

## LEPL - National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

### Minutes N3 of the meeting with the Coordinating Council of the Center

December 10, 2021

On December 10 of the current year, the third meeting of the Coordination Council of the LEPL National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement (hereinafter - the Center) was held. Considering the pandemic in the country, the meeting was held online via the platform Zoom. The meeting was attended by the members of the Coordination Council, Tamar Makharashvili, the Director of the Center, Lasha Margishvili and Kakhaber Eradze, Deputy Directors and the heads and employees of the structural units of the Center.

The Coordination Council meeting was attended by the following members of the Council:

- a) **Cay Etzold** - International Expert in Higher Education;
- b) **Shalva Mekravishvili** - Civic education expert within the framework of National Curriculum Development Sub-Program under the program "National Curriculum Implementation and Monitoring" of the Department of the Preschool and General Education Development of the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia;
- c) **Tea Gulua** - UNDP Knowledge Management and Innovation Specialist, Vocational Education Expert;
- d) **Maka Abuladze** - Representative of the Student Organization of Georgia NNLE, PhD student at the Georgian Technical University - LEPL ;
- e) **Kakhaber Tchelidze** - Professor of LEPL Tbilisi State Medical University, Head of the Department of Internal Medicine at the University Medical Center of Higher Medical Technologies;
- f) **Irma Kurdadze** - Professor of Samtskhe-Javakheti State University LEPL;
- g) **Natia Jojua** - Professor of "European University" Ltd, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine;
- h) **Zaza Purtseladze** - Director of the British Council for the South Caucasus and Georgia - did not attend the Coordination Council meeting.
- i) **Maya Shukhoshvili** - Head of the Higher Education Division of the Department of Higher Education and Science Development of the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia;
- j) **Anastasia Kitiashvili** - Expert of vocational education;

The following did not attend the meeting of the Coordination Council:

- k) **Rusudan Sanadze** - Head of the Department of Education Sciences of the Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences at LEPL Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University; Accreditation Expert of Higher Education Programs;
- l) **Heli Mattisen** - Director of the Estonian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher and Vocational Education (EKKA).

According to Paragraph 10, Article 5<sup>1</sup> of Statute of the Legal Entity of Public Law - National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement, Chairman of the meeting was Tea Gulua.

The meeting of the Coordinating Council started at 11:00 and ended at 14:00. The Council meeting was provided with simultaneous translation.

**Agenda of the meeting:**

11:00 - 11:05 Introduction- Tamar Makharashvili, The director of the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

11:05 - 11:35 Presentation of the 2022 Action Plan of the LEPL National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement-

Giorgi Munjishvili- Deputy Head of Planning, Research and International Relations Department at the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

Nino Kadagishvili- Planning Coordinator of Planning, Research and International Relations Department at the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

11:35-11:50 Question & Answer

11:50- 12:05 Presenting the Changes Introduced in the Accreditation Standards of Higher Education Programs- Nikoloz Parjanadze, Head of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Department of the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

12:05-12:20 Presenting the Changes Introduced in the Accreditation Procedures of Higher Education Programs - Nikoloz Parjanadze, Head of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Department of the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

12:20-12:35 Question & Answer

12:35-12:50 Presentation of the 2022 Personnel List and Budget of the National Center for Education Quality Enhancement- Maia Kalandadze - Head of the Financial Division of the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

12:50-13:05 Question & Answer

13:05-13:20 Presentation of the Policy of Electronic Services and Devices Consumption of the LEPL National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

Giorgi Gvasalia - Information Security Manager of the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement

13:20-13:35 Question & Answer

13:35-13:50 Presentation of the Coordination Council Evaluation Methodology

Giorgi Munjishvili - Deputy Head of Planning, Research and International Relations Department at the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement.

The meeting with the Coordination Council started with the greeting of Tamar Makharashvili, the Director of the Center. She expressed gratitude to each member of the Council for their involvement and noted that the Center plans to implement particularly significant changes, among them, the planned activities within the frame of general education quality assurance, which envisages the renewal of authorization standards and process updates, ensuring broad involvement of institutions and strengthening the capacity of the parties involved. Kakhaber Eradze, Deputy Director of the Center, also addressed the members of the Coordinating Council and stressed the importance of the Center's 2022 Action Plan. He also mentioned the role of the EU-funded twinning project, "Strengthening Capacities for Quality Assurance and Governance of Qualifications in Georgia (Twinnig)", in developing the Center's strategy. He noted that the process was conducted in a transparent manner, with broad stakeholder involvement, and that the implementation of activities was monitored through an electronic system developed with the support of the project, and thanked the project representative and the member of the Coordinating Council- Cay Etzold. The results of the 2021 Action Plan will be presented at a final conference.

