FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
<Date>
<Program>
Cyclical Program Review
Dean: <Dean>

Under Ontario Tech University's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) and the Ontario Quality Assurance Framework (QAF), all programs are subject to a comprehensive review at least/at minimum every eight years to ensure that they continue to meet provincial quality assurance requirements and to support their ongoing rigour and coherence. Program reviews involve several stages, including:

1. A comprehensive and analytical self-study brief developed by members of the program under review.
2. A site visit by academic experts who are external to and arm's length from the program. The visit involves discussions with senior academic administrators, faculty, staff, and students.
3. Submission of an external reviewers' report including recommendations on ways the program may be improved based on a review of the program's self-study brief, discussions during the site visit and supporting material.
4. Internal responses to the external review and recommendations prepared separately by the Program and Dean.
5. Development of an Implementation Plan prepared by the Dean including resource requirements and a timeline for acting on and monitoring the implementation of the recommendations.

On the completion of the program review, the Implementation Plan is reviewed by the Provost, through the Academic Resource Committee (ARC), to examine resource implications. The ARC prepares a summary report and CIQE prepares the Final Assessment Report (FAR) and an Executive Summary suitable for publication. The FAR, Executive Summary, and Implementation Plan are then presented to the appropriate standing committee of Academic Council (USC/GSC). Upon USC/GSC

approval, the Executive Summary and Implementation Plan are provided to Academic Council and the Board of Governors for information, sent to the Quality Council as required under the Quality Assurance Framework, and posted on the Ontario Tech corporate website.

In academic years <review term; format as: YYYY-YYYY> a program review was scheduled for <program(s)>. The internal assessment team is to be commended for undertaking this assignment in addition to an already challenging workload and within a very tight timeline.

This is the <first, second, third, etc...> program review for this program. Enhancements implemented as a result of the previous review were:
- <Provide a bulleted list of the previous review's key recommendations and how they have been implemented.>

The following pages synthesize the reports and recommendations resulting from the review, identifying the strengths of the program as well as the opportunities for program improvement and enhancement. A report from the Dean, on behalf of the Faculty, outlining the progress that has been made in implementing the recommendations will also be put forward in eighteen months' time.

External Reviewers: <Name, Institution>, <Name, Institution>
Site Visit: <Site Visit Dates>

Program Overview
<From self-study report>

Significant Strengths of the Program
<From response to ERR and self-study report>

Opportunities for Program Improvement and Enhancement
<From response to ERR and self-study report>

The External Review
The site visit took place on <Site visit date>. <External Reviewers> met with members of the Faculty as well as key stakeholders at the University, including <people with whom the reviewers met> and members of the internal assessment team and a number of faculty, staff, and students.

The external reviewers were invited to acknowledge and provide evidence of any clearly innovative aspects of the program and to identify and commend notably strong and creative attributes of the program relative to other such programs. The Faculty was grateful for the thoughtful and thorough review provided.

Reviewer Recommendations and Internal Responses

The external reviewers identified <mark>five</mark> recommendations, some of which have multiple components. The Faculty of <mark><insert name of Faculty></mark> values the recommendations and the Program and Dean have been very thoughtful in their responses.

The reviewers' recommendations are listed below in priority sequence, along with the corresponding responses from the Program and Dean.

<mark><insert chart from Decanal Response and Implementation Plan></mark>

No.	Reviewers' Recommendation	Program Response	Decanal Response
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

Recommendations not Addressed

Recommendations not addressed and rationale from the Decanal response.

#	Recommendation not Addressed	Rationale

Due Date for 18-Month Follow-up Report: <mark><Date></mark>
Date of Next Cyclical Review: <mark><Date></mark>

<If confidential information is presented in any of the documentation used to prepare the FAR, this information will be included only in an appendix. The appendix will be afforded the appropriate level of confidentiality within the Office of the Provost and will be withheld from distribution.>

<CIQE to prepare FAR PLO Enhancement Summary and append to FAR>