Queen’s University

Executive Summary of the Review of the Neuroscience Graduate Program

In accordance with Queen’s University Quality Assurance Processes (QUQAP), the neuroscience graduate program submitted a self-study on October 30, 2014 to the School of Graduate Studies, the Office of the Vice-Principal (Research) and the Office of the Provost and Vice-Principal (Academic) to initiate the cyclical program review of its graduate program. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, library report and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and the School of Graduate Studies. Appendices to the self-study contained CVs for faculty members in the neuroscience program and the library report.

Three arm’s-length reviewers (Kathryn Murphy, Professor, McMaster University; John Greer, Professor, University of Alberta; and, Joan Tranmer, Professor, Queen’s University) examined the materials and conducted a site visit on March 2-3, 2015. The site visit included interviews with the vice-provost (teaching and learning), vice-provost and dean and associate dean School of Graduate Studies, dean, vice-dean and associate dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences and meetings with the director of the Centre for Neuroscience Studies, heads of cognate units, the librarian, members of the neuroscience outreach group, students, staff and faculty.

In their report (March 19, 2015), the review team provided feedback that describes how the neuroscience graduate program meet the QUQAP evaluation criteria and are consistent with the university’s mission and academic priorities. The review team noted that the neuroscience graduate program is a large interdisciplinary program supported by a very strong group of faculty who are leaders in their fields and run state-of-the-art research facilities. The review team also complimented the excellent students within the program.

The review team did report on a number of challenges that face all large interdisciplinary and inter-faculty programs including: funding uncertainty; communication issues; and, a diversity of views about graduate education.

Based on all of the above documentation, a Final Assessment Report and an Implementation Plan were prepared by the vice-provost (teaching and learning) and approved by the provost (August 25, 2015).

The graduate neuroscience programs have been approved to continue and are scheduled for their next review in eight years (2022-2023)

Prepared by the vice-provost (teaching and learning) September 8, 2015
**Implementation Plan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To improve the student learning experience, the Centre for Neuroscience Studies should engage the Centre for Teaching and Learning to assist with a curriculum review to ensure that the curriculum is comprehensive, cohesive and aligned with the program’s learning objectives.</td>
<td>A curriculum mapping of all courses to DLEs, LOs and other indicators of achievement in conjunction with the Centre for Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Director, Centre for Neuroscience Studies, associate deans (FHS and SGS)</td>
<td>Vice-Provost and dean of Graduate Studies and the dean of Health Sciences’ annual reports to the provost 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the context of the new activity-based budget model, and in collaboration with the appropriate deans, the centre for neuroscience studies should review its current administrative structures and resources with an eye to maintaining and potentially augmenting the number of support staff.</td>
<td>Initiate meetings with director and relevant associate deans (FHS and SGS)</td>
<td>Director, Centre for Neuroscience Studies and associate deans (FHS and SGS)</td>
<td>Vice-Provost and dean of Graduate Studies and the dean of Health Sciences’ annual reports to the provost 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>