The first topic on the agenda was presented by representatives of Planning, Research and International Relations Department of the Center. The first part of the presentation was dedicated to the description of the 2022 Action Plan development process, the development methodology and the presentation of the draft document to the stakeholders.

Representatives of the Department noted that work on the action plan has started in the second half of September this year. During the work process, the structural units underwent preparatory training and an action plan frame-document was submitted to them. Following the plans submitted by the Departments, the joint document was first submitted to the Center's management and then presented to the stakeholders as a part of the workshops. More than 300 people, including representatives of educational institutions, council members and experts attended the workshops. The project was placed on the Center webpage for ensuring broad involvement. Here, it was noted that the process of developing the action plan took into account the results of 2021, international commitments and challenges and innovations in the education system. Representatives of the Planning, Research and International Relations Department also highlighted the important topics to be addressed in the 2022 Action Plan, among them: the digitization of services and processes, capacity building of parties involved in the processes (stakeholders), development of external quality assurance mechanisms, research, analysis and internationalization. Additional emphasis was placed on the cluster accreditation of higher education programmes, the concept of evaluation of doctoral programmes and the change of standards and processes in terms of quality assurance in general education. It was also noted that 2021 was important as the Center actively began to make evidence-based decisions, and to this end 2021 was actively busy with research activities and it will be same in 2022.

The presentation was followed by "Questions and Answers (Q/A)" session. Shalva Mekravishvili, a member of the Coordinating Council, asked several questions. The first question was about the conference planned by the Center, he wondered if the speakers' presentations would be publicly

available, which is important for ensuring transparency. In response, Kakhaber Eradze clarified that the Center will certainly discuss the issue of publishing materials.

The second question referred to the target benchmark set by the self-evaluation pilots under the Action Plan and was interested how the mentioned at least 5 general education institutions would be selected. In response, Kakhaber Eradze, Deputy Director, explained that the school will conduct self-evaluation individually through an electronic programme. It is more of a technical nature of piloting and therefore it is not of a systemic nature. In the technical pilot, the city school, as well as the regional school, private school, etc. will be selected. From the second quarter of 2022, all schools will begin diagnostic self-evaluation. A support specialist on content issues will be assigned to the activity from the Center.

The third question was of a technical nature, namely why the activity was not presented in Task 5.5 and whether this was a technical glitch and also Task 6.1 did not appear in the project at all. Giorgi Munjishvili, a representative of the Center, explained that Task 5.5 did not describe the activities of the Center for 2022, however, the task remained open until the project was approved within the working groups and discussions, and the Center was ready to add a task /activities within the relevant initiatives. As for Task 6.1 there was probably a technical problem regarding the task, as the text of the task was clearly visible in the document sent to the Council and the text of the tasks was introduced during the additional meeting.

Irma Kurdadze, a member of the Coordinating Council, noted that the document covers very important issues, and acknowledged the great work carried out by the Center in this direction. She also noted that during the meeting with international experts, they would especially outline the progress of the Center.

The following question was given by Cay Etzold. First, he mentioned the methodology of designing the action plan, which was developed by the Center with the support of the Twinning project experts. He also noted that according to the action plan, the Center is focused on general education for the coming year. He asked how the Center would involve Resource Centers in the implementation of the planned innovations and how it would manage the processes in this regard. In response to the question, Kakhaber Eradze explained that an integral part of the concept of the Center is to properly understand the role of the Center as an institution. Quality enhancement cannot be the sole responsibility of the Center, as its assurance involves a number of stakeholders, the Teacher's House, Resource Centers, etc. The role of the Center is to measure the status of the quality and to perform a coordinating function for other agencies that have a direct impact on the quality of general education. Understanding the role of Resource Centers is a necessary part and a precondition of general education reform. Their mandate must be understood properly. It will be advocating for the school in the area of action and not conducting local monitoring. Tamar Makharashvili, the director additionally mentioned that this issue had already been submitted to the Resource Centers.

