel likes to point out that the Quality Assurance Service also should monitor the production of the self-evaluation reports.

The system is implemented through a cycle process which runs regularly and involves four main interconnected steps: 1. planning; 2. implementation; 3. monitoring, evaluation and testing, collecting feedback followed by 4. Improvement. SER, 5.1, pp. 17, 18.

Evidences/indicators

- Interview with University Administration
- Interview with the SER team
- Interview with the Programme management team
- Component evidences/indicators including relevant documents and interview results
- Review of University Regulation documents.
- Review of QA reports
- SER, 5.1 description

<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>GTU should, via its Quality Assurance Department, organize teaching courses for (especially beginning) teachers, introducing them with new learning and teaching resources, offering training sessions, exposing them to examples of best practice. Eventually offer individual consultancy to teachers about how to remedy weaknesses in teaching.</p>
<p>Suggestions for programme development:</p>
<p>Best Practices (if applicable):</p>
<p>In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress</p>
<p>Evaluation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X Partially complies with requirements</p>

<p>5.2 Internal and external quality assurance results are utilized to improve the achievement of programme learning outcomes</p>
<p>Descriptive summary and analysis of compliance with standard requirements</p> <p>The SER describes in detail how the quality assurance process, explained in 5.1, is working at GTU and who is involved in that process. The Program Supervisor and Head of the Faculty Quality Assurance Service check the content of various components of the program and the compliance of the existing resources with the objectives.</p> <p>On the other hand, the University Quality Assurance Service examines the compliance with the accreditation standards and reports to the dean of the Faculty. Authors of the program and representatives of the University Quality Assurance Service propose remedies to the problems reported and implement the appropriate changes in the program. In cases of disagreement, the Rector of GTU is the ultimate Judge.</p> <p>The architectural organizations contributed actively to the development of this programme. The Bachelor in Architecture, English programme is a new programme and needs to comply with the accreditation standards. It will be adapted, if necessary, via the process described in 5.1.</p>
<p>Evidences/indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Course syllabi ○ Programme description ○ SER, 5.2

Recommendations:
Suggestions for programme development:
Best Practices (if applicable):
In case of accredited programme, significant accomplishments and/or progress
Evaluation
X Complies with requirements

Programme's Compliance with Standard

Standard	Complies with Requirements	Partially Complies with Requirements	Does not Comply with Requirements
Teaching quality enhancement opportunities	X		

Enclosed Documentation (If Applicable)

HEI's Name:

GEORGIAN TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Higher Education Programme Name: Bachelor in Architecture

Number of Pages of the Report: 41

Programme's Compliance with the Standard

Standard	Complies with Requirements	Partially Complies with Requirements	Does not Comply with Requirements
1. Programme objectives are clearly defined and achievable; they are consistent with the mission of the HEI and take into consideration labour market demands			X
2. Teaching methodology and organization, adequate evaluation of programme mastering		X	
3. Student achievements and individual work with them		X	
4. Providing teaching resources			X
5. Teaching quality enhancement opportunities	X		
Final Evaluation			X

Expert Panel Chair's Signature:

