



Ontario College Quality Assurance Service

Service de l'assurance de la qualité des  
collèges de l'Ontario

## **COLLEGE QUALITY ASSURANCE AUDIT PROCESS (CQAAP)**

### **AUDIT REPORT**

#### **GEORGIAN COLLEGE**

**DATE OF AUDIT VIRTUAL VISIT:** June 9 to 11 2025

**SUBMISSION DATE:** July 2, 2025

**PREPARED BY:** Alan Davis, Tracy Gedies and Andrea  
Mickelson



## Table of Contents

APPROVAL OF THE AUDIT REPORT .....	3
STIPULATIONS .....	4
1. Commendations .....	4
2. Affirmations.....	4
3. Recommendations.....	5
Conclusions.....	5
Audit Results.....	6
Audit Decision: .....	6




### APPROVAL OF THE AUDIT REPORT


This report represents the findings of the College Quality Assurance Audit Process for **Georgian college**.

This report has been prepared, reviewed, and accepted by all parties to the Audit, including the college President, members of the audit panel, and the Chair of the OCQAS Management Board. The signatures of the representative parties demonstrate their acceptance of the content of this report.




### COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Signature: 	Date: October 9, 2025
--	-----------------------

### CHAIR- OCQAS MANAGEMENT BOARD

Signature: 	Date: September 26, 2025
--	--------------------------

### AUDIT PANEL MEMBERS

<i>Chair</i> Signature: 	Date: July 2, 2025
<i>Panelist</i> Signature: 	Date: July 2, 2025
<i>Panelist</i> Signature: 	Date: July 2, 2025



## STIPULATIONS

### 1. Commendations

- 1.2 QA infrastructure: the several units that are central to QA at Georgian (in particular the OAQ, IR, CTL, and the RO) are each to be commended for their dedication to quality and the student experience, and (most importantly) their interconnectedness: there was no evidence of them operating in siloes and plenty of indications that they collaborate effectively.
- 1.2 and 2.1 APQR and CPR: a strong and effective relationship has been established between the Annual and Comprehensive Program Review processes. This alignment ensures programs remain relevant and current in a timely manner, while also supporting continuous quality improvement. The integration of these review cycles has streamlined the Comprehensive process, making it more manageable and focused. Additionally, there is a clear mechanism in place for monitoring and following up on action items, which reinforces a culture of accountability and ongoing program enhancement.
- 1.5 Impact of QA: The college does a very good job closing the loop on many of their quality assurance initiatives (using existing and new tools and processes) both on the academic side as well as among the Student Services (e.g. using Navigate 360).
- 1.7 Effective use of digital systems: these tools, such as CIM, SYL, and Navigate 360 effectively support QA at Georgian. The CIM demonstration highlighted the advantage of using this system enabling the institution (not just a person or department) to track documentation over the lifespan of a program. Examples were provided from program development, program review, and annual program reviews.
- 3.3 PACs: through orientation, onboarding and contribution, they are very involved in decision-making, with the student experience at the heart of those decisions.

### 2. Affirmations

#### Affirmation 1

1.2 The Audit Panel supports Affirmation 1 from the College's self-study: the College should continue to leverage the new APQR process with Comprehensive Program Reviews, standards implementation, and pathways development.

#### Affirmation 2



4.1 and 4.3 The Audit Panel supports this affirmation and considers that the introduction of SYL demonstrates another level of commitment to QA fostering further consistency, transparency and clarity for students. Continuing to bring consistency to the assessment of student learning, as per the College's policy and using SYL to provide syllabus templates etc. is encouraged.

The Audit Panel would also encourage the college to consider how CTL might use the Course Feedback Survey results to support ongoing teaching and learning development across all programs of instruction including the need for prompt and constructive evaluation of student learning.

### **Affirmation 3**

6.1 The Audit Panel also supports this affirmation to fully implement and monitor the new Formative Faculty Reflection Procedure, and to report on this in 2 years' time.

## **3. Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

5.5 As is often the case across many institutions, there is a disconnect between the policies, process and offices devoted to transfer credit and CPL and the experiences of students. The Audit Panel recommends that Georgian look at how it can improve the impact of its activities in this important area and recommends that Georgian ensures that its academic policies and procedures regarding prior learning and transfer credit (recognition) are established, explained, and applied for all programs offered by the college.

### **Recommendation 2**

6.1 The Audit Panel noted a discrepancy between policy and faculty feedback during the site visit and acknowledges that the College is piloting a new formative faculty review process. The panel recommends implementing performance appraisals beyond probationary requirements to support ongoing professional development planning.

## **CONCLUSION**

Overall, this is a very positive outcome, and a "mature" result for Georgian, with all standards being met.



There is an obvious dedication to QA at all levels, and willingness to work across divisions to make it so. There is underlying the processes and policies and work instructions a strong culture of QA which was evident everywhere: from the Board, externally, and across all academic and non-academic staff.

The Audit Panel commends the College for providing an abundance of evidence for all the required programs in the audit as well as others, and for responding so thoroughly to the Audit Team’s requests for more information and clarification before and after the virtual visit.

The Audit Panel believes that the infrastructure and processes that Georgian have established, all focussing on the student experience and on compliance with Ministry and OCQAS requirements are good exemplars for other colleges, for example:

- The structure of the Office of Academic Quality to include Curriculum Process Specialists.
- A strong and impactful Centre for Teaching and Learning, including copious communications, feedback strategies, mentoring, onboarding and required training for online, blended and GCflex deliveries, and its review of its own work.
- For requirement 5.2, the use of PolicyTech - the software used to create and revise policies, facilitate workflows and approvals, and communicates changes to the college community.
- For requirement 6.1 the Panel saw strong processes for hiring and onboarding new faculty.

**Audit Results**

Standard	Result		
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met
6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met

**Audit Decision:**

- Mature Effort
- Organized Effort
- Formal Effort