Zaza Purtseladze, Council Member asked at what extent the Center had access to the surveys conducted by various organizations or donors, noting that this was a major challenge for organizations and that there might be a platform to bring these papers together and reduce duplicate work. In addition, Kakhaber Eradze, Deputy Director explained that the Center, as a state institution, has the opportunity to get acquainted with certain surveys, as a rule, the authors of the surveys themselves share papers in the field of education. However, there are single cases when the Center is not aware of the research conducted on this or that topic. He noted that it is possible to initiate the creation of a platform through

joint efforts, which will serve to gather researches and will be available to all stakeholders. The Center will be one of the users of this platform. Tamar Makharashvili clarified that the Center is involved in a number of international projects in the field of higher education and has the opportunity to get acquainted with the innovations in the field of education, also supported the initiative of the Council member and noted that the Center would definitely interact further with specific proposals regarding the implementation of the mentioned initiative.

Additionally, Lasha Margishvili, Deputy Director noted that the Center actively participates in international workshops, seminars, meetings. The Center is also a member of the Association of European Universities and the employees of the Center are actively involved in the annual forum, where speakers present the results of the research, as well as get familiar with the works of their colleagues.

Receive and share information. These results are effectively applied by the Center. Also, the Higher Education Quality Assurance Service addresses the Planning, Research and International Relations Department of the Center with an initiative to conduct research on a specific topic. One of the most recent challenging studies conducted was the refinement and development of quality assurance mechanisms for medical education. The Department conducted a thematic analysis and the results helped the Center plan further steps. Lasha Margishvili also agreed that the issue of research sharing might be a challenge. He noted that the Center will consider what can be done to eliminate the problem. Giorgi Munjishvili added that the reports and other documents prepared within the framework of external quality assurance are an important source for analyzing the challenges of quality assurance as well as other important issues of education and due to the scale of these materials, it is of prior importance for the Center to process these results in the frame of thematic analysis, the results of which will be significant for a wider audience and can be used for larger scale studies as well.

The members of the Coordinating Council supported the draft Action Plan for 2022 by a majority of votes.

Pro: 10.

Against: 0.

According to the agenda, the next topic was the presentation of changes to be made in the standards for accreditation of higher education programmes and changes to be made in the accreditation procedures of higher education programmes. The presentation on the mentioned topics was conducted by the Head of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Department, Nikoloz Parjanadze. He noted that the changes were also discussed with higher education institutions.

In the first part of the presentation, Nikoloz Parjanadze discussed about the positive aspects of cluster accreditation and noted that it is important to go deeper into the content of the programme. Cluster accreditation allows not only evaluation of a form and a structure, but also provides a chance to observe the teaching-learning process of programmes from within. The purpose of the change is to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. This model of evaluation for the center and institutions is a good opportunity to use the resource rationally and efficiently. They will be able to achieve maximum efficiency at a lower cost. According to the changes, the programmes of all three levels of the field will be evaluated in connection with each other. However, this does not rule out that the Center will

monitor a separate programme. It is important here how institutionalized the approach to a particular programme and cluster is, how consistent the university is in the process of implementing the programme at different stages.

It is also important to design and develop sector benchmarks. The Center's Qualifications Development Department is working hard in this regard. It should also be noted that the selection of members of the Accreditation Council will take into account the issue of formation of councils according to fields. It will make the processes, as well as the functioning of the Council far effective.

Nikoloz Parjanadze noted that three institutions and nine educational programmes were involved in the pilot phase of cluster accreditation standards. This experience was reflected in the submitted document. Sector benchmarks for mastering archaeology, history, philosophy, philology and language have been developed together with the Qualifications Development Department.

It was mentioned in the presentation that for the development of the experts pool, the Center will start training in accordance with the planned clusters.

He noted that all these changes need a legislative framework and the Center is already working in this direction. It is important that these changes are implemented in a timely manner.

Nikoloz Parjanadze also noted that in connection with the standards of higher education programmes, structural changes were made to certain standards, components were regrouped, the verbal part was specified, so that equal attention is paid to each issue. 1.3; 1.4 and 1.5 components were added to the first standard, which had been moved from the second standard. This type of grouping is more in line with the purpose that the Center has in evaluating process of the programmes. The third standard places particular emphasis on student support services. The feedback from universities was notable in this process.

The Head of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Department of the Center noted that it was important to focus on research and, consequently, special emphasis would be placed in the fourth standard, on the qualification of masters and doctoral students, as well as on making the process healthier. According to the standards, in relation to the components of learning outcomes, great emphasis would be placed on the mechanisms of learning outcomes. Universities have little experience in this area so far and he added that the Center will be ready for constant communication with HEIs and provide supportive measures.

It was further noted that after the revision of the criteria and evaluation indicators, the Center sought to minimize the need to collect unnecessary documentation. The Center continues to work in this direction. Regarding the second standard, the focus was made on the development of a student body planning methodology at the doctoral programme. A framework document has been developed in this direction and the Center also had an opinion in terms of evaluation. Regarding the third standard, the issue of management was separated. Significant emphasis would be placed on the importance of the research component in the third standard. Educational resources were focused on in the fourth standard. The fifth standard — the possibilities to develop the quality of teaching, the self-evaluation document in this regard was very important.

As Nikoloz Parjanadze noted, the Center received feedback from 25 institutions, 10 of which shared the offered document. The rest provided feedback to the Center, which was reflected in the document as much as possible.

According to the agenda, the second presentation was dedicated to a part of the procedures, namely the changes in the accreditation regulations.

It was noteworthy that the option of presenting individual education programmes was defined, the rule of grouping programmes into a cluster, a maximum of 8 programmes. Against the background of the pilot, this information was examined and it was found that more than two programmes could not be processed by a field expert per day. As it was known, in most cases cluster accreditation took four days, except for the programmes of medical direction.

Nikoloz Parjanadze noted that the programmes would be grouped according to a narrow or detailed field. A sample document will be presented to the universities. Specifics of a field and a direction will be taken into account here too. It was important that accreditation would become mandatory for all types of programmes. Future programmes would not be in an authorized mode any more. It was a very important initiative in terms of quality development. As for the possible clustering scenario, the programmes could be grouped vertically and horizontally, as well as the Bachelor's programmes, Bachelor's and Master's programmes could be grouped. PhD programmes would belong to separate cluster.

In addition, it was noted that the Centre would ensure the interpretation services during the visit. The Center planned to introduce an application fee. The main logic was that the Center implemented timely accreditation of programmes. Accordingly, deadlines would be proposed from February 1st to May 1st, from September 1st to December 1st. The main concern and question for the universities here was how well the existing programmes would fit into these deadlines. The Center was working on this issue and it was expected that these issues would be regulated by appropriate legislative changes.

The involvement of international experts in this process has already been noted. Priorities were also defined in evaluation of standards. If at least one component in the first or fourth standard was assessed as partially, the Council would determine to grant accreditation with the prerequisite of monitoring. The Council will make decisions regarding the individual programme. The Center worked on how to address certain issues in the Report writing process.

While presenting the topic, Nikoloz Parjanadze additionally noted that the programme was accredited for a period of seven years and the rules for determining the student body in the medicine programme were defined. International accreditation of education programmes of educational institutions operating abroad was also important.

In the Q&A format, Council member Irma Kurdadze noted that it was important to evaluate the frame-document. It would be a guide for HEIs. She also noted that doctoral programmes, in European experience, are included in the cluster, although she expressed interest regarding the proposed version of the Center. Presenting the mentioned level with the increased requirements was definitely correct. She asked about the timeframe, how manageable was its implementation in those deadlines. The Director of the Center explained that the Center has been actively working in this direction and approved the sector benchmarks in 2021, as the Center was aware of a specific schedule which field

would have to be included in the cluster in 2022. 2022 was the year for humanities. Sector benchmarks already existed and universities were able to adapt programmes and prepare them for accreditation. They would have 6 months before a deadline, so the timeframe is reasonably set. Plus, the timeline, when the sector benchmark was approved. In general, institutions would fail to start working in a timely manner. The Center has made all possible efforts to ensure that the institutions had a reasonable time. The Center was actively providing consultations to the interested institutions and it will continue in future. Piloting was also worth mentioning. Whatever existed in documents had been examined in practice. Actually the major change concerned the doctorate level. Learning outcomes were well-shaped and identified. The standards have adapted to the cluster and become more transparent. Legislative changes were to be approved by the end of the year.

Maka Abuladze, a member of the Coordinating Council, noted that significant work was visible in the submitted paper and welcomed the work done by the Center in this direction. Ms. Maka put a question referring to article 19 of higher education programmes. At the accreditation preparatory meeting, it was indicated that the university could receive a consultation at least one month in advance. Ms. Maka's question was whether the deadline set by the Center was reasonable and whether it would encourage speeding up the self-evaluation process. Maybe it would be better to offer different timeline? It was explained by the Director that the Center was viewing the process through the eyes of the institution. While setting deadlines, it was considered where a conflict of interest might take place. Permanent training cycle was to be mentioned as well, provided for adapting to cluster accreditation. Guides had been prepared for institutions as well. Nikoloz Parjanadze noted in a comment that in the cluster accreditation it was clarified how the programme was implemented at the institutional level. Consequently, with the process started a month earlier, the HEI could not show the logic of cluster accreditation. It was in this direction that work had to be done to ensure that the content of process management and quality assurance was once again well-considered. It was a document of daily labor and consolidated information and not written in a week.

Council member Cay Etzold congratulated Nikoloz Parjanadze on his appointment to the new position, noting that the results of the cluster accreditation pilot were reflected in the submitted document, and welcomed the focus on research. The Director of the Center noted the work done by Cay Etzold in the pilot process. She also added that the Center planned to involve an international expert in the context of internationalization.

Following the presentations, the Council supported changes to be made to Higher Education Accreditation Standards.

Pro: 10

Against: 0

The Coordinating Council supported the changes to be implemented in the accreditation procedures of higher education programmes.

Pro: 10

Against: 0



According to the agenda, Maia Kalandadze, the Head of the Financial Support Division introduced the draft budget for 2022 and its main parameters to the members of the Council. By 2022, the Center had requested GEL 2,976,000. It has to be mentioned that there had been an increase in the number of employees, from 50 to 54 staff members, whose salaries, according to the project, were GEL 821,000 from the budget.

Also, the share of the State budget and the share of own revenues in the draft budget were presented. It is noteworthy that more shares came from the Center's own funds. As for the issue of own revenues and expenditures, according to the draft budget for 2022, the revenues of the Center should amount to 4,500,000 GEL and expenditures 5,000,141 GEL. The Center had increased revenues, namely in 2021 the Center received more own income than expected and based on it expenses in 2022 was planned to increase included 10% raise on salaries also for contract-based employees.

The Director of the Center added in a comment to the presented issue that the aim of the Center was to spend as little as possible from the State budget on its own revenue line from year to year. This was not only the goal of the Center, it was also the recommendation of ENQA.

In 2019, when the Center became a member of the ENQA, the share of the State budget in the general budget of the Center was more than 65% when now the result was vice versa and NCEQE's own revenues equalled 65% in the total budget, what is important for organizations financial independence and stability as per recommendation issues by ENQA. This trend would continue in the following years.

There was no question regarding this topic of the agenda. The Council supported the presented draft budget.

Pro: 10

Against: 0

According to the agenda, the next topic was presented by the Center's Information Security Manager- Giorgi Gvasalia. He briefed the meeting on changes to the 2022 information policy. He spoke about the initiated change to the law, which related to the coordinating body of the Center, implying that the Digital Governance Agency would no longer be the curator of the Center and this function will be performed by the 'OTO' - Operational-Technical Department. Giorgi pointed out that the biggest change in the information security law was that OTO would request from the Center the results of the examination conducted by an external certified body at the end of each year.

Giorgi then talked about e-Services and Device Consumption Policy, which aimed to control and regulate certain procedures from hiring to dismissal, which may include necessary software on the employee's personal computer, networked devices, or problems with the employee's computer, what procedures to perform or to whom to apply. The document also reviewed email, password and user policies and issues related to user account deactivation. Giorgi stressed that this entire policy would make the employee's responsibilities while working in the information security department and after his dismissal more visible.

After the presentation, in a question-and-answer format, Zaza Purtseladze noted that when it comes to an access to electronic resources, two important issues emerge: the so-called 'Safe guarding' policy, which includes the protection of vulnerable adults and children in the digital space. He said vulnerable adults are a particularly important target group, and therefore he asked whether a specific policy document would be developed in this regard to protect teachers, professors or others, or even to have information about the risks involved. He also stressed the importance of protecting children, and, in this context, raising awareness among parents was one of the most important directions for the Ministry. Mr. Zaza wondered at what extent the Center could be involved in this process. In addition, he spoke about one of the main problems, the language barrier and his organization is working hard to eliminate the problem.

Tamar Makharashvili, the Director of the Center responded that the problems listed by him could not be regulated only by the Center mandate and that these issues should be discussed more specifically by lawmakers, although the Center would pay attention to the problem by the help of its quality assurance mechanisms. She added that these directions were quite new to everyone and much needed to be done to address these challenges, including human and financial resources. The Director expressed readiness to allocate these resources.

Giorgi Gvasalia agreed with the Council member that these problems were realistic, although it would be more reasonable to involve the Education Management Information System in the issue of content filtration within its competence, which to some extent already implemented the above for minors, in terms of content filtering. But, the problem was exacerbated due to the fact that students have recently switched to online learning, neither the Center nor the Ministry will have direct access to their personal computers. Giorgi also agreed with Mr. Zaza on the issue of raising awareness and said that the concept of cyber security, unlike other countries, was quite vague in Georgia, both in terms of terminology and law. Nevertheless, one of the main parts of the country's information and cyber security strategy for 2021-2024 was to protect cyber hygiene and raise awareness around information and cyber security in the school and educational environment, and the Center was going to follow this strategy and act within its competence.

The members of the Coordinating Council supported the adoption of a policy document on the consumption of electronic services and devices.

Pro: 10

Against: 0

The last item on the agenda was the methodology for evaluating the Coordinating Council as a unified body, presented by Giorgi Munjishvili. He said that big changes took place between the previous and current Coordinating Council, which increased the powers of the Council and expanded the composition of the Council, more stakeholders had been represented in the current Coordinating Council, the requirements for members and the rules of working process were clarified. Giorgi noted that the changes were based on recommendations made in the framework of external evaluation, in particular the ESG 2015 standards and the ENQA recommendations. He also stressed that the Center

was an administrative supporter of the Coordinating Council and, therefore, the function of the methodology was, on the one hand, to evaluate the activities of the Council, which include various directions, and then, through the results obtained, to improve its activities in communication with the Council. On the other hand, prepare recommendations that can help improve the performance of the Council.

Lika Kutelia, Chief Specialist of the Planning, Research and International Relations Service, continued to talk about the methodology framework. She said that two topics were defined as evaluation criteria, the first being the participation of the Coordinating Council in the process of discussing the issues and the second, the activities carried out by the Council.

The first criterion identified three indicators. The first was the number of sessions and the attendance rate. Target benchmarks had been also set, as a good practice. According to Lika Kutelia, the second indicator was the timeliness of the decisions made. The third indicator was the frequency of communication and the timeliness of feedback.

According to Ms. Kutelia, the data according to the indicators should be collected using the following methods: analysis of the minutes of the meeting and the correspondence with the Council. To do this, they developed an instrument called the Framework for reflecting the Council operations. The frequency of data analysis was determined once a year (last period of the reporting year).

Lika Kutelia also spoke about the second criterion - the work conducted by the Coordinating Council in terms of improving the management and quality assurance system of the Center. She said that this criterion has four indicators. The first is the substantive feedback of the Council on the issues under consideration, and its target benchmark is that a large part of the Council's deliberation should be directed to the substantive (contextual) side of the issues under consideration. The second indicator is the recommendations developed by the Council within its competence and its target benchmark is at least 2 recommendations developed during the year, around the issues discussed.

The third indicator was the initiatives presented by the Council, and here two initiatives were targeted. According to Lika Kutelia, in order to collect the relevant data of these indicators, the analysis of the minutes of the Council meetings and the analysis of the written feedback of the Council members are again considered and the framework reflecting the work of the Council is still used as a tool. Although this part also meant collecting qualitative data, Ms. Lika said that focus groups would be held with decision makers as well as those involved in enforcement, services, divisions. In this case, a focus group Guide was used as a tool.

Finally, the fourth indicator was the purposefulness / relevance of the decisions made by the Council, the target benchmark of which was the result of the implementation of the decisions made by the Council. According to Ms. Lika, the evaluation method in this section was defined as a desk study, during which the minutes of the meeting, activity reports and other documents reflecting the activities were used. And for qualitative analysis the focus group method would be again applied. In this case, too, data is collected once a year (at the end of the reporting year).

In conclusion, Lika noted that the Center's Planning, Research and International Relations Department is responsible for the evaluation and that it will report to the Center's management. The results will be applied to improve the work of the Council. Giorgi Munjishvili pointed out that the mentioned evaluation methodology is useful for the Center, on the one hand, to improve the coordination and the administration part and on the other hand, to issue recommendations, which will help to improve the activities of the Council. According to him, it is planned to approve the mentioned methodology this year and evaluate the activities of the Council next year with this very methodology.

The questions in this section were not raised by the Coordinating Council and they supported the new evaluation methodology document by the majority of votes.

Pro: 10

Against: 0

**Chairman of the meeting:**

**Tea Gulua** -UNDP Knowledge Management and Innovation Specialist, Vocational Education Expert

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'A. Gulua', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Secretary of the meeting:**

**Maka Abuladze** - Representative of the Student Organization of Georgia NNLE, PhD student at the Georgian Technical University – LEPL

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Abuladze', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.